



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Votre file - Votre référence

Notre file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**Attitudinal and Socio-Demographic Determinants of Nonmarital
Heterosexual Cohabitation: the Case of Canadian Women**

Maria Rossetti

**A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Sociology**

**Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

September, 1992

© Maria Rossetti, 1992



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-90917-X

Canada

ABSTRACT

Attitudinal and Socio-Demographic Determinants of Nonmarital Heterosexual Cohabitation: the Case of Canadian Women

Maria Rossetti

This thesis investigates the relative explanatory powers of a subset of attitudinal and socio-demographic factors with respect to Canadian women's propensity to cohabit. Nonmarital heterosexual cohabitation is defined as two members of the opposite sex residing together in one residence. In this study, respondents defined whether they were in a nonmarital cohabiting union. No restrictions or set of conditions were used to define what constituted nonmarital cohabitation. The duration of the cohabiting relationship and the number of days per week spent together in the same residence, are not specified in the survey. The data source used in this study is the Canadian Fertility Survey (Balakrishnan et al., 1984), the first of its kind in Canada. In order to investigate the effects of attitudinal and socio-demographic variables on cohabitation practice, step-wise multiple regression analysis is employed.

The findings of this research indicate that the three most salient variables encouraging women to cohabit are history of a previous marriage (indicating divorce, separation or widowhood); childlessness; and membership in the age cohort 18 to 25 years. Other relatively important indicators of nonmarital cohabitation are; membership in the 26 to 39 years of age group and a negative attitude towards marriage. Concurrently, employment status and religiosity demonstrated weak effects on women's propensity to cohabit. Women who are employed are less likely to cohabit and women who are more religious (frequently attend religious services) are less likely to cohabit. However, it must be stated that while attaining levels of statistical significance, these factors have minimal effects on Canadian women's propensity to cohabit. Other variables such as: 1) lack of desire for secure long-term commitments, 2) greater prevalence of female single-parent families, 3) years of women's education, 4) women's perception of cohabitation as a

viable living-arrangement, 5) autonomous attitudes in women, 6) women's attitude concerning the importance of children in one's life, 7) attitude towards abortion 8) egalitarian sex role attitudes in women, and 9) family and peer group acceptance of nonmarital cohabitation, resulted as statistically insignificant indicators of nonmarital cohabitation for women. Cumulatively, our empirical research model accounts for a total of 44 per cent of the unexplained variance in this sample of Canadian women's propensity to cohabit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my Thesis Supervisor, Dr. Susan Hoecker-Drysdale, for her unfailing encouragement and scholarly guidance; Committee Member, Dr. Bill Reimer for his support, and expertise in statistical methods and analyses and Dr. Fran Shaver for her support and guidance as a Committee Member.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: INTRODUCTION

Research Problem	4
Rationale	7

Chapter II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Social-Exchange Theory

The Evaluation of Costs and Rewards	13
Cohabitation Studies: A Social Exchange Context	16
- Cohabitation: A Form of Trial Marriage	
- Cohabitation: An Extension of Courtship	
- Cohabitation: An Alternative to Patriarchal Marriage	

B. A Feminist Analysis

A Critique of the Monolithic Family	21
Woman's Role as "Natural and Proper"	22
The Cultural Glorification of Women's Roles in the Family	22
The Sexual Division of Labour within Different Living-Arrangements	25
Women's Status as Unpaid Labourer	27
The Incompatibility of Family Responsibilities and Employment Opportunities	27
Feminist Empirical Analyses:	
- Shifting Attitudes towards Marriage	30
- Shifting Attitudes towards Sex Roles	31
Feminist Conclusions	35

C. Socio-Demographic Factors And The Propensity To Cohabit

Pertinent Factors:

1. The Instability of Marriage and High Divorce Rates	39
2. Age Cohort	40
3. Decreasing Fertility Rates and the Postponement of Childbearing	41
4. Desire for Security and Commitment	42
5. Employment Status and Income Level	43
6. Religiosity and Religious Affiliation	44

Outmoded Factors:

1. Educational Attainment	45
2. Urban/Rural Residence	45
3. History of Illicit Drug Use	46
4. Social Acceptance	47

Chapter III: MODEL SPECIFICATION

Social and Demographic Determinants of Nonmarital Cohabitation

1. History of Divorce/Separation	49
2. Childlessness	49
3. Religiosity	50
4. Age Cohort	51
5. Education	52

6.	Employment Status	53
7.	Urban/Rural Residence	53
Attitudinal Factors		
8.	Attitude Towards Marriage	54
9.	The Desire for Security - the Need for a Long Term Relationship	54
10.	Perception of Cohabitation as a Viable Living Arrangement	55
11.	Social Acceptance of Cohabiting Couples	55
12.	The Importance of Children in Women's Lives	56
13.	The Desire for Autonomy	56
14.	Egalitarian Sex Role Attitudes	56
15.	Acceptance of Nontraditional Family Forms	57
16.	Attitude towards Abortion	58
Hypotheses		59
 Chapter IV: METHODOLOGY		
	Data	61
	Operationalization and Variable Measurement	62
	Socio-Demographic and Attitudinal Variables	63
	Methods	64
 Chapter V: ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS		67
 Chapter VI: CONCLUSION		84
 APPENDIX A		
	Variable Specification and Coding Procedures	89
 APPENDIX B		
	Frequency Distributions	
Table 1.0	Cohabitation by Presence of Children	108
Table 1.1	Cohabitation by Age Cohort Distribution	108
Table 1.2	Cohabitation by Marital Status	108
Table 1.3	Cohabitation by Attitude towards Marriage	109
Table 1.4	Cohabitation by Importance of a Long-Term Relationship	109
Table 1.5	Cohabitation by Religiosity	109
Table 1.6	Cohabitation by Social Acceptance of Cohabiting Couples	110
Table 1.7	Cohabitation by Acceptance of Female Single-Parent Family	110
Table 1.8	Cohabitation by Attitude towards Children	110
Table 1.9	Cohabitation by Acceptance of Cohabitation as an Alternative Living-Arrangement	110
Table 2.0	Cohabitation by Attitude Towards Abortion	111
Table 2.1	Cohabitation by Sex Role	111
Table 2.2	Cohabitation by Autonomous Attitude	111
Table 2.3	Means and Standard Deviation Scores for Education and Attitude towards Abortion	111
Table 3.0	Stepwise Regression Coefficients	112
 REFERENCES		113

Introduction

The present study provides an analysis of attitudinal and socio-demographic determinants influencing women in their decision to cohabit. The data applied here, are selected from the Canadian Fertility Study (Balakrishnan et al., 1984), Canada's first national level fertility study conducted from April to June of 1984.

The theoretical frameworks supporting this study feminist and social exchange theory. These perspectives are selected primarily because of feminist theory's analysis of shifting attitudinal and behavioural trends with respect to changing sex roles and alternative family forms. Feminist literature contains comprehensive analyses of the changing societal attitudes and behaviour beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, which brought about a greater acceptance and increase in the practice of cohabitation. Social-exchange theory provides a cost analysis perspective in which individuals evaluate and negotiate the costs and rewards of various marital and doughty living arrangements and partners involved.

While much of the empirical research on cohabitation is of a descriptive nature, few studies compare different living arrangements and investigate determinants of cohabitation. Moreover, only a limited number of studies apply a theoretical approach using feminist or social-exchange theory (Doughy, 1987; Lopata, 1980; Kotkin 1983; and Lyness et al., 1972; Murstein et al., 1977 respectively). This research attempts to utilise social-exchange theory to help explain women's propensity to cohabit. From this view point, it may be argued that nonmarital cohabitation offers greater rewards and fewer costs than traditional courtship or marriage. In addition, feminist theory proves to be a valid analytical perspective because it examines socio-economic, political and attitudinal changes of recent decades which have helped pave the path towards a growing practice of cohabitation.

The objectives of this research are, to determine which demographic, social, and attitudinal determinants explain the growing tendency of nonmarital heterosexual unions in Canada and second, to provide a descriptive analysis of cohabiting women. Empirical studies, dating mainly from the 70s and early 80s, have noted the importance of the following attitudinal and behavioural factors with respect to cohabitation: the desire for autonomy, a history of illicit drug use and attitudes towards abortion, marriage and division of household chores. These and other social and demographic factors, such as a history of divorce, parental divorce, age cohort, presence of children, educational level, social acceptance of cohabitation, religiosity and place of residence have been identified as possible determinants of cohabitation. This study attempts to investigate: 1) the empirical validity of feminist and social-exchange premises; 2) support for the findings of previous studies; and 3) the relative impact of each variable on the main dependant variable, women's tendency to cohabit. The first chapter presents the research question central to this study, followed by a rationale for a socio-demographic analysis of nonmarital heterosexual cohabitation, in a changing social context. The second chapter constitutes a review of theoretical literature which elaborates on the tenets of social exchange and feminist theory. In addition, this chapter discusses previous empirical research in terms of the relationships between demographic, socio-psychological and attitudinal factors and cohabitation. The third chapter delineates the empirical model to be tested. The hypotheses presented in this model are based upon findings of previous empirical research as well as the theoretical assumptions of feminism and social-exchange theory. The fourth chapter specifies the methodology implemented, including a brief discussion of the data, operationalization of the theoretical framework and measurement of the selected variables, and a discussion on the applied statistical method of analysis. The fifth chapter entails three objectives: 1) to provide an analysis of the present research findings, 2) to compare these findings with those from previous research, and 3) to ascertain the usefulness of feminism and social-exchange theory as relevant theoretical perspectives. The last chapter provides a

summary of the results, their implications, and possible future questions for empirical inquiry.

Research Problem

This investigation attempts to investigate the relative impact of various socio-demographic and attitudinal variables on Canadian women's propensity to opt for nonmarital heterosexual cohabitation. This research is based on a sample of 5315 Canadian women between the ages of 18 and 49 years, of which 451 presently cohabit and 2599 are married and never cohabited. In most of the empirical studies conducted on the subject of cohabitation, the concept of cohabitation has not been defined in a theoretical sense, nor has it been operationalized in a consistent or univariate manner in order to conduct research. Instead researchers have used various definitions, ranging from very liberal explanations to restrictive definitions including in them the regularity, frequency, duration of cohabital arrangement, as well as shared duties and responsibilities of the cohabiters (Cole, 1977; Macklin, 1976; Tanfer, 1987).

Lyness and associates (1972) define cohabitation as a situation where a man and a woman are not married to each other nor living in common law yet occupy the same dwelling. Cole (1977:65) establishes the criterion of common residence or common residence under marriage-like conditions in the following definition of cohabitation: "two adult persons of different sex living together under marriage like conditions in the same household without having officially confirmed their relationship through marriage", although the concept of "marriage-like conditions" is not entirely clear. Another definition used by the U.S. Bureau of Census is "households occupied by two or more unrelated adults of the opposite sex, with and without the presence of children under 15 years of age (Macklin, 1983).

The cohabiter/noncohabiter definition used in this study is derived from a single question asked of respondents, that is: "Now I have some questions about your marital

status. Are you now married, living with a partner (common-law), separated, divorced, widowed or have you never been married?" This direct and unqualified question sets no predefined conditions as to what constitutes cohabitation, however the existence of sexual relations may be implied. Although conditions which define cohabitation may vary across empirical studies, they usually include: (1) an established minimal duration for the cohabiting relationship, and (2) a predetermined minimal number of nights per week spent together. In this research no definition is conceptualized since the understanding of what constitutes this practice is left up to the respondent (Notional Fertility Survey, 1984). It can only be assumed that a consensus exists among respondents, as to what constitutes cohabitation. Although this situation is not expected to cause serious methodological problems for the research, couples who spend most of their nights together, but prefer to maintain separate residences or commute due to work commitments, may consider themselves as living alone.

In studying presently cohabiting and never-cohabited married women, it is assumed that various factors (investigated in this study) lead women to cohabit as opposed to opting directly for marriage. The present study focuses upon the relative effects of these explanatory variables. In view of the significant amount of information on attitudinal, behavioural and demographic variables, the Canadian Fertility Survey was used. As was mentioned, the sample population consists of 5315 Canadian women between the ages of 18 and 49 years. Various aspects of women's lives such as: respondent's background, attitudes on the family and children, marital background, maternity history, knowledge and use of contraceptive methods, fertility expectations, sharing housework and professional life, economic aspects of the family are studied in this comprehensive survey of Canadian women. This survey was conducted on a national level with the collaboration of three Canadian universities: University of Montreal, University of Western Ontario and University of Alberta. Those responsible for the undertaking of the immense research were

E. Lapierre-Ademsyck (University of Montreal) and T.R. Balakrishnan (University of Western Ontario).

A Rationale for Socio-Demographic and Attitudinal Research on Determinants of Nonmarital Heterosexual Cohabitation for Canadian Women

Numerous studies have focused upon shifting attitudes towards issues related to cohabitation and cohabitation itself. The 1966 - 1975 period appears to have been a turning point in North American culture with respect to sexual values and related lifestyles. The erosion of social norms, concomitant with the revolution in the sexual experience of unmarried persons, has seriously weakened the grounds for the rejection (disapproval) of cohabitation (Bumpass, 1990). It has been theorized that on a broad level, the trend towards liberalized attitudes such as: the liberalization of sexual mores, the increased acceptance of homosexuality, and the growing pattern of secularization have in part been responsible for the declining social stigmatization of this living arrangement and consequently the dramatic increase in the acceptance and practice of nonmarital cohabitation (Macklin, 1983; Newcomb, 1979; Bumpass, 1990).

Since the 1920s, growing urbanization, increased mobility, and higher level of educational attainment for women have increased the possibilities for greater anonymity and privacy. This situation progressed as the 1960s witnessed the emergence of social movements and the growing demands for equal rights for both women and men, including students, who were now considered adults as a result of changes in university policy.

The outcome on most campuses was a rapid abolishment of "loco parentis", the introduction of coed dorms, the authorization of 24 hour visitation privileges, new freedom for women to live off campus, and a gradual reduction in the double standard (Macklin, 1983). Thus, living together relationships began to acquire greater acceptance among the general population and became increasingly popular. Consequently this emerging reality

has led to a steady decline in the age of initial sexual experience for women and a growing acceptance of premarital sexual activity.

By 1972, it was estimated that 70 percent of single college students both male and female, were nonvirginal by the senior year (Macklin, 1983). Moreover in a 1978 survey of America's values undertaken by Yankelovich (1981) for TIME Magazine, 52% of the respondents disagreed with the belief that it was "morally wrong for couples who are not married to be living together" (Macklin, 1983:55).

While the sixties experienced a liberal-egalitarian swing in societal opinions concerning politics, religion and sex, this trend was most significant in the area of sex (during the sixties) and remained the most important area in which attitudes continued to shift during the seventies.

"The changes in attitude toward politics and church were 10 to 15%, respectively, while in the area of sex, the changes ranged from 10 to 40% according to particular topic surveyed (e.g., birth control, abortion, and homosexuality). In the 1970s this progressive tendency continued only in the area of sex ." (Cees J. Straver, 1981:44-5)

A liberalization of sexual morality in turn has lead the North-American people to view relationships more openly and contributed to the increasing prevalence of non-marital unions. Positive attitudes towards this arrangement are generally more current among the young, while older respondents express more favourable attitudes than they had a decade earlier (Macklin, 1983). Newcomb (1983-4) states that the "situational contexts" such as social acceptance by parents or peers plays an important role in determining whether cohabitation will be a viable living arrangement and the meaning it will acquire. Accompanying this growing liberalization of norms relating to lifestyles is the relaxation of social pressure to marry (for its own sake or for that of legitimizing out-of-wedlock births) (Tanfer, 1987), and a decrease in the social stigma associated with divorce (Glick, 1978a). These factors have actually eased the path towards cohabitation during the sixties, seventies

and eighties decades. Consequently, nonmarital unions have become a common part of the relationship cycle. Partly as a result of economic factors (i.e. tendency to share resources to deal with limited financial means), liberalized societal norms, the postponement of marriage, and increasingly large numbers of divorced or separated individuals, nonmarital cohabitation may become a significant determinant of low fertility rates and the postponement of marriage.

The relatively recent and significant increases in cohabitation among the general population, reported by several demographers in the U.S. Census (Glick, 1977, 1980; Macklin, 1976, 1983), point to greater acceptance and tolerance of this living arrangement. In the past, this living arrangement was practised mostly by the lower economic classes as a temporary arrangement for couples who lacked the financial means to marry, while middle class morality was opposed it. Today middle-class white America has begun increasingly to adopt this living arrangement.

Evidence of such increases are reported in numerous studies and national polls on nonmarital cohabitation (Hobart, 1979; Glick and Norton, 1977; Glick and Spanier, 1980; Macklin, 1972, 1978; Yllo, 1978; and Newcomb, 1983-4). However, within the Canadian context there is a paucity of demographic studies on cohabitation. Although estimates of the prevalence of cohabitation are not very reliable, demographers have reported considerable increases in cohabitation, primarily among college students in the late 60s and 70s, and in the general population during the 1970s and 80s. This increase in heterosexual cohabitation has been substantial enough for the U.S. Census Bureau to create an entirely new category for this population: "Persons of the Opposite Sex Sharing Living Quarters or POSSLQ" (Cotten-Huston, Lunney and Heard, 1984).

Researchers theorize that part of the increase in the numbers of cohabiting dyads may be attributed to more honest reporting of marital status and living arrangements (due to decreasing social stigmatization of alternative lifestyles), as well as a larger cohort of individuals born during the postwar baby boom period. According to Glick and Norton (1977), individuals born during the 1940's and 1950's, now in their forties are those most likely to cohabit. However other sources (Tafner, 1987) claim that cohabitation is most common among those born at the end of the baby boom period who are now in their twenties and thirties. Despite the diverse predictions of which age cohort is most likely to cohabit, the growing popularity of this living arrangement over the past two decades is significant and cannot be attributed solely to frankness in response or fluctuations in cohort size. It is hypothesized that other elements, such as a trend towards liberal attitudes and the secularization of society, are likely to influence cohabitation.

Social researchers (Glick, 1988; DeMaris, 1984; Macklin, 1983; Hobart, 1981, 1983; Glick and Spanier, 1980; Glick and Norton, 1977) claim that various societal changes are responsible for the recent increase in nonmarital cohabitation. Pervasive social changes such as a permissive sexual morality, the invention and accessibility of contraceptive methods, a greater tolerance and acceptance of alternative lifestyles, growing secularization, and disillusionment with marriage have made cohabitation an attractive alternative to marriage. Concurrently, the feminist movement also played an important role in the re-examination of the traditional sex roles by questioning the nature and limitations of conventional marriage and other forms of personal relationships, while advocating personal emancipation and autonomy for women.

Regardless of all the cohabitation research that has been produced to date, the concept of cohabitation has not yet been systematically defined. Researchers have applied various definitions, with only slight variations on the conditions that constitute

cohabitation. These definitions extend from very liberal and inclusive to highly restrictive definitions, with respect to consistency, frequency and length of time sharing the same residence, as well as shared duties and responsibilities of the partners (Cole, 1977; Macklin, 1978).

Although this study does not intend to investigate the rates of cohabitation, its increasing frequency indicates a new norm rather than an exception. In Canada, the latest Census figures (1986) estimate a total of 6,734,980 married couples and 486,940 cohabiting couples or approximately 7 percent of all couples residing together. In 1984, the U.S. Census estimated that 1,560,000 unmarried couples were living together, three times the number engaging in this practice in 1970 (Macklin, 1983). According to the latest U.S. Census Bureau estimates, this figure has now risen to more than 2 million in 1986, a 25% increase within a two-year period (Thornton, 1988).

Although U.S. census figures estimate that in 1984, unmarried cohabiting couples represented approximately 4% of all households, "currently cohabiting" percentages tend to be much lower than "ever-cohabited" percentages (Arland, 1988). Arland speculates that:

"With increasing rates of transition into cohabitation and high rates of transition out of cohabitation either because of marriage or the dissolution of the relationship, the gap between current status and lifetime experience increased across the life course. By the age of 23.5 the percentage of men and women currently cohabiting was only about one-third as large as the percentage who had ever cohabited, and this discrepancy is likely to become larger as these young people age (Arland, 1988:506)."

More updated findings reveal that from the 1960s to 1985-1986, the proportion of first marriages preceded by cohabitation rose from 8% to 49% (Bumpass, 1990). This finding is also confirmed in other studies by Gwartney-Gibbs, 1986; Burch and Madan, 1986). Thus, it is increasingly clear that nonmarital cohabitation affects a significant proportion of the population (Arland, 1988; Macklin, 1983; Newcomb, 1979). Thus, the

objective of this research is to identify social and demographic factors which may help explain women's behavioural tendencies with respect to cohabitation.

Chapter II: THEORETICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

A. SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

In the past two decades social-exchange theory, which presupposes that personal relationships are based upon the negotiation of rewards and costs, has been used to study the family and marital relations (Scanzoni, 1970, 1972, 1978, 1982; McDonald, 1978). Social-exchange theory encompasses elements of exchange, including alternatives to economic resources provided by one's spouse or partner. This theoretical standpoint is particularly applicable to the issue of choice of living arrangement. We may ask: Does nonmarital cohabitation offer a more favourable balance of costs and rewards than marriage, and if so, will this favourable trade-off of costs and rewards have a positive influence on women's tendency to cohabit?

The Evaluation of Costs and Rewards in Relationships

In terms of costs, two types can be identified. In the first category of costs certain positions (i.e. as that of homosexuals, lesbians or mistresses) are accompanied by widespread societal persecution, distrust or disdain because of a conservative value orientation. The second type of costs involves rewards forgone (such as: rewarding positions, interaction, feelings, relationships or milieu) because a competing alternative was chosen (Nye, 1979). It is assumed that the individual will make choices based upon the 'greatest anticipated profit' or 'least loss'. Yet as outcomes cannot be accurately predicted, the outcome of the decision may actually be less rewarding than anticipated or less than another alternative could have offered (Nye, 1979). Given that heterosexual cohabitation is generally well accepted as a living arrangement, the costs entail rewards forgone in relation to marriage.

Autonomy may be one factor considered to be a valuable reward, in that one may choose certain activities, careers and relationships that offer a surplus of rewards in relation to costs. With other rewards and costs being equal, security becomes an important factor in determining choice of relationships. It is hypothesized that "... reasons for an essentially conservative aspect of human affairs are fear and worry about the unknown (Nye, 1979:18). Although Nye does not elaborate on what is meant by "conservative aspect of human affairs" it is assumed that this refers to an unwillingness to take risks or attempt any change which has no guarantees (i.e. emotional or financial security). These individuals opt for alternatives that offer the least ambiguity in terms of expected outcomes and future events. Hence the "promise of security", present in marriage but not as obvious in nonmarital cohabitation, may discourage women from opting for cohabitation.

Furthermore, evaluation of a given relationship (such as cohabitation) according to alternatives (being married or single) entails a comparison of the social consequences of the relationship (i.e position and social background) to those of alternatives involved. When an alternative provides a better reward-cost ratio, it is hypothesized that the individual will leave his/her present relationship and enter into the relationship or situation offering a better reward-cost ratio. Yet this presupposes that when in a personal relationship, human-beings are rational and do not let emotions interfere in their decision-making. Hence, social-exchange theory presupposes that both partners in a personal relationship calculate the rewards and costs involved. This assumption negates the importance of the emotional/affective aspect of the relationship. It must also be assumed that the alternative relationship or situation is more attractive than the chosen one, in order to make up for the costs of moving out of the old relationship and into the new. In this respect, social-exchange theory is incomplete in its analysis of the dynamics of exchange between two partners and the perceived rewards and costs which may be quite subjective.

Studies of nonmarital cohabitation have discovered that this living arrangement has numerous possible meanings and motives for cohabiters. For some, this arrangement is viewed as providing easy access to termination of the relationship without the legal implications of marriage. For the younger population, this lifestyle is an extension of the courtship process and appears attractive because it provides an intimate and full relationship allowing for the deferral of marital commitment. It also provides the opportunity for helping individuals in their decisions about one another ("Am I satisfied with this person?"). In this respect, living together allows individuals to weigh marital reciprocity and exchanges in daily routine in a more dispassionate form (on a trial basis) than is possible under the traditional premarital courtship process (Nye, 1979). Still other cohabiters view unmarried cohabitation as a means of avoiding total commitment as that required by legal marriage, because of its perceived restrictive and repressive nature.

In a Canadian public opinion poll (Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, 1981) a significant change in attitudes towards cohabitation was reported to have occurred during the 70's. Almost 50 percent of the respondents felt that it was sensible to cohabit in order to determine whether the individuals involved wanted to marry one another. In DeMaris' study (1984:274) it was revealed that "...fully 70 percent of American couples lived together for at least some period of time prior to marriage...". It appears that a significant number of individuals, single and married, use nonmarital cohabitation as a transitional phase prior to marriage to determine compatibility. Other research (Bumpass, 1990:487) shows that among several questions regarding reasons for cohabitation, respondents most often cited that: "couples can make sure they are compatible before getting married". This growing need or desire to "try out" (in order to determine their compatibility as marital partners) marriage in cohabitation may be the result of our increasing awareness of the fragility of marital relationships.

Within the Canadian context, recent Census figures point to the growing popularity of cohabitation experience. In 1986 there were 486,940 cohabiting couples, compared with 356,610 couples living together in 1981, the first time the Canadian census enumerated cohabiters (Statistics Canada: 1986 Canadian Census). This figure points to a considerable increase of 37 per cent over a five year period. Furthermore, there are 188,665 unmarried couples living together in Quebec, representing Canada's highest cohabitation rate; 12.6 per cent of all couples living together, compared to a national rate of 8.3 per cent. In the U.S., research has shown that increases in the rate of cohabitation coincide with important changes in family patterns, such as the decrease in the rates of marriage and remarriage (Sweet and Bumpass, 1989). This situation also appears to be true within the Canadian context.

COHABITATION STUDIES: A SOCIAL EXCHANGE CONTEXT

Cohabitation a Form of Trial-Marriage

Thus, according to the social-exchange perspective (Newcomb and Bentler, 1980, Newcomb, 1983-4, Bumpass, 1990) cohabitation serves as a temporary arrangement which allows for the postponement of marriage by giving an individual time to determine compatibility. During this time the participant evaluates the reciprocation of positive qualities or their compatibility, (i.e. attractiveness, intelligence, sociability and so on) by one's partner.

In a study by Newcomb and Bentler (1980) cohabiters individually perceive themselves as having significantly more positive qualities (e.g. attractive, intelligent, outgoing, etc) than married respondents who have no cohabitation experience. Thus, in viewing themselves with significantly greater positive qualities, cohabiters are perhaps more cautious and selective about marital commitment to a partner, because they feel they

have more to offer in terms of personality or various other aspects. Thus, some women may desire to experiment with cohabitation before considering the permanency of marriage.

It must also be said that cohabiters perceive fewer deterrents to ending their relationship than married couples (Cole, 1976; Kotkin, 1990). Therefore, cohabiters are more likely to enter this relationship with a view of this relationship as temporary when compared to marriage. In a study on American university students, Kotkin (1990:159-160) reports that a majority (64%) of engaged cohabiters consider their living arrangement a form of trial-marriage, while the vast majority of all respondents (grouping together married/ unmarried, engaged and non-engaged living-together men and women) do not view their initial decision to cohabit as contingent upon marital plans. In a series of questions on reasons for cohabitation examined in the Bumpass (1990) research, the option "couples can make sure that they are compatible before getting married" is reported far more often than any other choice offered. In 90% of nonmarital unions (Bumpass,1990) at least one partner expects marriage. This indicates that from the outset, most respondents do not perceive living together as a form of trial-marriage. These findings may also be attributed to the fact that the sample is composed of university graduate students as opposed to a heterogeneous population.

The theoretical rationale introduced by social-exchange theory assumes that the individual (who views cohabitation as a trial-marriage) may be weighing the costs and benefits of choosing this individual as a marital partner, as opposed to selecting another partner or simply remaining single. This is also reflected in Hobart's (1979) finding that a significant percentage of students feel that it is acceptable to cohabit in order to determine compatibility. This is supported by Kotkin's (1990:160) findings which reveal that 95% of married respondents who previously cohabited and 80% of unmarried cohabiting respondents affirm that cohabitation prepares them for marriage. Thus, nonmarital

cohabitation serves as a temporary intimate arrangement, allowing them time to make adjustments, and to determine whether their love will last. In addition, it delays the constraints and obligations involved in marriage, and allows them time to adjust or improve their communication skills.

Cohabitation: An Extension of Courtship

Other research has revealed that among Canadian and American college students cohabitation serves as an extension to the traditional dating patterns (Macklin, 1983; Spanier, 1983; Hobart, 1979). The large number of persons cohabiting (noted in the Introduction), as well as those expressing a willingness to participate in this behaviour, indicates that it has become an accepted phase of the courtship process, and imminently a norm rather than an anomaly in North America.

Cohabitation: An Alternative to Patriarchal Marriage

While it is reported that nonmarital cohabitation is viewed as a form of "trial marriage", or as an extension of the conventional dating system, some research (Stinnett, 1978) shows that cohabitation also serves as an alternative to marriage for those ideologically or emotionally opposed to marriage.

For divorced or legally separated women as well as those ideologically or emotionally opposed to marriage, this relationship offers intimacy without the legal or social constraints of marriage. Consequently, this group believes that the legal sanctions of marriage should be minimized or done away with, replacing it with a more open unrestricted relationship (i.e. unmarried cohabitation). These women opt for nonmarital unions because of personal experiences with ruptured marriages of their own or of others.

In addition to a history of divorce, age also plays an important role in determining women's propensity to cohabit.

These varying perspectives of unmarried cohabitation appear to be based on the same fear or expectation that: "...in the midst of a love relationship they are likely to strike a bargain they may later regret" (Scanzoni, 1982:55). Thus, choosing a partner and making the decision to cohabit are assumed to be rational decisions. Hence, it seems that cohabitation is a logical response to the uncertainties (i.e. fears and expectations) of modern sexual relationships. Consequently, social-exchange theory argues that nonmarital cohabitation may serve as a trial period in which two persons attempt to strike the best possible bargain in terms of the partner's (notably the man's) potential power, prestige and financial assets. This preconception is starkly sexist and stereotypical of the relations between the sexes. In present times, both partners attempt to 'reap the greatest rewards' in terms of financial, emotional, and social benefits or rewards, when entering into a nonmarital living arrangement. Upon consideration of the rewards and costs offered in cohabitation, a question which arises among women is 'is this living-together arrangement simply a new form of the old oppression found in traditional marriage, offering sexual and domestic services in exchange for marriage or companionship' (Skolnick, 1983)?

In turning our attention to other factors, one should not overlook the importance of context variables (signifying the context of situation) such as: tangible resources, age, number of children, and intangible resources such as self-esteem, which influence both the decision-making processes, and subsequent outcomes which determine behavioral patterns. Thus, social-exchange theory is limited in its explanation of the decision-making process involved in one's choice of lifestyle.

The shortcomings of this theoretical perspective are as follows: 1) it assumes that the individual's decisions are automatically calculated (based on costs and rewards), 2) it does not account for the socio-economic value of women's work within the household, and 3) it assumes that power is determined solely by the economic position of the spouses/partners. To compensate for these limitations, feminist theory explains the general societal trends as well as the attitudinal and behavioral tendencies among women, with regards to marriage, the family and alternative living arrangements.

B. A FEMINIST ANALYSIS

A Critique of the "Monolithic Family" and the Viability of Alternative Living Arrangements

Feminists repudiate mainstream sociological theory of the family by attempting to demystify the ideology of the "monolithic family" and "woman's proper place". The concept of the "monolithic family" developed by Parsons, elevates the nuclear family structure to an international level as the only viable family structure throughout time. This ideology is tenacious and difficult to demystify, contend Thorne and Yalome:

"... partly because of all institutions the family seems the most natural and biological and most timeless and unchanging. And insofar as women are defined by their reproductive and mothering roles embedded in the family, their situation too has been made to appear natural." (1982:6)

This division of labour of nurture-homemaker and breadwinner in modern Western society was institutionalized in the family and made to appear as a normative and inevitable pattern. Firestone claims that; "nature produced the fundamental inequality, which was later consolidated and institutionalized in the interests of men" (1979:14).

Feminism questions this "naturally" proclaimed role of women within the family while emphasizing the importance and validity of relationships (i.e. nonmarital cohabitation) which provide more conducive grounds for liberal-egalitarian behaviour. Sex roles (i.e. childrearing, household chores, and the supportive/emotional function) as defined in traditional marriage are challenged by feminist demands for equal sharing of family roles, and greater flexibility in types of living arrangements.

Concomitantly feminism critiques the monolithic view of what constitutes the family (i.e. the nuclear family is viewed as the only viable family structure) by including other living arrangements (i.e. heterosexual cohabitation) as viable family forms. Thus the

women's liberation movement which attempts to influence women's attitudes regarding their position within the family and the viability of other living arrangements, has logical implications for their position outside of marriage.

Woman's Role as "Natural and Proper"

In spite of the increasing popularity of cohabitation as a viable living arrangement, patriarchal marriage (i.e. traditional sex norms) continues to be practised (albeit to slightly lesser degree). This situation persists because of the lingering cultural perception that conventional (i.e. patriarchal) marriage is the only viable living arrangement. Feminists seek to eliminate this cultural perception of women's "proper" sphere through the exploration of other forms of relationships which provide a basis for more negotiable, equitable and less sexually defined roles are more liberating for women.

The Cultural Glorification of Women's Roles in the Family

The following discussion examines the sexual division of labour fostered and legitimized in the family which oppresses women (Beauvoir, 1984; Firestone, 1979; Barrett, 1980; Whitehurst, 1977). Although the sexual segregation of roles within the family may have been viewed as functional and practical from the outset, this perception is highly questionable. The segregation of housewife and breadwinner roles became particularly predominant with the advent of industrialization and the coming of late Capitalism. Whitehurst (1977) argues that these roles became institutionalized and had little to do with the welfare of the family and more to do with the economics of the market. Feminists maintain that women are prisoners of their procreative abilities, and the patterns of dependency, love and commitment to the family, which continue to devolve from this biological reality (Firestone, 1979).

In spite of the assumption that the traditional family is natural and inevitable, research findings have indicated that it is psychologically devastating for women. Some feminist scholars argue that the structure and requirements of motherhood entail negative consequences for women. The present form of motherhood results in intense relationships between mothers and children, in which many mothers are likely to devote an excess of psychological energy (Voydanoff, 1988). In short, this caring behaviour entails costs to women. The costs of marriage to women are perceived in their differing views and experiences of marriage as compared to men. Almost two decades later, Voydanoff corroborates the findings of earlier studies regarding the psychological well-being of married women. She reports that:

"Women report lower levels of marital happiness and are more negative about marriage than men. Women are less satisfied with the level of expressive interaction and companionship in marriage than men. Furthermore, married women report more mental health problems than men (1988:272)."

A number of other studies have shown that the costs of marriage are considerable for women (New York Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1971; Prochaska and Prochaska, 1978; Bernard, 1981; Greenglass, 1987; Voydanoff, 1988). In a study conducted by the New York Narcotic Addiction Control Commission (1971), it was reported that the housewife role carried with it a high degree of psychological distress. Other research further demonstrated that wives experienced a loss of ground in terms of personal development and self-esteem during the early and middle years of adulthood, while husbands gained ground in these respects during the same years (Bernard, 1981). Similarly, marriage counsellors, Prochaska and Prochaska (1978) noted that the problem most frequently reported among couples in marital therapy was that the marriage was troubled by the wife's struggle for equality. Although, many individuals tout companionship marriage as the most favourable relationship, it remains difficult to implement. Furthermore, it should be stated that although a number of studies date back to

the 70s, more recent research continues to show that women today experience psychiatric symptoms as a consequence of having to relinquish power to their husbands in traditional marital arrangements (Greenglass, 1987).

Nevertheless for a long time women have recognized a duty and responsibility towards themselves and other family members, to seek equitable relationships as the basis for their caring or "stroking function" rather than a strict "love and/or duty ethos"(characterized by a display of solidarity, raising of the status of others, moral support, giving, helping, rewarding, agreeing, concurring, complying etc...,). There is growing evidence that women are demanding that men participate in the caring function involved in marriage.

This realization and demand for mutual (equitable) exchanges between partners leads some women to choose lifestyles that appear conducive to a fairer sharing of the caring function. The assumption is that women who seek a mutual exchange of the "stroking" or supportive role are more likely to opt for nonmarital cohabitation since this type of living arrangement may be more open to the negotiation of role definitions and career decisions (Kotkin, 1983; Lopata, 1980).

In essence then, the psychological effects of traditional marriage on women have caused them to reassess their views of personal fulfilment and autonomy. Feminist thought recognizes that women can find fulfilment in personal achievements in the public and private spheres outside of the experience of motherhood. As more and more women begin to view motherhood as inessential for their personal well-being or sense of fulfilment, the necessity of marriage is reevaluated.

The Sexual Division of Labour within Different Family Forms

The oppressive nature of marriage is essentially the result of the unequal material structure of the household which renders women financially dependent on men. However, as more and more women share the role of provider, they feel justified in making demands on men that were not made in the past, albeit demands which the men are unprepared or unwilling to fulfil (Greenglass, 1987). Many modern marriages are in a cultural bind between an egalitarian ideal for which society is supposed to strive, and marriage as it really exists with its social and legal inequities (Greenglass, 1987). Even among dual-income couples the ideology of woman's subordination to man remains strong (Barrett, 1980). Married women still do not make the major decisions affecting their lives and concurrently men are less willing to relocate for the advancement of women's professional careers (Kotkin, 1983; Lopata, 1980).

Research has shown that men continue to contribute very little time and effort with respect to responsibilities within the home (i.e., housework and child care), even as women take on paid employment outside the home (Voydanoff, 1988). Thus the number of working hours for women increases dramatically. In a study by Williams and associates (1980) married women, members of the Canadian Psychological Association, had an increased workload of approximately two working days per week. Thus although couples may profess a commitment to equality within marriage, they find it difficult to achieve. It is precisely the lack of male participation in the private sphere which renders the private realm oppressive to women.

Cohabiting relationships appear to be more equitable in terms of sacrifices made by each partner. Studies, discussed later on, show that among cohabiting couples partners are

equally likely to make compromises for each other, compared to a significantly higher percentage of wives who do so for their husbands (Kotkin, 1983; Lopata, 1980).

Research has shown that the entrance of women into the work force and post-secondary educational institutions are important determinants of shifting attitudes towards sex roles and relationships. In spite of the possibility of greater flexibility in the private and public realms, a majority of women still remain a relatively disadvantaged group. While individuals pursue many educational, occupational or other interests outside of the household unit, family patterns or responsibilities (i.e. the division of labour and socio-emotional obligations) either hinder or facilitate the fulfilment of these social interests. As previously mentioned studies have shown, women continue to assume most of the responsibilities for household functions. Whether this is equally true of cohabiting relationships, is an interesting aspect to be studied, but is not explored here.

Consequently, as women's attitudes towards sex-roles become more egalitarian, they come to employ the same decision-making processes as men (this being that the welfare of the family is dependent upon the achievement of her/his own career and social interests). Likewise, women will become increasingly active in symmetrical power relationships (Scanzoni, 1980). Feminist scholars (Bernard, 1981; Tavris, 1984) maintain that this is evident with the increasing numbers of young women who do not contemplate having a life filled with a career/work, marriage and children. Instead they choose a compromise determined by occupational and domestic role combinations. Some examples of these selective lifestyle combinations are: families with part-time career women and mother; full-time voluntarily single career woman; full-time career woman with a partner desiring no children; and full-time homemakers and mothers.

Women's Status as Unpaid Labourer

Women's status as unpaid houseworkers constitute the foundation of their subjugation (Brittan and Maynard, 1984). To refer to 'work' solely as wage-earning employment, clearly negates the economic contribution and value of women's domestic and reproductive functions. Furthermore, if the number of hours and the rigorous nature of the work are considered, housework must certainly be viewed as "work" (Brittan and Maynard, 1984). Because of a lack of societal acknowledgement of the economic value of women's work the family is thus maintained at the expense of women. Not only their work, but they themselves are undervalued.

Despite their socio-economic contribution within the family and society, women's status as "housewife" has become synonymous with the view of a parasite in society. They are unpaid; their labour is free. Consequently many women have already begun to view the role of housewife as a source of social stigma, of low status. Other factors such as an increase in education, postponement of marriage, and increased participation in the labour force (attaining some financial security) may also have positive influences on women's decision to cohabit as opposed to marrying. When given a choice, women of today are more likely to cohabit because this arrangement provides them with greater sex role flexibility, fewer career sacrifices, and a informed context for choice of marital partner.

The Incompatibility of Family Responsibilities and Employment Opportunities

The most important development affecting women's perception of the family proved to be the influx of women into the labour market. Skolnick maintains that while...

" ... women are far from economic equality in terms of either pay or job opportunity, the increasing movement of women into the labour force gives women additional bargaining resources" (1983:254).

Until recently, women viewed marriage as offering greater rewards and fewer costs (i.e. financial and emotional security, the possibility of having children, social approval, status and some prestige) than remaining single. Yet this is a point of considerable debate since the history of women presents evidence against this idealization of marriage for women. Women have now begun to reevaluate the changing nature and function of marriage in their lives. There is evidence now that women are expecting and demanding greater equality within marriage than they did in the past. Women's newly acquired position in the work place has given them additional bargaining power and consequently changed their perception of marriage. This is particularly true for women in professional occupations, where more power and authority are exercised. These recent social changes have altered the rules of sexual-bargaining and the exchanges inside and outside of marriage.

Feminists point out that familial obligations limit women's personal interests significantly. For instance they are excluded from the labour force, or must accept jobs which fit in with other family members. To the degree that women are limited in this respect, men are able to gain power and relative freedom (Brittan and Maynard, 1984). Essentially then, the heart of the matter relates to the economic dependence or independence of women on men.

"As women entered the work force in large numbers, they realized that their family responsibilities hampered their professional abilities to compete successfully in the male work world which gave priority to work over family responsibilities " (Voydanoff, 1988:276).

Women's careers are dependent upon family circumstances such as the timing of marriage and the selection of the marital partner, the demands of their husband's occupations, and the timing and number of children they bear (Voydanoff, 1988). For

women to blend both the worlds of work and family, they must be able to coordinate the responsibilities involved.

In the early stages of marriage, it has been shown that women experience a greater loss of autonomy than men, this because of the greater demands of involvement placed on the woman but not on the man (Lopata, 1980). Other research findings have also suggested that a greater amount of stress is placed upon married working women as a result of an increased workload burdening them (Walker, 1973; Williams et al., 1980) .

Additional social research (Kotkin, 1983; Lopata, 1980) suggests that in contrast to American married couples, both male and female cohabiters sacrifice their career/education advancement equally for one another. In Kotkin's study (1983:979) it was reported that;

"... 70% of the married women had already made sacrifices, including economic support, relocation, postponement of own career, and career adjunct roles (typing papers, labwork, etc.). Only 10% of the married men had made these sacrifices for their wives. On the other hand, 30% of both cohabiting men and cohabiting women had made such sacrifices. Second, when asked why they were currently residing in Philadelphia, most married couples (55%) specified the man's career/education, only 5% the women's; in contrast, 25% of the cohabiters listed the man's career, 15% the woman's career. Controlling for the length of the relationship did not significantly affect the above findings."

These findings indicate that individuals who cohabit are more likely to express unconventional-egalitarian attitudes and behaviour than their married counterparts. This may also explain women's tendency to choose nonmarital relationships over marriage, as marriage continues to demand that a greater share of sacrifices be assumed by women. Thus, consensual unions seem to offer greater freedom and rewards than traditional marriage for autonomous women (i.e., socially and financially independent women).

In studying cohabitation more closely, recent research reveals the presence of class differences among different types of cohabiting relationships (Kotkin, 1990). Kotkin's (1990) study suggests that career/education tendencies differ among non-engaged and engaged cohabiters. Non-engaged cohabiters tend to be less career-oriented, earn less and are more likely to pursue less financially secure careers (i.e. in the social sciences and humanities) than married (previously cohabiting) couples, while engaged-cohabiting couples are more likely to pursue professional career choices in the legal, medical or business fields. (Kotkin, 1990). It is clear that class variations exist among cohabiters with the various types of education and prospective income. Thus, while some may choose cohabitation as a practical means of sharing limited economic resources, others perceive their relationship as a premarital arrangement with the added financial benefit of sharing living expenses.

FEMINIST EMPIRICAL ANALYSES

Shifting Attitudes towards Marriage

It becomes increasingly clear that principles or morals no longer pose obstacles to cohabitation. Instead, the deterrents to this lifestyle are of a practical nature, involving intrinsic disadvantages (costs) or limitations particular to nonmarital cohabitation (Hobart, 1983). Hobart's longitudinal survey conducted in 1979, revealed that respondents viewed marriage as unnecessary, and cohabitation as intrinsically good. This change in attitude is a result of the decreasing influence of the clergy particularly in Quebec (which focused on the intrinsic goodness and necessity of conventional marriage as ordained by the church), and of the growing dissatisfaction with marriage in general.

In a recent study of university graduates students non-engaged cohabiting respondents associated a number of benefits with cohabitation over marriage (Kotkin, 1990). They most frequently cited factors such as "ease of dissolution, personal

autonomy, and being treated as individuals rather than as a couple who was "feeling trapped" and "lack of freedom" (Kotkin, 1990:166). The attitude towards marriage ranged from hostile to indifferent. College women's objections to marriage centred around role of "wife" with its various stereotypes - loss of individuality, career and domestic roles, and, above all, subordination to the husband (Kotkin, 1990).

Bumpass (1990) states that both marital instability and cohabitation contribute to the decreased necessity or viability of marriage. Bumpass hypothesizes that:

"If marriage is not a prerequisite for many of the benefits traditionally associated with it, and if it is only a weak guarantee of those benefits, awareness of these facts may be eroding marriage's normative prescription (Bumpass, 1990:488).

Moreover, only one third of young adults under 25 concurred that "it is better to be married than to go through life single," and one quarter (25%) disagreed (Bumpass, 1990). One could interpret these findings as reflecting a trend towards marriage as a much more discretionary aspect of adult life.

Shifting Attitudes towards Sex Roles

By the 1970s, it was reported that in the United States, large majorities of married college-educated graduate women held relatively autonomous attitudes concerning women's dependency on men's plans (Oppenheim et al., 1976). Even before the women's movement captured widespread media attention, college-educated women in the U.S. had begun shifting their attitudes away from traditional sex-roles towards a liberal sex role orientation. Particularly notable were the large increases between 1970 and 1973 in the percentages supporting the "... psychological feasibility or moral acceptability for women

of a life without marriage and motherhood" (Oppenheim et al., 1976:587). In actuality, women rejected or discarded the traditional morality including the double standard.

Although not recent, a number of studies, have shown that cohabitation appears to attract individuals with similar values, personalities, and expectations (Newcomb and Bentler, 1980). According to studies conducted during the 70s and early 80s, cohabiters tend to express either liberal sex-role attitudes or a tendency towards unconventional behaviour (Joesting and Joesting, 1972; Henze and Hudson, 1974; Bower and Christopherson, 1977; Clayton and Voss, 1977; Abrahams, Feldman and Nash, 1978; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980; DeMaris, 1984). Cohabiting women are described as follows;

"...less clothes-conscious, less law-abiding, less religious, more extroverted, more liberal, more androgynous, and had more leadership qualities than noncohabiting women." (DeMaris, 1984:271)

In research done in the 70's, nontraditional sex role ideology resulted as the most frequent and strongest correlate of willingness to participate in alternative marital and family arrangements among both sexes (Strong, 1978). Cohabiting individuals demonstrated a greater desire for autonomy and nonconformity, which may have in turn created an enticing image of cohabitation in comparison to the symbiotic and traditional connotations implied in marriage (Newcomb, 1983).

According to these aforementioned studies, personality differences (i.e. sex role attitudes - feelings of autonomy) thus proved to be the most significant determinants of cohabitation (DeMaris, 1984; Henze et al. 1974). It is questionable however that this situation continues to exist to the same extent today. Moreover, it is hypothesized that sex role attitude may now be less important as sex role attitudes of cohabiting and married (never-cohabited) women shift towards liberal-egalitarianism.

Moreover, Meyer and Schulze (1983) argue that, egalitarian women enter into nonmarital relationships when a number of factors are present. These socio-economic, demographic and psychological factors include: financial independence, lessened ties with one's original family during adult years, lower level of religiosity, childlessness, and greater social tolerance. Under such conditions women attempt to undo traditional marital structures, by experimenting with alternative partnerships (Meyer and Schulze, 1983). Thus it seems that factors of a practical nature enter into the equation when modern (egalitarian) women face a decision with respect to their choice of living arrangement.

An important question raised here, is: "Do (never-married) cohabiting individuals differ from married individuals who never cohabited, with respect to sex role attitudes, values and behavioural tendencies?" More precisely, it seems logical to assume that one's values, sex-role attitudes and general behaviour would have an influence on one's lifestyle choice. However, the pervasive shift among the general population towards liberal-egalitarian sex role attitudes and behaviour may significantly reduce the differences in attitudes, values and behaviours, observed between cohabiters and noncohabiters during earlier studies.

Furthermore researchers argue that changing sex-role stereotypes (the trend away from traditional sex roles) are a result of societal role pressures (Neugarten and Gutmann, 1968). This situation is particularly applicable to women in demanding and rewarding vocations who can no longer provide the physical and psychological support for the family since they need the personal reproductive energy for themselves (Meyer and Schulze, 1983). For these women, nonmarital cohabitation serves as a viable and attractive alternative to the more restrictive nature of conventional marriage.

Thus, the path towards woman's emancipation is achieved primarily through self-realization of her abilities. Nonmarital cohabitation may allow women to enhance the possibility of retaining a sense of self-identity, self-determination and personal autonomy. Marriage could also become an equitable living arrangement if the present sexual differentiation of labour and sexism within it is abolished (Whitehurst, 1977; Beauvoir, 1979; Firestone, 1984).

FEMINIST CONCLUSIONS

Of interest to this research are three concerns posed by feminists relating to women's lives which are presently unresolved: 'How can the private/public, female and male worlds be adjusted to the current and future social conditions?'; 'How can marriage become rewarding for women?'; and, 'How should current values and behaviour change, to either fit or transform the current sexual division of labour within the family and society?' and 'Do nonmarital unions in contrast to marriage, allow women greater social opportunities and benefits and a greater sense of personal and emotional fulfilment?'

Since the 1950s, women have been leaving the confines of the home, spending less time in traditional maternal and homemaker roles, to pursue work aspirations and other social interests. Feminists in general advocate social change in theory and practice which they anticipate will result in political, economic and social equality of the sexes. They capitalize on the importance of woman's priorities for herself as well as her family. This assumes that women's own sense of value (with respect to their individual growth and achievements) is perceived as equal to the needs of her family and others (Dreyer-Arkin, 1981). Hence, as women become more self-oriented, they will tend to choose nonmarital arrangements which provide a range of autonomous and individualistic behaviour.

Thus, the socio-political nature of the feminist movement has been effective in changing the sex-role attitudes of women, gearing them towards self-emancipation and egalitarian views (Oppenheim Mason et al., 1976). Oppenheim Mason and Associates (1976) report that since the emergence of the women's movement, women's sex role attitudes (within the family) are increasingly related to their attitudes concerning their acquired rights and position in the work place. In a study by Morrison and Anderson (1973), male and female cohabiters cited the influence of women's liberation as second most salient factor (the other being the increasing instability of marriage as an institution),

for their living arrangement. However it is not entirely clear whether this shift in attitudes resulting in cohabitation is provoked by the movement itself.

Mainstream feminists support relationships based on "equality and mutuality", while repudiating the traditional relationship based on a view of male-superiority and female inferiority. In doing so, most feminist critiques debunk the patriarchal family structure, arguing that it maintains and perpetuates unequal power relations between the sexes (Mandel, 1979). In nonmarital unions both partners are to a significant extent, perceived as separate and autonomous individuals providing greater ground for the attainment of equal status. Hence, liberal feminists do not care to change the liberal democratic principles of freedom and autonomy, rather they seek equal application of these principles among women and men in the private/public spheres (Virginia Shapiro, 1986).

With the exception of feminist literature, nineteenth-century patriarchal ideology glorified the virtues of motherhood and marriage. Today however, there is sweeping support in North American society concerning issues of shared and equal parenting, and greater individuality (i.e. being employed and involved in social circles outside the bounds of family). The extent to which nonmarital unions can provide a basis or starting point for this kind of egalitarian behaviour is still open to question.

Furthermore, while until recently women lacked social power and the societal means to judge their worth, today they have obtained some societal recognition of their social power and societal worth in the public realms of law, politics, business, art and literature (Sabrosky, 1979). Almost inevitably, this attainment of societal recognition and power has resulted in questioning the necessity or desirability of marriage for such women (Oppenheim, 1976; Hobart, 1983).

As an increasing number of women enter the labour force and acquire a certain degree of economic independence and power, they are less likely to be dependent on marriage or men for economic support. Moreover, as more women strive for careers, motherhood is less and less perceived as the ultimate achievement for women. With the decreasing importance of motherhood, women begin to reassess the need for a marital relationship accompanied by the sexually segregated functions of childbearing and rearing. Furthermore, in current times traditional marriage is perceived as almost economically unrealistic, entailing considerable costs for both men and women because of a loss of personal freedom.

Unlike conventional marriage, nonmarital cohabitation is perceived as allowing for greater self-determination and autonomy partly because of: (1) the lack of socio-economic policies recognizing the status of cohabiters (i.e. viewing them as separate individuals without any formal rights particularly in Quebec), and (2) there are fewer socially defined roles and expectations when entering consensual unions. These factors have made cohabitation a plausible and attractive alternative to traditional courtship or marriage.

The salient assumption of this research is that women are considering nonmarital cohabitation at some point in their life cycle because traditional marriage has failed to satisfy their needs while burdening them with most of the familial responsibilities. It is expected that cohabitation has the potential for freeing women from the more confined and coercive roles of marriage (Firestone, 1979). It remains important to discern amid the many changes in society, why women are opting for various types of living arrangements (i.e. cohabitation) and the impact this trend will have on: (1) already significantly low fertility rates in Canada and particularly in Quebec where the incidence of cohabitation and low fertility are the most pronounced; (2) the increasing flow of female labour market participation and its effect on future labour market work patterns; as well as (3) the socio-

economic ramifications on existing policies and laws which are predisposed to conventional marital arrangements.

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS AND PROPENSITY TO COHABIT

Pertinent Factors:

1. The Instability of Marriage and High Divorce Rates

Although this trend was first observed on college campuses across the U.S., more recent evidence points to a growing prevalence of cohabitation among divorced and legally separated persons. Growing disillusion with traditional courtship and marriage, due in part to the high divorce rates, has contributed to the increasingly appealing image of cohabitation (Bumpass, 1990; Newcomb, 1983-4, Morrison and Anderson, 1973). Data shows that separated or divorced women are significantly more likely to cohabit than never separated or divorced single women (DeMaris, 1984; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980).

In a survey by Morrison and Anderson (1973), the awareness of the high divorce rates (revealing the fragility of marriage) by cohabiters is a salient determinant of cohabiters decision to form nonmarital unions. The 1986 Canadian Census reveals that the rates of remarriage have dropped significantly in the past two decades. While the majority of divorced or widowed Canadians in 1975 remarried, by 1984 this rate had fallen to a third. Concurrently, during this time period more couples chose to live together as opposed to remarrying (Statistics Canada, 1986 Census).

In 1984, figures showed that 42 per cent of unmarried women between the ages of 25 and 29 lived in common-law unions (Statistics Canada, 1986 Census). In 1986, 63.5 per cent of common-law partners were childless, possibly because they were younger and often postponed marriage until deciding to have children (Statistics Canada, 1986 Census). Thus, cohabitation may serve as either a substitute for marriage, or as an interim arrangement before remarriage. Nonmarital unions may also play an important role in inadvertently delaying second marriages (Spanier, 1983). Moreover the timing of

cohabitation, after, between or prior to marriage, reflects its attractiveness as a living arrangement during various stages of the life cycle.

In concluding, DeMaris (1984) reveals that a history of parental divorce is a predictor of cohabitation for men while similarly findings are reported in several other studies suggesting that both male and female cohabiters are more likely to come from "unhappy or divorced homes" (Risman et al., 1981; Yllo, 1978; Tanfer, 1987). In spite of this hypothesized relationship between parental divorce and the propensity to cohabit, the presence of such a relationship cannot be tested for due to the limitations of the data set (in the Fertility Survey) used in this analysis.

2. Age Cohort

There has been a consistent tendency toward an increase in cohabitation particularly among young adults, 35 years and younger, with a large percentage between 18 and 25 years of age (Arafat and Yorburg, 1963; Bower & Christopherson, 1977; Lunney and Cotten-Huston, 1979). In a study conducted by Erdwins, Tyler and Mellinger (1983), younger age groups in their twenties and thirties view themselves as less traditional (i.e. possessing culturally defined masculine traits).

Women who are presently in their thirties and forties experienced in their formative years (1960's and 1970's) the reevaluation and redefinition of women's roles in our society. Major socio-political and economic developments, such as the introduction of the Equal Rights Amendment in the U.S., the demands for and practical implementation of women's rights and freedom, the growing awareness of women's desires for careers and the rise of dual career marriages engendered the reevaluation and consequent redefinition of women's roles (Erdwins et al., 1983). Thus, it may be that rather than age in itself, generation is a more accurate predictor of cohabitation. For instance, one would expect to

find a difference in the assigned meaning and moral attitudes toward cohabitation between those who came of age during the 1940's and 1950's, in contrast to those who reached young adulthood during the 1960's and 1970's.

3. Decreasing Fertility and Postponement of Childbearing

In a study conducted by Glick (1981b), the decreasing fertility rate for single and postponement of childbearing promote cohabitation by delaying the need for marriage for the sake of bearing or legitimizing children. Moreover, children born outside of marriage today are no longer labelled or considered "illegitimate". The stigma associated with being an unwed mother has greatly diminished over the past twenty years. The primary reason for the taboo against "illegitimacy" state Bumpass and McLanahan (1989) has been desire to provide a two-parent family, for the socialization and support of the children. Increased marital dissolution makes marriage a poor guarantee in this respect. The second major force is the separation of sex from marriage, which at one time may have been publicly disapproved, but today is widely accepted (Bumpass et al., 1989).

Today, unmarried motherhood is a major contributor to single-parent families and poverty in the U.S. Almost one quarter of the children born in the U.S., are born to unmarried mothers. The proportion of children born to an unmarried mother has more than doubled since 1970 to more than a quarter in 1987.

"The rapid increase in the prevalence of nonmarital childbearing is evidence of, and contributes to, the erosion of norms against behaviour traditionally described by such terms as "illegitimacy" and "bastardy" "(Bumpass, 1990:488).

Despite this change in attitude, Hobart's (1983) study reveals that the desire for and/or presence of children is one of the most important indicators to negatively influence

women's decision to cohabit. This hypothesis is supported in Kotkin's study (1990) which reveals that married (previously cohabiting) and engaged (cohabiting) graduate students cited the desire for "legitimate" children as a motivating factor in their decision to marry.

The present study hypothesizes that childless women are more likely to cohabit than women with dependent children. Childless women are more easily inclined to live unmarried with their partners because they do not have the added responsibility of considering what is best for their children. The tendency to postpone, if not avoid childbearing, compounded by increasing economic instability especially among the young (high unemployment rates, lack of financial insecurity), are significant factors contributing to the tendency to cohabit.

These changes are particularly significant because they reflect an increasing trend away from marriage, towards the postponement of marriage with cohabitation as a more accessible and practical living-arrangement. The sharp increase in cohabitation concomitant with the significant decline in marriage rates is reported by Bumpass and Sweet, (1989:620) in the following:

"...Among females, the proportion who had cohabited before 25 years of age, increased from 3 to 37 percent over these cohorts, whereas the proportion who married by this age declined from 82 to 61 percent. In contrast to this 21-point decline in the proportion ever married by 25 years of age, there was only a 7-point decline in the proportion ever in a union. For the United States,... much of the decline in marital unions has been offset by the increase in cohabiting unions."

4. Desire for Security and Commitment

The perception that cohabitation is a private relationship between two individuals, free of any links with the church or state, results in few agreed-upon expectations and

definitions (Kotkin, 1990). Additionally, the lack of norms, roles and nomenclature (i.e. husband, wife, adultery, divorce) in cohabitation leave it open to greater variation in behaviour. Like marriage, cohabitation may have become an institution which is socially perceived as augmenting interpersonal commitment between individuals while providing greater personal and financial autonomy. This may be particularly true for Quebec because of the new "Patrimonial Bill 146" in effect since June 25th, 1989 which has turned marriage into a financial liability for both partners, in the event of divorce (cf. Quebec provincial government publication; Loi sur le Code Civile de la Famille, 1991). Kotkin's study (1990:163) reveals that approximately 20% of American respondents report indicators of social acceptability (e.g. legitimacy and acceptance-family pressures, societal stigmatization of cohabitation, and the desire for "legitimate" children) as motivating factors for marrying, while another 50% indicate personal desires for security and commitment. Most cohabiting couples who decide to marry view cohabitation as a less stable relationship, and this stability appeared more feasible when economic security ("getting settled" having a career and family) (Kotkin, 1990) is established.

5. Employment Status and Income Level

In the following research studies, employment status and income level are treated as correlates rather than determinants of cohabitation practice. Spanier (1983) reports that although cohabiting women are more likely to be employed than married women, the cohabiting dyad is also more likely to have a low income than the married dyad. Cohabitants may represent lower income groups because of two factors: (1) this group is comprised of a large proportion of university students, who have not yet started full-time careers, and (2) an important proportion belong to the young age cohort. It is important to note however, that this indicator is based upon the couple unit of analysis as opposed to the

individual unit, thereby giving an inaccurate reflection of the level of income for cohabiting women.

6. Religiosity and Religious Affiliation

Research has shown that low levels of religiosity (measured by low rates of attendance at religious services) and the absence of religious denomination were positively correlated with a propensity to cohabit. There were inconsistent findings on the relationship between cohabitation and specific religious affiliation (measured as Catholic and Non-Catholic) (DeMaris, 1984, Strong, 1980; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980; Strong, 1978; Arafat and Yorburg, 1973; Henze and Hudson, 1974).

In several studies based on the respective Canadian and American populations, (Balakrishnan, 1990; Strong, 1978), infrequent religious observance yields a small (statistically significant) correlation with willingness to participate in alternative family forms including nonmarital unions. Consistent with earlier research, Watson's survey (1983) reveals that respondents who are highly religious, are more likely to follow the conventional courtship process than to engage in nonmarital cohabitation.

An earlier study (Arafat and Yorburg, 1963) reveals a strong relationship between strength of religious beliefs and negative attitudes toward nonmarital cohabitation. This concurs to some degree with research findings suggesting that frequency of attendance at religious services had suppressive effects on premarital sexual liberalism (Balakrishnan et al., 1990). Thus, the hypothesized relationship between religiosity and propensity to cohabit is based on the premise that religion discourages any form of premarital sexual relations (i.e. as that found in nonmarital or premarital cohabitation).

OUTMODED FACTORS:

2. Educational Attainment

Research has shown the relationship between socio-economic status and cohabitation to be inconsistent (DeMaris:1984). In DeMaris' (1984) study, level of education is an insignificant predictor of cohabitation for individuals, but emerges as a significant determinant for couples. These findings may be a result of different samples used in his study on cohabitation. This research investigates the impact of educational level on women's propensity to cohabit, a factor on which there are inconsistent research findings.

When mother's education is used as an indicator of social class background, women whose mothers have not completed high school are somewhat more likely to cohabit (Tanfer, 1987). However, the association between women's social class background and tendency to cohabit is not clear, and Tanfer provides no rationale for this hypothesis. Again, this factor is not tested in the present study due to the limitations of the Fertility Survey.

2. Urban/Rural Residence

When analysing the effect of urban/rural residence, it is reported (Clayton and Voss, 1977) that individuals who grow up in a metropolitan area are more likely to engage in unconventional activities (i.e. cohabitation) than those who grow up in rural areas. Other empirical studies (Spanier, 1983; Tanfer, 1987) suggest that a large percentage of cohabiting couples tend to reside in large urban areas (with populations over one million).

This research hypothesizes that urban/rural residence has a weak positive influence on propensity to cohabit, if any at all. The relationship is expected to be relatively

unimportant in comparison to other factors which are expected to have a significantly greater impact on Canadian women's propensity to cohabit. The weakness of this relationship may be the result of increasingly liberal attitudes, including a greater acceptance of cohabitation, which have spread throughout North American society, regardless of residential area. Moreover, other more relevant factors affecting women's inclination to cohabit include the presence of children, a history of a previous marriage, attitude towards marriage, age, and religiosity among others, affect women's inclination to cohabit.

3. History of Illicit Drug Use

The broad concept of a liberal lifestyle has been reported to be a consistent predictor of premarital cohabitation, including a willingness to experiment with drugs or participate in other forms of unconventional behaviour (Henze and Hudson, 1974; Clayton and Voss, 1977). Liberal values, attitudes and behaviour with respect to politics, religion, family life, and the use of illegal drugs are used to measure unconventional role behaviour and attitude in adulthood. Consequently, it can be ascertained that marriage is negatively associated with the use of illegal drugs, while the opposite is maintained for cohabitation practice and attitudes (Bower and Christopherson, 1977; Clayton and Voss, 1977; Kandel, 1984; Macklin, 1978; Newcomb, 1979; Risman et al., 1981; Strong, 1978; Yamaguchi, et al., 1985). This link, between the use of drugs and cohabitation was part of the counterculture of the 60's and 70's and would no longer be suspected of influencing women's cohabitation behaviour. Yet, Yamaguchi and Kandel (1985:530) continue to maintain that: "... the use of marijuana and other illicit drugs increases the probability of cohabitation for men and women...". Although illicit drug use is included in this literature review it is not included in our model as a predictor of cohabitation.

4. Social Acceptance

In Arafat and Associates (1963) study dating back to the 1960s the student sample considered peer group influence to have the strongest positive effect on their attitudes and behaviour towards cohabitation, while parental influence was judged to have a weaker impact. For female students however, parental disapproval of cohabitation exercised a moderate degree of influence on their decision to cohabit.

This situation, present during the 1960's, may not exist to the same degree today. Although, according to Kotkin's (1990:161) research half (50%) of married and engaged (cohabiting) couples cited parental pressure as an important factor in their decision to marry. Most respondents had not however experienced any problems with other nonfamilial influences (Kotkin, 1990). Thus, it appears that parental acceptance or rejection of the living arrangement continues to influence one's decision to cohabit or marry. Newcomb's (1983-4) research also sustains this finding, in reporting that parental and peer group acceptance of cohabitation render cohabitation a viable living-arrangement. Thus, the present research hypothesizes that social acceptance of cohabitation by parents or peers is likely to have a positive influence on women's decision to cohabit.

Lastly, research has shown (Strong, 1978) that females who perceive their parents as relatively rejecting of them are more willing to engage in alternative marital relationships. However, due to the limitations of the Fertility Survey data set (i.e with respect to variable inclusions), parental rejection cannot be tested for in this model.

Outmoded factors such as illicit drug use, years of education, sex role attitudes and social acceptance of cohabitation and urban/rural residence pertinent to a particular historical context (1960's and 1970's). As social change occurs, influence generated by these factors diminishes significantly and the meaning attributed to cohabitation changes.

Moreover recent studies examine different factors which help to determine whether women will cohabit in the 80's and 90's such as: history of previous marriage, presence of children, desire for security and commitment, attitude towards marriage, religiosity, and employment status. Thus, the research is bound to the changing societal perceptions and meaning given to cohabitation.

Chapter III MODEL SPECIFICATION

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC DETERMINANTS OF NONMARITAL COHABITATION

1. History of Divorce/Separation

Empirical studies have repeatedly shown an over representation of divorced persons among cohabiters (DeMaris, 1984; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980). Although social-exchange theory does not explicitly refer to divorce as a possible factor influencing individuals choice to cohabit, feminism's critique of the traditional family structure and its emphasis on changing societal values links the failure of marriage to the increase in alternative living arrangements.

It is argued (Macklin, 1983; Schwartz et al., 1989) that women who have gone through a first marriage that has failed are more cautious in considering remarriage. This research postulates that; 'women who were previously married are more likely to cohabit than never married women.' Nonmarital cohabitation offers the possibility of an intimate relationship, while delaying the need for a second marriage or replacing marriage altogether.

2. Childlessness

In this research, childlessness is another factor which is considered to have a positive effect on women's tendency to cohabit. As revealed in the literature review, most cohabitants were shown to be childless in comparison to married couples. It may be anticipated that with the growing numbers of single parent families more and more children will be present in this relationship. Although a recent study by Bumpass et al. (1989)

offers no comparison between cohabiting and married couples, almost half of all cohabiting unions are shown to have children present.

Hobart's (1983) study reveals that the presence of children is one of the most important indicators of women's tendency to cohabit. The desire for and/or birth of children is expected to have a negative effect on women's propensity to cohabit. This hypothesis is further supported by Kotkin's study (1990) which reveals that married (previously cohabiting) and engaged cohabiting graduate students report that a desire for "legitimate" children is a motivational factor in their decision to marry.

Despite empirical investigations which include the childlessness factor as a correlate of cohabitation, the theoretical literature does not account for this aspect in one's lifestyle decision. This study hypothesizes that; 'childless women have a greater tendency to cohabit than do women with children.' The decision to enter into a cohabiting relationship is more complicated for women with children than childless women because of: (1) concern over their children's reactions to the presence of the new partner, and (2) concern about the effect of the new living arrangement on their children.

3. Religiosity

As was previously discussed in the literature review section, degree of religiosity results as a salient determinant of cohabitation. This study attempts to investigate whether religiosity (measured by frequency of attendance at religious services) among women is an explanatory factor of nonmarital or premarital cohabitation. The hypothesis entered into the model is: 'women who report a low level of religiosity are more likely to cohabit than their religious counterpart.' Religiosity is measured by frequency of attendance at religious services (cf. Variable Measurement).

In Balakrishnan's study (1990) which is based on the same data source as this study, religious affiliation shows a negligible effect upon women's propensity to cohabit. Since previous research findings reveal a weak or nonexistent relationship, religious affiliation is not investigated in this study.

4. Age Cohort

The age factor is believed to play a role in women's tendency to choose alternative living arrangements. Several articles (Arafat and Yorburg, 1963; Bower & Christopherson, 1977; Lunney and Cotten-Huston, 1979) have revealed that differences in attitudes and behaviour may be the result not only of age differences but also of the "generation gap", a generation's history and situation. However, because the data base used is not longitudinal, we cannot measure the specific impact of socio-economic and political changes corresponding to each age cohort (i.e. the influx of women into the labour force, women's liberation movement, the postponement of childbirth and an increasing trend towards childlessness, etc). This study is therefore limited to testing whether age has a bearing on women's propensity to cohabit. Thus, two hypotheses are tested with respect to the age factor: 1) 'young women between the ages of 18 and 25 years are more likely to cohabit than women above this age category', and 2) 'young women, 26 to 39 years of age, are more likely to cohabit than women above this age group (40 to 49 years of age).'

The following presuppositions are the basis for which the age variable is divided into three categories: 1) respondents in the youngest age cohort are more likely to cohabit than to marry because of financial insecurity and less likely to live alone because of the financial advantages in cohabitation, and 2) young respondents, between the ages of 18 and 25 years of age desire intimate relationships but are not prepared for the legal commitment

of marriage while, 3) those in the 26 to 39 age category may have experienced separation/divorce and desire to live with a partner but not remarry, and 4) they may want to postpone marriage. The 40 - 49 years of age cohort is expected to have more conservative-traditional views and is less likely to cohabit, than they had earlier. This study reveals that respondents within the 40 to 49 years of age cohort, are less likely to cohabit and more likely to be married than those in their twenties and thirties (cf. Table 2.4).

This claim is based on the conclusion that the once "radical" youths of the 60s and 70s who experienced the sexual liberation movement, the women's liberation movement, and the cultural revolution (of the 60s and 70s), have more recently reverted back to more traditional norms and behaviour such as the institution of marriage and the family. Thus, although this generation of "baby-boomers" was once considered radical in its ideology and behaviour, it has now adopted more traditional values and lifestyles, partly as a result of the changing socio-economic and political situation. Yet, one may argue that the changing view of cohabitation, especially among baby-boomer yuppies makes this conclusion questionable.

5. Education

Educational attainment may be another factor accounting for a greater likelihood of non-traditional living arrangements. Although studies (Clayton and Voss, 1977; Glick and Spanier, 1980; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980) have reported that education does not determine women's propensity to cohabit, this research nonetheless examines the relationship between educational attainment and women's decision to cohabit as opposed to marrying. The hypothesis concerning education states that; 'women who cohabit are more likely to have a higher level of education than their married counterpart.' This is based on

the assumption that women who remain in the educational system for a longer period of time are more likely to cohabit because of the following factors: 1) they lack the financial means to marry when in school, 2) they find it economically viable to cohabit (i.e. the sharing of expenses), 3) they are more likely to adopt liberal-egalitarian attitudes and behaviour (i.e. cohabitation which first spread among student campuses), and 4) they tend to postpone marriage until a later age but still desire intimate relationships.

6. Employment Status

As more and more women take on paid employment, marriage is seen as less vital for their economic survival and social well-being. Moreover, as women become more career-oriented and thus attain a greater degree of financial autonomy, they come to view marriage as a vital part of life. It is thus hypothesized that employed women are more likely than unemployed women to cohabit.

7. Urban/Rural Residence

Few studies have shown urban/rural residence to be a correlate or determinant of cohabitation, with the exception of a study conducted by Clayton and associates (1977) who suggest that individuals who are socialized in metropolitan areas are more likely to be involved in unconventional practices (i.e. cohabitation) and Tanfer (1987) and Spanier (1983) who report that a large percentage of cohabiters reside in large urban areas. For some persons, particularly those residing in small rural communities, nonmarital cohabitation may be perceived as an unconventional and unacceptable lifestyle. Thus, this research hypothesizes that; 'females who are socialized and presently reside in metropolitan areas are more likely to cohabit than those socialized and living in rural settings.' The logic supporting this claim stems from the belief that large urban spaces provide greater

anonymity and privacy than smaller rural areas where community interference (social pressure) is greater.

ATTITUDINAL FACTORS

8. Attitude Towards Marriage

Literature on social trends and lifestyles (Skolnick and Skolnick, 1983) and feminist literature theorize that high divorce rates in general help to foster negative perceptions of marriage among cohabiters and raise scepticism about the permanence of interpersonal relationships in general. This study hypothesizes that women who have a negative attitude towards marriage are more likely than women with a positive attitude to cohabit.

9. The Desire for Security: The Need for a Long Term Relationship

This study also assumes that 'women who desire long-term relationships or commitment, are less likely to cohabit than women who do not desire such relationships.' The rationale for such an assumption maintains that, nontraditional relationships such as cohabitation offer less security (i.e. legal rights) or permanence than marriage. Thus women who assert a greater need for security and permanence in personal relationships may be less likely to cohabit than women who do not express this need for permanence in their personal relations.

10. Perception of Cohabitation as a Viable Living Arrangement

As a result of high divorce levels and times of financial instability (due in part to the greater number of years spent in school as well as economic conditions), many women find themselves turning towards cohabitation as a suitable living arrangement, in order to satisfy their personal needs for companionship and intimacy, without the added responsibilities and commitment implicit in marriage. Moreover argues Macklin (1983) the increasing divorce rate has lead individuals to evaluate first or second marriages more carefully, and has resulted in a considerable number of persons who wish to try out a relationship before making a permanent commitment. As more and more individuals begin to question the permanence or viability of marriage as a living-arrangement, social acceptance of alternative living arrangements becomes more widespread.

11. Social Acceptance of Cohabiting Couples

Relaxation of patriarchal norms and values (i.e. regarding our attitudes towards relationships and sexuality) has lead to an increase in the occurrence and acceptance of divorce. It is suspected that as societal acceptance of cohabiting couples becomes more pervasive, women will be more inclined to cohabit.

The present study postulates that the acceptance of cohabitants as married couples by women's reference group will significantly increase their likelihood to practice cohabitation. The hypothesis reflecting this maintains that: 'women whose social circle includes cohabiting couples who are accepted as married couples, are more likely to engage in this behaviour than women whose social circle includes cohabiting couples who are not accepted as married couples.'

12. The Importance of Children in Women's Lives

Although the importance of children in women's lives is not postulated in the theoretical and empirical literature covered in this research, it would appear to be a relevant attitudinal factor which is suspected to influence women's choice of lifestyle. The importance of children in women's lives has been selected as a determinant of cohabitation because it is reflective of a possible desire to bear children. The hypothesis postulated in this model is: 'women who view children as essential to their personal well-being are less likely to cohabit than women who do not regard children as such.'

13. The Desire for Autonomy

In the survey conducted by Hobart (1983), women who indicated a high degree of dependence most often felt that marriage was a very important aspect of their lives. According to feminism, women who express autonomous attitudes and behaviour are likely to consider unconventional living arrangements (i.e. nonmarital cohabitation) to suit their desire for independence and self-determination. In this study it is hypothesized that 'women who express a desire for autonomy are more likely to cohabit than women who do not express this desire.' The concept of autonomous attitude is measured by merging two attitudinal variables concerning the importance of one's career and personal freedom.

14. Egalitarian Sex Role Attitudes

Research has shown that egalitarianism among women is positively correlated to cohabitation experience (Joesting and Joesting, 1972; Henze and Hudson, 1974; Bower and Christopherson, 1977; Clayton and Voss, 1977; Abrahams, Feldman and Nash, 1978; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980; DeMaris, 1984; Strong, 1978; Meyer and Schulze, 1983).

The hypothesis included in this model is as follows: 'women who maintain egalitarian sex-role attitudes are more likely to cohabit than women with traditional sex role attitudes.' Although this research attempts to test the existence of this relationship, it is suspected that egalitarian sex-role attitudes among women are no longer important determinants of cohabitation. During the 1960's and early seventies, cohabitation was perceived as a statement of rebellion an unconventional and immoral lifestyle practised only by those who were overtly nonconformist and sexually-liberated. Today however nonmarital unions are largely perceived as acceptable living arrangements acquiring an even greater appeal than marriage itself.

15. Acceptance of Nontraditional Family Forms

Some research based on a feminist perspective (Strong, 1978) suggests that women who express nontraditional/liberal attitudes towards living arrangements are more likely to opt for unconventional relationships. This relationship present during the 60's and 70's (when smaller proportions of women espoused the ideal of liberal-egalitarianism) is no longer applicable because of women and men's changing reasons/ motivation for cohabiting. Today, other factors (listed in the chapter) have become important determinants of cohabitation because of shifting attitudes. The concept of liberal attitudes is measured by women's acceptance of single parenthood (i.e. having children without the presence of a man), and the hypothesis put forward states that: 'women who choose or accept single-parenthood by choice (i.e. having a child without the presence of a man in contrast to divorced single-mothers) are more likely to cohabit than women who do not'. This relationship is expected to be supported in this research, although it is also assumed to have a weak impact on women's propensity to cohabit.

As was mentioned earlier, history of parental divorce was also shown to be a determining factor in women's tendency to cohabit. Although parental divorce or coming from a broken home is expected to have a positive effect on women's tendency to cohabit, it is excluded from our empirical model, due to the limitations of the Fertility Study (1984).

Additionally, it is also suspected that women who are raised in single-parent families (a never-married parent) are more likely to cohabit. However, this demographic factor is not included in the data set, therefore this relationship cannot be tested in the present empirical framework.

With respect to unconventional behaviour, it has been shown that illicit drug use increases the likelihood for cohabitation while decreasing the likelihood of marriage among women or men (Yamaguchi et al., 1985). This factor, "illicit drug use", is not accounted for as a variable in the Fertility Study (1984).

16. Attitude towards Abortion

Attitude towards abortion is selected as yet another indicator of a general liberal/egalitarian value orientation. It is presumed that women who accept abortion are more likely to participate in unconventional/modern living arrangements such as cohabitation than are women who reject abortion. This variable is not included in any empirical studies on cohabitation, but may prove to be of some importance since it reflects a conservative/liberal value orientation upon which individuals base their behaviour.

HYPOTHESES

This research aims to investigate the validity of the following hypotheses:

- 1. Women who were previously married are more likely to cohabit than their never-married counterpart.**
- 2. Childless women are more likely to cohabit than women with children.**
- 3. Women who are not actively religious are more likely to cohabit than their religious counterpart.**
- 4a. Young women between the ages of 18 and 25 yrs. are more likely to cohabit than women between the ages of 40 and 49 years.**
- 4b. Young women between the ages of 26 to 39 yrs. are more likely to engage in cohabitation than women in the older age cohort (40 to 49 yrs.).**
- 5. Women who have more years of schooling are more likely to cohabit than women with less schooling.**
- 6. Employed women are more likely to cohabit than unemployed women.**
- 7. Women who live in urban areas are more likely to cohabit than women living in rural areas.**
- 8. Women who maintain a negative perception of marriage are more likely to cohabit than women who have a positive view of marriage.**
- 9. Women who do not desire long-term relationships are more likely to cohabit than women who desire such relationships.**
- 10. Women who view cohabitation as a viable living arrangement are more likely to cohabit than women who do not view cohabitation as such.**
- 11. Women whose social circle includes cohabiting couples who are accepted as equal to married couples, are more likely to cohabit, than women whose social circle includes cohabiting couples who are not accepted as married couples.**
- 12. Women who view children as essential to their personal well-being are less likely to cohabit than women who do regard children as such.**

13. Women who express a desire for autonomy are more likely to cohabit than women who do not assert this desire.

14. Women who maintain egalitarian/liberal sex-role attitudes are more likely to cohabit than women with traditional/ conservative sex role attitudes.

15. Women who express a positive attitude towards the possibility of female single-parent families are more likely to cohabit than women who are opposed to this unconventional family form.

16. Women who view abortion as acceptable are more likely to cohabit than women who are opposed to abortion.

Chapter IV METHODOLOGY

DATA

The data reported in this study has been selected from the 1984 National Canadian Survey (Balakrishnan, Krotki and Lapierre-Ademsiyck, 1984). The survey is comprised of a sample of 5,315 women, Canadian citizens, age 18 to 49 years and provides detailed information on a number of attitudinal, socio-economic and demographic factors.

The principal limitation of this data set is the age restriction imposed on the sample population. This sample is limited to women between the ages of 18 and 49, the age limits of the fertility survey. The main dependent variable in this study is comprised of two categories: (1) presently cohabiting women including those in common-law unions compared to (2) never-cohabited married women. The presently cohabiting group includes women whose previous marital status included those "divorced", "separated", "widowed", or "single"; while the married category isolates women who were married during the survey period and had no prior cohabitation experience. Thus, our sample excludes: (1) married respondents with past cohabitation experience, and (2) respondents who previously cohabited but were not cohabiting during the survey period.

This work is unique in that it is the first of its kind in Canada. The sample chosen in this study was based on a two stage probability selection process involving telephone numbers generated randomly through the use of a computer. The survey involved extensive telephone interviews after feasibility pre-tests concerning the administering of a lengthy telephone questionnaire on the issue of fertility in Canada were conducted. Once having initiated the survey questionnaire, more than 98% of the respondents interviewed completed it, indicating a very high response rate compared to other telephone surveys which tend to have higher withdrawal rates.

A sample of 451 cohabiting women and 2599 (never-cohabited) married women was selected from the original sample size of 5315 female respondents; resulting in a total subsample of 3050 respondents. The present study aims at determining the empirical validity of relationships postulated in feminist and social-exchange theory, and a number of variables identified as determinants or correlates of cohabitation in previous empirical works.

OPERATIONALIZATION AND VARIABLE MEASUREMENT

LIVING ARRANGEMENT (LIVING)

The main dependent variable in this model specification differentiates between currently cohabiting and married women. The cohabiting category was selected from a complex variable (FAITLEG) computed in the survey (see appendix A). The total sample size of cohabiting women during the time of the survey was 451 while that of never-cohabited married women was 2599.

The objective of this study is to identify factors suspected of influencing them in their decision to cohabit. Married women with prior cohabitation experience are explicitly excluded from the 'married women' category because of potentially confounding results (for instance presently cohabiting and married (previously-cohabited) women may display similar attitudes towards personal freedom, the importance of work, religiosity, children, etc.) which may surface as a result of cohabitation experience among both groups. Thus, two categories are selected ("Never-cohabited Married women" and "Cohabiting women") in order to provide an accurate picture of the differences between currently married women without any prior living-together experience, and presently cohabiting women.

SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC AND ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

This study attempts to examine the relative impact of attitudinal and socio-demographic variables on women's tendency to cohabit. The following socio-demographic factors are incorporated into this model and are expected to influence women's decision to cohabit: (1) marital status, (2) the presence of children, (3) degree of religiosity, (4) employment status, (5) education, (6) residence and (7) age cohort.

The most important determinants which are expected to have a positive effect on women's tendency to cohabit are: history of a previous marriage, young age of woman, absence of children, women's lack of desire for security or commitment, a negative attitude towards marriage, low level of religiosity and being unemployed. In comparison to these variables, employment status, religiosity, level of education, and (urban/rural) residence, and a number of attitudinal variables are expected to have significantly weaker effects on women's propensity to cohabit.

Attitudinal determinants included in this analysis are attitudes towards: (1) marriage, (2) autonomy, (3) sex roles, (4) the importance of long-term relationships (i.e. commitment) as well as (5) the importance of children, (6) the viability of cohabitation as a living arrangement, (7) family and peer group acceptance of cohabiters as married people, (8) the acceptance of female single-parent families, and (9) acceptance of abortion. Among these variables, attitude towards marriage, and the importance of a long term relationship (for personal happiness), are suspected of having a greater influence than the remaining attitudinal factors.

METHODS

From a methodologically "pure" point of view, multiple regression analysis is not viewed as the best method when a dichotomous dependent variable is present. However, because of the exploratory nature of this study, and a lack of familiarity with the best type of analysis, log-linear regression, multiple regression serves as a good second choice.

Step-wise regression is judged adequate because of its ability to determine the relative importance of numerous factors. The step wise regression procedure emits variables which have the greatest impact on the dependent variable, controlling for other statistically significant variables in a step wise fashion (attaining a level of significance of at least 5%). Concurrently, statistically insignificant variables are dropped from the regression equation.

Step-wise regression is used to determine whether a variable or group of variables significantly add to the explained variance of cohabitation experience. It determines the cumulative explanatory power of all significant variables on women's propensity to cohabit. Thus this procedure is utilized in order to (1) determine the overall impact of all variables combined, and, (2) investigate the relative importance of selected variables in determining the variance in unmarried-cohabitation experience when controlling for other factors.

The standardized beta coefficients represent decreases or increases in the log odd of the conditional probability of current propensity to cohabit. They are interpreted relative to the omitted category which consists of married never- cohabited women between the ages of 18 and 49. The rationale for selecting married women with no prior cohabition experience is that it is suspected that married women who previously cohabited would have

similar attitudinal, behavioral and demographic characteristics as presently cohabiting women. The unstandardized coefficients indicate which variables are significant determinants of nonmarital cohabitation among Canadian women. Appendix A provides a description of the selected variables and specifies the coding procedures utilized. Appendix B contains background sample characteristics using frequency distributions (Tables 1.0 to 2.3), and a stepwise regression analysis (Table 3.0) indicating positive or negative associations between the dependent and independent variables and the total explained variance of propensity to cohabit, by our empirical model. Of the variables which were highly correlated, only income was dropped from our model due to a strong association with the employment status variable. A number of other variables which demonstrated weaker, nonetheless considerable correlations, were collapsed together to form new variables. These are as follows:

- 1) Acceptance of cohabitation as a practical living arrangement is created by collapsing "agree/disagree that cohabitation serves as a form of trial marriage in order to determine compatibility" with "accept/reject any long-term commitments";
- 2) The view of children as important/unimportant is created by collapsing "important/unimportant to have at least one child in order to be happy" with "agree/disagree that a child provides a goal that nothing else can replace";
- 3) Attitude towards Marriage is created by collapsing "agree/disagree that marriage adds something positive to the relationship" with "agree/disagree that marriage creates certain obligations";
- 4) Importance of a stable relationship is created by collapsing: "important/unimportant to be married" with "important/unimportant to have a lasting relationship as a couple";
- 5) Autonomous attitude is created by collapsing "important/ unimportant to have a job" with important/unimportant to be free to do as one wishes"; and
- 6) Egalitarian sex-role attitude is created by collapsing "childrearing is done only by the woman, mostly by the woman, by both man and woman, mostly by the man, only by the man, with "household chores are done only by the woman, mostly by the woman, by both man and woman, mostly by the man, only by the man".

Furthermore, multicollinearity tests were conducted prior to stepwise regression, so that highly related variables were dropped from the model or collapsed to form a new single variable.

Chapter V

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

As an introduction to this study, a descriptive analysis of the sample characteristics of cohabiting and married respondents is provided. Frequency distributions (Table 1.0 -Table 2.3) of these characteristics are used for comparative purposes when studying the two sample categories. Only significant determinants of cohabitation not exceeding the .05 level of statistical significance (Table 3.0) will be elaborated upon in this chapter.

Beginning with Table 1.0, (Appendix B) the findings show that among childless women, a considerably higher percentage, 44%, cohabit, in comparison to only 8.3% of women with children who do so. This coincides with the findings of Glick (1981b) and Hobart (1983), who conclude that there is a positive relationship between childlessness and cohabitation practice.

Age distribution (Table 1.1) shows that, in the 18 to 25 age cohort a considerable proportion (41.3%) of the respondents cohabit in contrast to 12.6% in the 26 to 39 age group, and 6.1% in the 40 to 49 age cohort. These figures are consistent with the findings of earlier studies which reveal that cohabitation is practised largely by young adults, 35 years and younger, with a large percentage between the ages of 18 and 25 (Arafat and Yorburg, 1963; Bower & Christopherson, 1977; Lunney and Cotten-Huston, 1979). Macklin (1978) maintains that this situation may reflect the assertive and independent attitudes of young women (in their twenties and thirties), and their self-perception as generally uninhibited and competitive. For these women, cohabitation may appear to be a more accommodating and less intimidating than marriage. This finding reinforces the feminist claim that alternative living-arrangements (i.e. cohabitation) offer women the opportunity for greater self-determination as well as egalitarian and equitable relations.

With respect to marital status, it is revealed that among previously married women, a majority, 59%, cohabit, in comparison to only 9.7% of never married women who do so (Table 1.2). This finding supports the social exchange theoretical premise which postulates that personal relationships are entered into and maintained on the basis of a 'balance of costs and rewards'. It may be speculated that women who experience marriage and separation or divorce, come to view marriage as entailing more costs (i.e. being more restrictive and demanding and requiring women to assume most of the personal sacrifices and compromises) than cohabitation. This also reflects certain feminist positions about the restrictions of marriage especially for women. The increasing numbers of women who choose to cohabit as opposed to remarrying also reinforces the feminist argument that marriage is largely oppressive to the fulfilment of women's needs, desires and freedom.

Feminism posits that women may enter into this less formal and restrictive union because traditional marriage places a heavy burden of familial responsibilities on women, coercing them into relinquishing the most with respect to personal and career interests. It is hypothesized that some women, having already experienced marriage, desire not to remarry and therefore opt for nonmarital relationships as their preferred living arrangement. No current studies have investigated the strength or extent of such women's desire to remarry.

The following reasons help explain why women tend to cohabit: 1) they perceive cohabitation as offering greater rewards than marriage (Macklin, 1972); 2) they view cohabitation as a form of trial marriage, a period during which compatibility of the partners is determined (i.e. the reciprocation of positive qualities) (Macklin, 1972; Lewis et al., 1977), and 3) they view cohabitation as providing a more intimate and complete relationship than traditional courtship (another area of research not dealt with in this study) (Macklin, 1983).

It is assumed that cohabiters have a tendency to espouse liberal/egalitarian attitudes towards various issues such as: sex roles, abortion, the need for children, to mention a few. The figures in Table 1.3 indicate that only 8.2% of female respondents who express entirely positive attitudes towards marriage cohabit, in comparison to 17.7% who express partly negative attitudes, and a majority, (65.6%), who report completely negative attitudes toward marriage and cohabit. These findings confirm the validity of the assumption of feminist and social exchange theories that women are changing their attitudes towards marriage, away from the idealization of marriage and towards an increasing acceptance of alternative arrangements. Consequently, the perception of marriage as an unrewarding/unfavourable living arrangement becomes increasingly popular among women.

With respect to the importance of a long-term relationship including marriage, this research shows that the desire for long-term relationships continues to exist. When looking at Table 1.4, 38.1% of respondents who support both views that marriage or a long-term relationship are necessary in order to be happy cohabit, in comparison with 35% of those who partially support these views (i.e support only one statement), and only 8.3% of those who reject both views and cohabit.

Some support is given to feminism's assertion that women's shifting attitudes regarding marriage have led to a reevaluation of the need for marriage in order to be personally fulfilled. While substantial proportions view marriage and a long term relationship as necessary in order to have personal fulfilment, an almost equally significant proportion view only one of these relationships as important, and a relatively small number completely disagree with these two statements. These findings also corroborate the results of Hobart's (1983) longitudinal study, which suggests that marriage (i.e the need for

security) is less important to cohabiting women today than it was in the recent past (when a greater proportion of cohabiting women reported a personal desire for marriage).

In Table 1.5, degree of religiosity among female respondents is measured by frequency of attendance at religious services ranging from never attending religious services to participating on a weekly basis. The findings suggest that as frequency of participation in religious services increases, the proportions of respondents who cohabit steadily decreases. Among respondents who never attend religious services, 32.9% cohabit, in comparison to 24% of those who "rarely" attend, 18.1% who attend "a few times a year", 6.8% who attend "monthly", and 3.7% who attend "weekly" and cohabit.

While social-exchange theory provides a theoretical framework based on the rewards and costs involved in relationships, it does not account for the religiosity factor. Feminism, elaborates upon shifting societal values and attitudes concerning sex, religion, and relationships. In doing so, feminism accounts for the influence of growing secularization on women's values, attitudes and behaviour and diagnoses a society with increasingly diverse lifestyles (i.e. same sex relationships, single parent families, nonmarital cohabitation). More specifically, feminist reform within the church and feminism's rejection of the traditional religious view of women pushed towards this trend of secularization.

With respect to the acceptance or rejection of cohabiting couples by the respondents' social groups, the results (Table 1.6) indicate that among respondents who report an acceptance of cohabiting couples, 18.1% cohabit, compared to 7.4% whose social group rejects cohabiting couples and cohabit.

This acceptance of cohabitation amid cohabiting women's reference group may help eliminate some of the costs previously associated with this living-arrangement (i.e. family or societal pressure and rejection). Along these lines, feminist literature contends that as increasing numbers of individuals continue to practise diverse living arrangements, societal attitudes towards non-traditional relationships will become increasingly relaxed/liberal. Similarly, social-exchange theory hypothesizes that as most of the previous costs associated with cohabitation dissipate (i.e. family and peer pressure/disapproval, general societal scorn and rejection), this relationship will then be perceived as offering greater rewards.

Table 1.7 reports whether women feel it is acceptable to have a child without the presence of a man: (1) for herself, and (2) for others. This variable is used as an indicator of liberal/traditional value orientation. The findings show that, a considerable proportion, 41%, of respondents who support these views entirely (i.e. on both counts) cohabit, in comparison to 19% who partially agree with these situations (on one count only) and cohabit, and 9.4% who reject these views entirely and also cohabit. These findings indicate that cohabiting women are more likely to accept single-parent families and the feasibility of diverse family forms. Social-exchange theory goes further to argue that cohabiting women associate less costs with the single-parenthood while married women perceive more costs with this choice. Feminist theory also presupposes that women who maintain liberal and autonomous attitudes are more likely to enter into nontraditional living arrangements than women who support conservative attitudes.

The findings in Table 1.8, "Cohabitation by Attitude towards Children", indicate a higher proportion of women who view children as unimportant are cohabiting as opposed to those who do not share this view. Among respondents who maintain that children are entirely (on both counts) unimportant to them, 25.9% cohabit, while 16.3% of those who

partially (on one count) agree that children are not important cohabit, and only 12% of those who do not support these views (perceive children as being important) cohabit. These findings suggest that there is a change among cohabiting women they are more likely to view children as secondary or even unimportant in their quest for personal fulfilment. Thus their views about the consummation of their roles as women have become more self-centred (fulfilling their personal ego) as opposed to other centred (fulfilling the nurturing role). Additionally it may be hypothesized that because children are a traditional and salient reason for marriage, women who express no desire for children may shun marriage and turn towards the preferred nonmarital commitment of cohabitation.

Both feminist and social exchange literature support these findings by theorizing that women who demonstrate egalitarian and autonomous attitudes and behaviour (i.e. support shared-parenting, do not view children as a priority and are career-oriented), are more likely to engage in unconventional living arrangements which they perceive as offering greater rewards than traditional marriage. According to feminist theory, women opt for non-traditional sex role relationships because they view such relationships as less demanding in terms of familial responsibilities, (e.g., household chores, childrearing, time spent at home) and therefore entail fewer costs with respect to career sacrifices and personal compromises. Women choose to cohabit so that they may have greater intimacy with their partner, without the legal commitment and socially defined roles involved in marriage.

As shown in Table 1.9, among all respondents in the survey, attitudes towards cohabitation include: (1) cohabitation serves as a form of trial marriage and, (2) as an extension of traditional courtship. This table investigates whether the perception is that cohabitation is a practical arrangement during certain periods of the life cycle. When comparing across categories, (among respondents who favour and those who oppose cohabitation as an alternative living-arrangement) attitude towards cohabitation (specifically

approval of cohabitation) varies even among cohabiting women. In the sample, 21.9% of all women who report entirely favourable attitudes towards cohabitation currently cohabit compared to 14.1% of respondents who only partially favour cohabitation, and a minute 2.1% who are totally opposed to this arrangement yet also cohabit. These findings seem to suggest that even among female cohabiters cohabitation may serve different purposes and therefore have different meanings and levels of desirability.

Social-exchange theory proves to be relevant here in providing a framework which analyses the decision-making process with respect to relationships. The respondent who accepts 'cohabitation as alternative to ...' does so from what she perceives to be a favourable balance of rewards and costs regardless of their nature. To the degree that both partners feel rewarded in terms of the costs and benefits (i.e., status and resource provision as well as expressive rights), both will seek such a relationship.

The findings of this study appear to confirm what other researchers have suggested concerning attitudes towards cohabitation. The findings of earlier studies indicate that, among both the general population and those who cohabit, cohabitation is perceived as a positive experience (Hobart, 1979; Kotkin, 1990; Bumpass, 1990). A large majority reported that they would not marry without cohabiting nonmaritally first (Macklin, 1978; Peterman et al., 1984). In a study by Bower and Christopherson (1977), 50% of American college respondents who had not cohabited would consider doing so in order to test out the relationship, while 80 percent of students who had cohabited would repeat this experience. This finding is consistent with other studies which report similar figures (Hienze and Hudson, 1974), while Arafat and Yorburg (1973) report that nearly 90 percent of noncohabitants in their sample would cohabit if the opportunity arose.

Respondents are asked whether they favour abortion under the following conditions: 'the mother has been raped, risk of an abnormal fetus, danger to the mother's life and health, mother will be a single-parent, and family poverty'. The findings in Table 2.0 reveal that 22.8% of respondents who view abortion as acceptable under all circumstances cohabit, compared to 14.4%, 15.6% and 15% who view it as acceptable under 'most circumstances' (from five down to three counts) and cohabit. However, smaller percentages (8.7% and 5.1%) of respondents who favour abortion under limited circumstances cohabit, while another 4.4% who reject abortion entirely also cohabit.

When looking at the sex role attitudinal variable in Table 2.1, it can be seen that respondents express whether they maintain egalitarian or traditional sex role attitudes towards childrearing and household chores. The findings show that, 17.2% of those who reported entirely egalitarian sex role attitudes cohabit, in comparison with 10.4% who express only partly egalitarian sex role attitudes and cohabit, and an even smaller proportion, 5.5% who reject liberal/egalitarian sex roles and cohabit. These findings seem to indicate that cohabiting women are more likely to support egalitarian rather than conventional sex role attitudes. The feminist theoretical postulate which emphasizes a shift in sex roles attitudes from traditional/conservative to liberal/egalitarian is supported by the findings of this study.

With respect to the autonomous attitude variable presented in Table 2.2, respondents express the importance of: (1) a job outside the home; (2) the freedom to do as one wishes, in order to be happy. In this table, autonomous attitude is measured by the importance of having a job, and (2) the freedom to do as one wishes in order to be fulfilled. The findings indicate that, like other attitudinal variables discussed earlier, the proportions of respondents who express autonomous attitudes and cohabit outweigh those with non-autonomous attitudes who cohabit. Among respondents who express entirely autonomous

attitudes regarding the importance of work and freedom in their lives 17.6% cohabit, in comparison to 11.4% of women who only partly support this attitude and cohabit, and a further decreasing proportion, 6.1% who do not support autonomous attitudes.

As is revealed in Chapter II, earlier research has shown that a number of demographic and attitudinal factors such as: childlessness, age, religiosity, high divorce rates, and attitudes toward marriage and sex roles are salient determinants of cohabitation. The results of this study reveal that, when all factors are controlled (Table 3), the following socio-demographic and attitudinal variables exert the strongest positive influence on women's cohabitation behaviour in this order: (1) a history of a previous marriage; (2) being in the youngest adult cohort (18 to 25 years of age); (3) childlessness; (4) the perception of the importance of a long-term relationship; (5) a negative attitude towards marriage; (6) being in a young to middle-age cohort (26 to 39 years) and, (7) infrequent religious attendance. Only employment status (presently employed) has a negative effect on women's propensity to cohabit and proves to have a very weak impact on women's cohabital behaviour. These statistically significant variables account for 44 percent of the unexplained variance in our model on women's tendency to cohabit.

When looking at the effects of each variable individually, we notice that when all other factors are controlled, marital status (operationalized as previously married and never-married) emerges as the most significant determinant of cohabitation practise. The Beta coefficient figure (.3674) indicates that respondents who report a previous marriage are significantly more likely to choose cohabitation as opposed to marriage. Thus, a history of previous marriage has the strongest positive influence on women's tendency to cohabit.

In earlier research, divorce (measured here as experience of a previous marriage) was investigated as a salient determinant of women's propensity to cohabit. The findings

of this research support the results of earlier studies (Morrison and Anderson, 1973; Glick, 1978; Newcomb and Bentler, 1984; Macklin, 1983; Newcomb, 1983-4; DeMaris, 1984) which conclude that the experience of divorce promotes cohabitation. This is because nonmarital cohabitation may be perceived as a practical arrangement free of any legal commitments, after a period of divorce. Consequently, the hypothesis; 'women with a history of previous marriage are more likely to cohabit than women with no previous marital history' is supported by the findings of this study.

This study shows that in Canada, younger women, between the ages of 18 and 39 are more likely to cohabit than older women between the ages of 40 and 49. Looking more closely, the findings reveal that women between the ages of 18 and 25, are significantly more likely to cohabit than women in older age cohorts. This proves to be equally true for women in the 26 to 39 year age category, which have a greater tendency to cohabit than women in the 40 to 49 age bracket. The Beta coefficient (.3113) indicates that being between the ages of 18 and 25 years, is the second most important factor influencing women's behaviour towards cohabitation. Thus, the hypotheses put forth; 'women in the 18 to 25 year age cohort are more likely to cohabit than women in older age cohorts' and 'women in the 26 to 39 year age cohort are more likely to cohabit than women between the ages of 40 and 49' are supported by the figures presented in our study.

These findings are consistent with previous studies suggesting that cohabitation is practised primarily by young adults, 35 years and younger, with a large percentage being between the ages of 18 and 25 (Arafat and Yorburg, 1963; Bower & Christopherson, 1977; Lunney and Cotten-Huston, 1979). Other research concludes that because young women (in their twenties and thirties) view themselves as being less traditional, this may have a bearing on their increased likelihood to cohabit (Erdwins et al., 1981). The

assumption is that young and unconventional or rebellious women are more likely to cohabit than the older female cohorts.

The differences in the perceptions and behaviour of various generations are a result of the recently liberalized attitudes towards sex-roles (Erdwins, 1981). However, it is suspected that the decision to cohabit is no longer based on the issue of morality, values or attitudes; rather it has become a matter of convenience whether cohabitation serves as a practical living arrangement. Both theoretical feminist research and empirical works (some of which were also feminist) have shown that during the 60s and 70s there was a general trend among women towards a liberal-egalitarian perspective (Tanfer, 1987; Macklin, 1983; Straver, 1981; Newcomb, 1979). This was particularly true in the 60s and 70s, however, the eighties and nineties are a time of selecting priorities and preferences as women begin to choose personal relationships suited to their practical needs (i.e., with respect to their career choices, degree of emotional involvement, their desire to bear children, and time spent together).

As is hypothesized in earlier empirical literature, a positive relationship exists between childlessness and women's propensity to cohabit. The Beta coefficient of .2598 indicates that when other factors are held constant, childlessness is the third most important factor in our model, following marital status and age. It must be noted, however that before accounting for age, childlessness had a significantly stronger effect on women's propensity to cohabit (Bumpass, 1989; Hobart, 1983; Kotkin, 1990). Consequently, when the age factor is held constant, the impact of childlessness on women's cohabitation behaviour is reduced.

This finding concurs with previous studies (Glick, 1981b; Hobart, 1983; Bumpass and McLanahan, 1989) which show that childlessness or the postponement of childbearing

encourages cohabitation by delaying the need for marriage for the sake of "legitimizing" children. The results of this study indicate that childless women are more likely to opt for cohabitation than are women with children, including pregnant women. Thus the hypothesis 'childless women have a greater tendency to cohabit than do women with children', is supported by the findings of this research.

The attitudinal variables 'importance of a long term relationship in order to be happy' and 'attitude towards marriage' are relatively significant determinants of cohabitation. The Beta coefficient (.1645) shows that importance of a long term relationship is the fourth most important variable influencing women's cohabitation behaviour. The hypothesis that, Canadian women who view a long term relationship as unimportant in order to be happy are significantly more likely to cohabit than to marry, is therefore supported in this study. This finding corroborates Hobart's (1983) conclusion that: the desire for a long-term or permanent relationship is likely to positively influence women's attitudes towards marriage, while women who express no desire for security or permanence in a relationship are more likely to cohabit.

With respect to women's attitude towards marriage, the Beta coefficient (.1515) indicates that a negative attitude (towards marriage) has a positive effect on women's propensity to cohabit. This figure thus supports the hypothesis that, women who maintain a negative perception of marriage are more likely to cohabit (than to marry), while confirming other research findings which indicate that increasing divorce rates (the instability of marriage) contribute to the rising practise of cohabitation (Morrison et al., 1973). Although these relationships appear to be obvious, they are nonetheless investigated because of their relevance to this study.

The relatively important effect of attitudinal factors on women's propensity to cohabit justifies our inclusion of both feminism and social-exchange theory. Feminism theorizes that women's changing attitudes towards marriage have lead them to reevaluate their need for marriage and to search for more rewarding and practical alternatives (e.g. nonmarital cohabitation). Similarly, social-exchange theory argues that, a negative attitude towards marriage is reflective of a perception associating greater costs with conventional marriage. As a result of the perceived unfavourable balance of costs and benefits involved in marriage, it is theorized that these respondents will opt for some other living arrangement, such as nonmarital cohabitation. Both these theoretical assumptions are confirmed by the present research findings which suggest that a negative attitude towards marriage has a positive effect on women's attitude towards cohabitation. However according to Denmark and associates (1985), nonmarital heterosexual cohabitation may or may not entail less traditional sex roles at home. Further research should be conducted in order to investigate whether a greater degree of egalitarian behaviour is present in nonmarital settings as opposed to marital unions.

With regards to the employment status of women, the findings of this research suggest that unemployed women are more likely to cohabit than to marry. The Beta coefficient (-.1208) demonstrates a negative weak relationship between employment status and women's cohabitation behaviour, and reveals that it is the seventh most important variable in the equation. (This result may be due partly to the limitation of the employment variable, in which only presently employed women are selected. This variable consequently excludes those who were employed during the last year and those actively seeking work, information which was not included in the National Fertility Survey. Another explanation for this finding may be that many unemployed college or university students may choose to cohabit, thereby increasing the numbers of unemployed women among cohabiters. A third factor, may be the large percentage (42%) of cohabiting women

who belong to the 18 to 25 age category (see Table 1.1). Because cohabiters are also preponderantly young, they may be unemployed for reasons of school attendance, lack of work experience, being underskilled, etc. Therefore, although this finding does not support the feminist tenant that cohabitation serves as a convenient arrangement (in comparison to marriage) for career-oriented/employed women, one must take into consideration the effect of the variable limitation factor as well as the possibility of great numbers of unemployed college/university students who choose to cohabit.

In feminist theory, it is argued that women's careers are dependent upon family situations (i.e., timing of marriage, selection of the marital partner, demands of husband's occupation, and timing and number of children) (Voydanoff, 1988). In this respect, empirical studies show that a large majority of married women make sacrifices with respect to their education and career opportunities, in comparison with only a small minority of married men who reciprocate for their wives (Kotkin, 1983). Unlike married couples, Kotkin finds that equal percentages of men and women cohabiters make such compromises. Thus these studies suggest that nonmarital cohabitation offers greater freedom and rewards than traditional marriage, particularly for autonomous women intent on establishing careers. Despite these findings, the present research cannot investigate the equal education/career factors as determinants of cohabitation, since women alone constituted the 1984 Fertility sample surveyed.

With respect to religiosity or frequency of attendance at religious ceremonies, a weak but statistically significant relationship is found to be present, with religiosity being the eighth most significant variable. The regression coefficient (.1037) suggests that, as was expected, women who infrequently attend religious services are somewhat more likely to cohabit. Yet, when holding all (statistically significant) variables constant in our model, religiosity emerges as the least important determinant of cohabitation.

This finding supports earlier investigations which report that low levels of religiosity (measured by low rates of attendance at religious services) have a positive effect on propensity to cohabit (DeMaris, 1984, Strong, 1980; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980; Strong, 1978; Arafat and Yorburg, 1973; Henze and Hudson, 1974). Although some of these researchers (DeMaris, 1984; Arafat and Yorburg, 1973) found degree of religiosity to be a salient determinant of cohabitation, this study like that of Balakrishnan's (1990) which is based on the same data set as that used in this study (1984 Fertility Survey), reveals a weak relationship between attendance at religious services and the practice of nonmarital cohabitation. Thus, the results of this study indicate that in Canadian society today, religion plays a weak role in women's lives, particularly with respect to their choice of living arrangements.

To conclude, this study suggests that demographic and attitudinal factors, such as the experience of a previous marriage, young age, childlessness, and a negative attitude towards marriage significantly influence Canadian women in their decision to cohabit. Employment status (tendency to be employed) and low level of religiosity (infrequent attendance at religious services) prove to be less important. Succinctly then, nonmarital unions appear to be the result of a situational context based on social and demographic factors (i.e., history of previous marriage, young age, presence of children) and a negative attitude towards marriage.

The suspected relationships between a conservative value orientation (operationalized by attitudes towards abortion, single-parent families, sex roles, autonomy and children) and cohabitation suggest that these attitudinal factors have little bearing on whether Canadian women decide to cohabit. These hypotheses (linking attitudinal variables with cohabitation behaviour) are rooted in a single general proposition which maintains that women who express unconventional attitudes (i.e., modern/liberal-

egalitarian and autonomous) are more likely to cohabit than to marry. Additionally, findings here show that social pressure is no longer a deterrent of cohabitation as was concluded in earlier empirical studies (Newcomb, 1983-4; Macklin, 1983; Arafat et al., 1963). On the contrary, the findings in Table 3.0 point to a widespread societal acceptance of cohabitation as an acceptable living arrangement.

More specifically variables which were initially included in our theoretical model but are dropped due to a lack of statistical significance are as follows: (1) residence; (2) years of education; (3) view of cohabitation as a viable living arrangement; (4) attitudes towards autonomy, (5) towards sex roles, (6) abortion, (7) children, (8) female single-parent families; and (9) social acceptance of cohabiting couples. To recapitulate, the findings of this study support the following hypotheses presented in order of importance:

1. Women who were previously married are more likely to cohabit than their never-married counterpart.
2. Young women between the ages of 18 and 25 yrs. are more likely to cohabit than women who are their seniors.
3. Childless women are more likely to cohabit than women with children.
4. Women who are not actively religious are more likely to cohabit than their religious counterpart.
5. Young women between the ages of 26 to 39 yrs. are more likely to engage in cohabitation than women in the older age cohort (40 to 49 yrs.).
6. Women who do not desire long-term relationships are more likely to cohabit than women who desire such relationships.
7. Women who maintain a negative perception of marriage are more likely to cohabit than women who have a positive view of marriage.

However, this study fails to support the following hypotheses:

1. Women who have more years of education are more likely to cohabit than, those with less years of education.
2. Women who are raised in metropolitan areas are more likely to cohabit than, women raised in rural areas.
3. Women who view cohabitation as a viable living arrangement are more likely to cohabit than, women who do not view cohabitation as such.
4. Women whose family or peer group accept cohabiting couples as equal to married couples are more likely to cohabit than, women who's family and peer group do not.
5. Women who do not view children as essential to their personal well-being are more likely to cohabit than, women who do not perceive children in this way.
6. Women who express a desire for autonomy are more likely to cohabit than, women who do not express this desire.
7. Women who maintain egalitarian sex-role attitudes are more likely to cohabit than, women with traditional sex role attitudes.
8. Women who express a positive attitude towards the female single-parent families are more likely to cohabit than women who are opposed to this unconventional family form.
9. Women who view abortion as acceptable are more likely to cohabit than women who are opposed to abortion.

Despite the immense amount of information on Canadian women provided in the Canadian Fertility Survey, other potential determinants of cohabitation such as a history of parental divorce, or being raised in a single (never-married) parent family are not included in this analysis.

VI. CONCLUSION

The results of this research indicate that nonmarital cohabitation is no longer a moral issue determined by religious or puritanical beliefs regarding premarital sex, rather it is perceived as a convenient arrangement for an increasing number of people. This is particularly evident for divorced women as well as younger childless women. A growing trend towards the postponement of marriage and consequently childbirth, with the already presently low fertility rates and the increasing wage-earning power of women (Newcomb and Bentler, 1980), indicates that nonmarital cohabitation is likely to become even more widely practised in North America. With an increase in nonmarital cohabitation birth rates may be expected to drop, since most cohabiters tend to be childless or delay having children (Newcomb and Bentler 1980).¹

In both Canada and the U.S., the high incidence of divorce or separation, (precipitating pessimistic views about the viability of marriage), may be a significant contributing factor in the widespread practice of nonmarital cohabitation. It is difficult to assess the impact of nonmarital cohabitation on future divorce rates because of numerous contributing factors. However, the findings of this study clearly indicate that persons who previously married and later divorced are significantly more likely to cohabit than persons who never married.

¹ Research has shown that (Newcomb and Bentler, 1980a) individuals who cohabited prior to marriage were significantly less likely to have children within the first four years of marriage; 21% of cohabiters compared to 53% of noncohabiters had children within four years after marriage. This finding is consistent with other research findings (Bower and Christopherson, 1977) which suggest that students who cohabited intended to have significantly fewer children. Similarly, this study indicates that presently cohabiting women are more likely to be childless than are married women, supporting previous findings on a low level of planned fertility, and actual low fertility rates among cohabiters (Bower and Christopherson 1977; Newcomb and Bentler, 1980a).

Until recently, educational level, sex role attitudes, religiosity and religious affiliation, history of illicit drug use and peer pressure were found to be significant determinants of nonmarital cohabitation. This study has shown that for the most part (with the exception of religiosity as a weak contributing variable), these factors are no longer pertinent in the decision-making process women face concerning cohabitation. Moreover, our research findings indicate that the relevant determinants of cohabitation are: (1) a history of divorce; (2) young age; (3) childlessness; (4) a negative attitude towards marriage as well as (5) a negative attitude towards long term relationships; (6) low level of religiosity, and (7) employment status/being unemployed.

Although previous studies have reported positive correlations between autonomous/egalitarian sex role attitudes and marital status (i.e., cohabitation versus marriage), such attitudes no longer appear to have a significant impact on women's decision to cohabit. This may be a result of the general consensus with regards to an egalitarian sex role perception in North American society (Tavris, 1984, Greenglass, 1987, Scanzoni, 1980, Macklin, 1983). Thus, as attitudes and perceptions change, our expectations and perception of nonmarital unions and marriage are also transformed, bringing about a different meaning and view of cohabitation. Consequently, research literature dating back to the 1960's, 1970's and early 1980's (although representative of that time period) is time-bound and limited in understanding cohabitation in the late 1980's and early 1990's.

It is interesting to observe that, sociological research of the 1950's through 1970's is reflective of the changing attitudes and values of those decades. The once socio-analytical works on cohabitation which mirrored the conservatism of the post war decades, have now largely been replaced by more liberal-egalitarian studies. This change is particularly evident when observing the choice in earlier studies of variables selected as

correlates or determinants of cohabitation, which are no longer considered relevant. In addition, the changing interpretation of nonmarital cohabitation elaborated upon in social research is another indicator of the historical and time bound paradigm of social research.

Two decades of cohabitation experience confirmed by research have indicated that the benefits tend to be greater or at least balance the costs with few detrimental effects to society (Macklin, 1983). On the other hand, significant strides have not been made with respect to benefits envisioned, according to some feminists (i.e. a more equitable division of labour within the home and fairness in the career advancement of each partner) (Bernard, 1981; Greeglass, 1987; Firestone, 1984; Voydanoff, 1988).

Although theoretical and empirical research conclude that cohabitation allows partners to effectively determine compatibility, the present study shows that women's perception of cohabitation as an acceptable premarital or nonmarital living arrangement has no bearing on their tendency to cohabit (Scanzoni, 1982; Macklin, 1972; Lewis, 1977; Hobart, 1979; Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, 1981; Kotkin, 1990; Bumpass, 1990). In other words, the findings of this study (Table 3.0) indicate that, acceptance of cohabitation as a form or trial marriage, or as an alternative to the legal commitment of marriage, is no longer a pertinent factor influencing women's cohabiting behaviour.

Additionally, this research points to the changing attitudes and expectations of women in general towards marriage and a search for alternatives. Reiterating what feminist theory and social exchange theory have argued, women have come to reevaluate the costs and benefits of traditional marriage. With the rising instability of marriage, and the expansion of women's responsibilities in it, women are increasingly likely to express negative attitudes or a greater reluctance towards marriage and socially defined sex roles, consequently opting for more flexible and innovative living arrangements such as

nonmarital cohabitation. Conclusively, the findings of this study confirm that a negative perception of marriage (which implies the calculation of rewards and costs) will have a positive effect on women's tendency to cohabit. Thus, attitude towards marriage is a relatively reliable indicator of the balance of rewards and costs women perceive in marriage.

The repercussions of the increasing practise of cohabitation on other societal institutions is profound to the extent that change is required in areas of policy and procedures (i.e legal rights and recognition) regarding the entitlements and rights of common-law couples and their children. The most obvious is the need (notably in Quebec) for legal recognition of nonmarital cohabitation so that cohabiting individuals and their offspring may have equal legal rights and benefits under the law. Thus, the protection of common-law partners and their children against discrimination, the legal rights of children of cohabiters, the effect of cohabitation on custody and alimony decisions and the division of property upon dissolution of the unit are salient issues in the debate on demographic trends provincially and federally.

It is suspected that cohabiting women will continue in the direction of delayed childbearing and childlessness because of the uncertain legal status and rights of cohabiting individuals and their offspring. Consequently, as the infant age cohort continues to shrink, government must inevitably turn towards immigration for an increase in this important demographic problem. Therefore, clarification of the legal status and obligations of these individuals towards one another and their offspring would seem to be a priority for them and for society at large.

Finally, since the 1970s there has been an abundance of research on nonmarital cohabitation in the United States with generally consistent findings. In Canada, however,

there has been insufficient research on cohabitation. Hence, there is a need for research based on Canadian attitudes and behaviour towards nonmarital cohabitation. Longitudinal studies are required to determine whether the hypotheses based on a cross section of North Americans can be sustained over time. Equally important, is the need to clearly define the concept of cohabitation and to understand its meaning and significance in the developmental stages of relationship experiences (i.e. prior to marriage, and after courtship or divorce).

Equally valid questions which also need to be answered are: Where does cohabitation stand in the lifecycle/span of both men and women? - Is it viewed as a temporary/transitional or permanent arrangement?; At what point in life is this most likely to occur?; What are the rates of cohabitation dissolution? - Rates of cohabitation ending in marriage?; and rates of cohabitation left intact after a period of at least a decade? It would also be interesting to provide a socio-economic profile for such couples in Canada and to correlate class differences with attitudinal variables (such as: attitudes towards marriage, cohabitation, children, work, and the household division of labour). These studies could lead to an interesting comparison of male and female perceptions and behaviour surrounding cohabitation and related issues.

This type of research, would be particularly interesting to carry out in Quebec, primarily because no major study has focused on cohabitation in Quebec or Canada since the 1970's (by Hobart, 1972). The recent emergence and prevalence of nonmarital unions in Quebec as well as other provinces suggests that this form of living arrangement, as a new type of household, deserves social investigation (cf. Statistics Canada, 1990 Census).

Appendix A

VARIABLE SPECIFICATION AND CODING PROCEDURES
FAITLEG (VAR620): Marital Status Common-Law and Legal of which
four categories of respondents were selected:

- 11. De facto and legal marriage
- 13. Common law marriage and legally separated
- 14. Common law and legally divorced
- 15. Common law and legally widowed
- 16. Common law and legally single
- 33. De facto and legally separated
- 44. De facto and legally divorced
- 55. De facto and legally widowed
- 66. De facto and legally single
- 99. Unknown

The cohabiting category was then recoded in the following manner: (13,14,15,16 = 0)

The married women category was measured by selecting the following two items:

Item 1: "Now, I have some questions
about your marital status. Are you now
married, living with a partner (common-law),
separated, divorced, widowed or have you
never been married?"

Married	1
Living with a partner	2
Separated	3
Divorced	4
Widowed	5
Never married	6

Item 2: "Have you ever lived with a partner
without being married?"

Yes	1
No	2

A subgroup of married women with no prior cohabital experience is selected.

Whereby:

Living = 0 currently cohabiting women
Living = 1 never-cohabited presently married women

The model for this study is specified here as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LIVING} = & a + b \text{ MARSTAT} + b \text{ CHILD} + b \\ & \text{VAR56} + b \text{ MARATT} + b \text{ EGSXRA} + b \\ & \text{AUTOATT} + b \text{ IMSTREL} + b \text{ IMPCH} + b \\ & \text{SNGPF} + b \text{ VAR49} + b \text{ EMPSTAT} + b \\ & \text{YOUNGEST} + b \text{ YOUNG} + b \text{ VAR38} + b \\ & \text{VAR85} + b \text{ ABORTATT} \end{aligned}$$

where:

a = constant

b = unstandardized regression coefficients

(1) = total number of cohabiting respondents

(0) = total number of never-cohabited married respondents

The following variable abbreviations are entered in a stepwise fashion (one at a time, in order of importance):

MARSTAT	-Marital Status (previously married/never married)
CHILD	-Presence of Children (childless women/women with children)
MARATT	-Attitude towards Marriage (negative/positive)
VAR56	-Degree of Religiosity (frequent attendance at religious services/infrequent attendance)
IMSTREL	-Importance of a long term relationship (unimportant/important)
EGSXRA	-Sex Role Attitudes (egalitarian/traditional)
AUTOATT	-Autonomous Attitude
SOCEXCH	-Attitude towards cohabitation as a viable living arrangement (positive/negative)
IMPCH	-The Importance of children (unimportant/important)

ASNGPF	-Acceptance of female single-parent family (accept/reject)
VAR49	-Years of Education
EMPSTAT	-Employment Status (Employed/not employed)
YOUNGEST	-Youngest Age Cohort (18 to 25 years of age)
YOUNG	-Young Age Cohort (26 to 39 years of age)
SENIOR	-Oldest age Cohort (40 to 49 years of age)
VAR38	-Residence (urban/rural)
VAR85	-Social acceptance of cohabiting couples (accept/reject)
ABORATT	-Attitude/acceptance of abortion (positive/negative)

1. HISTORY OF PREVIOUS MARRIAGE (MARSTAT)

In order to determine whether one's previous marital status (MARSTAT) has a bearing on the respondent's subsequent - present living arrangement, the following items were used:

Married Women Only:

Item 1: "Have you ever been married before?"

Yes	1
No	2

Common-Law Only:

Item 2: "Before this relationship started, had you ever been married?"

Yes	1
No	2

Given that both items were originally coded in the same manner, these two items were later computed to form a new variable, distinguishing between ever-married and never-married women. Thus, women who answered "Yes" to either question were assumed to have been either divorced, separated or widowed while those who answered "No" to either question are assumed to have been never divorced, separated or widowed.

Marital status (MARSTAT) is computed and recoded as follows:

Code	Label	Description
0	Previously married	- Respondents who were married previous to their present living arrangement
1	Never married	- Respondents who were never married previous to their present living arrangement

The creation of these two categories is supported by the logic that a large proportion of previously married women are likely to cohabit as opposed to remarrying. Cohabitation among this group of women may serve as a replacement to marriage, or as a temporary arrangement before a second marriage.

2. CHILDREN (CHILD)

In order to test for "Presence of Children" (CHILD) a dichotomy was formed including pregnant women and those with children compared to childless women.

Children (CHILD) was measured by selecting and computing the following items:

Item 1: "We would like to get a complete record of all the children each woman has given birth to in her life or has adopted: to begin with have you ever adopted a child?"

Yes	1
No	2

Item 2: "How many LIVE BIRTHS have you had up to now including those who died after birth or who do not live with you?"

None	0
1 child	1
2 or more	XX

Item 3: "Are you pregnant now?"

Yes	1
Possibly	2
No	3

For the purpose of this study, these items are computed into the following two categories whereby:

Code	Label	Description
0	Women with children	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Respondents who reported having adopted children;- Respondents who had at least one live birth;- Respondents who were pregnant
1	Childless women	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Respondents who reported no adoption of children and no live births

3. RELIGIOSITY (VAR56)

"Religiosity" (VAR56) is operationalized by the following item measuring frequency of attendance at religious services:

Item 1: "How often do you attend religious services? Would you say ..."

- 1-... every week
- 2-... every month
- 3-... a few times a year
- 4-... rarely, or
- 5-... never

This item was not recoded, so that the higher value the less religious was the respondent. The score could range between 1 and 5, with a score of 1 being very religious and a score of 5 being secular. The mean score (2.9) resulting for this factor indicates that respondents who cohabit are not actively religious (i.e. attending religious services only several times a year).

4. AGE COHORT (YOUNGEST, YOUNG, SENIOR)

Age cohort (YOUNGEST, YOUNG, SENIOR) is divided into to three age cohorts; 18 through 25, 26 through 39, and 40 through 49 years of age. The grounds for creating these dummy variables from an interval level variable is the theoretical explanation that the two younger age cohorts have a greater tendency to cohabit than the oldest group of respondents, because of certain life experiences (cf. empirical studies). Age of respondent was measured on the basis of information provided on the year of birth of the respondent.

This item is recoded into dummy variables in the following manner:

(18 - 25 = 1)
(26 - 39 = 2)
(40 - 49 = 0)

where:

Youngest Age Cohort (YOUNGEST)

0 - all other age groups
1 - Youngest

Young Age Cohort (YOUNG)

0 - all other age groups
1 - Young age cohort

Senior Age Cohort (SENIOR)

0 - Youngest, Young
1 - Senior age cohort

5. EDUCATION (VAR49)

"Years of Education" (EDUC) is operationalized by the variable "years of education completed" and is left as an interval level variable.

Item 1: In total how many years of education did you complete?

XX years
00 - None
01 to XX

6. EMPLOYMENT STATUS (EMPSTAT)

The demographic variable "Employment status" (EMPSTAT) is selected from the following item in the data set:

Item 1: Are you working now?
1- Yes
2- No

The second category corresponding to respondents who were not employed was recoded:

(2=0)

where: 0 - respondents who were not
 working during the survey period
 1 - presently working respondents

This single item looks at the present employment status of women by forming a dichotomous variable.

7. RESIDENCE (VAR38)

Lastly, in order to investigate whether place of residence has a bearing on women's tendency to cohabit, the following item is used and originally coded as follows:

Item 1: Do you currently live in a city, a small town, or on a farm?"
1 - City, Town
2 - Small city
3 - Farm
4 - Reservation
6 - Suburb

These five categories are recoded to create a dichotomy as follows:

(1, 2, 6 = 1)
(3, 4 = 0)

where: (1) - respondents living in urban areas
(0) - respondents living in rural areas

This dichotomization of urban/rural residence best serves this research.

ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES

8. ATTITUDE TOWARDS MARRIAGE (MARATT)

The indicator "Attitude towards marriage" (MARATT) measures women's perception of marriage as being either positive or negative. This variable is constructed by collapsing the following survey items:

Item 1: "Would you say that being married adds something positive to the relationship that helps the couple get through difficult times?"

Yes	1
No	2

recoded as: (1 = 0)
(2 = 1)

Item 2: "Would you say that being married creates certain obligations which have a negative effect on the relationship?"

Yes	1
No	2

recoded as: (2 = 0)

Whereby (0) reflects respondents who maintained positive attitudes towards marriage, and (1) respondents who perceived of marriage as being negative. Given that the index is comprised of only two items, the possible range of values is between zero and two, with 0 indicating strong positive attitudes towards marriage and 2 indicating strong

negative attitudes towards marriage.

Code	Label	Description
0	Positive attitude towards marriage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Respondents who reported that marriage adds something positive to the relationship;- Respondents who reported that marriage does not create certain obligations which have a negative effect on the relationship
1	Negative attitude towards marriage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Respondents who reported that marriage does not add something positive to the relationship;- Respondents who felt that marriage created certain obligations which have a negative effect on the relationship

9. IMPORTANCE OF A LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIP (IMSTREL):

Importance of a long-term commitment is operationalized by the following indicators:

"In order for you to be generally happy in life, is it very important, important, not very important or not at all important ..."

Item 1: ... to have a lasting relationship as a couple

Item 2: ... to be married

Both variables were originally coded the same manner where 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = not very important, and 4 = not at all important. These coded as follows:

(3,4 = 1)
(1,2 = 0)

Where the codes of (1) and (0) represent the following in the newly computed variable "Importance of a long-term relationship" (IMSTREL):

Code	Label	Description
0	Desire for a long-term commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respondents who affirmed the importance of a lasting relationship in order to be content; - Respondents who felt this way about marriage
1	No desire for a long-term commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respondents who viewed a lasting relationship as relatively unimportant for their contentment; - Respondents who viewed marriage in the same way.

10. PERCEPTION OF COHABITATION AS A VIABLE ARRANGEMENT (SOCEXCH):

In order to test for "Attitude towards cohabitation as a viable living arrangement" a new variable is computed by collapsing two items. The two variables selected from the data set are as follows:

"Do you find it acceptable or not acceptable for a man and a woman to decide to live together without marriage ..."

Item 1:... if they want to make sure that their future marriage will last?"

Item 2:... if they are attracted to one another but do not want to make any long term commitments?"

Both these indicators were originally coded in the same way where a code of 1 = acceptance of cohabitation and a code of 2 = reject cohabitation. These scores are recoded so that a low code reflects a rejection of cohabitation and a higher code reflects the acceptance of cohabitation. That is a code of 0 = rejection of cohabitation and a code of 1 =

acceptance of cohabitation. The new variable "acceptance of cohabitation as a viable living arrangement" is thus computed into two categories:

Code	Label	Description
0	Rejection of cohabitation as a viable living-arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respondents who reported that it is unacceptable for couples to cohabit in order to ensure that their future marriage will last; - Respondents who rejected cohabitation as a means of avoiding long term commitment
1	Acceptance of cohabitation as a viable living-arrangement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respondents who reported that it is acceptable for couples to cohabit in order to ensure that their future marriage will last; - Respondents who accepted cohabitation as a means of avoiding a long term commitment.

11. SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF COHABITING COUPLES (VAR85)

Societal (i.e. family and peer group) acceptance of cohabiting couples is another important factor encouraging women to opt for cohabitation as opposed to courtship or marriage. The acceptance of this lifestyle has reduced the societal stigmatization towards cohabiters, thereby facilitating the choice to enter and report such a living arrangement.

In order to investigate whether family and peer group acceptance of cohabiting couples has an influence on women's propensity to cohabit, the following item is used:

Item 1:"Among couples you know, are couples living together accepted in the same way as married couples?"

Where the original coding was (1) = Yes and (2) = No. This is recoded so that a code of (0) reflects societal rejection of cohabiting couples, and (1) societal acceptance of cohabiters as married individuals.

12. ATTITUDES CONCERNING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILDREN (IMPCH)

Traditional/liberal value orientation is operationalized by examining the importance of children in women's lives. This factor; "Importance of children in one's life" is gauged by constructing an index utilising the following two indicators:

"In order for you to be generally happy in life is it very important, not very important, not at all important ..."

Item 1: "to have at least one child?"

"On the whole would you say that you strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree with the following statement:..."

Item 2: "having a child provides a goal that nothing else can replace?"

Both items were originally coded in the same manner, with lower codes of (1) and (2) representing the view that children are important in one's life, and higher codes of (3) and (4) reflecting the attitude that children are not important in the respondent's life. The initial codes in the first item represent: (1) very important to have at least one child, (2) not very important to have at least one child, (3) not important to have at least one child, and (4) not at all important to have at least one child. In the second item, the original code of (1) = strongly agree that a child provides an irreplaceable goal in life, (2) = agree that a child provides an irreplaceable goal in life, (3) = disagree that a child provides an irreplaceable goal in life, and (4) = strongly disagree that a child provides an irreplaceable

goal in life. For the purpose of this study, the four categories are collapsed into two categories as follows:

- (0) respondent views children as important for her happiness
- (1) respondent views children as unimportant for her happiness

Noting that the index consists of two items, the possible range of values is between 0 and 2.

13. DESIRE FOR AUTONOMY (AUTOATT)

The desire for personal autonomy is operationalized by forming a new variable "Desire for autonomy" (AUTOATT). This variable is constructed by collapsing together two attitudinal variables in the data set which measure the concept of personal autonomy. Thus the desire for autonomy is measured by the following two items denoting the importance of work and personal freedom in one's life:

"In order for you to be generally happy in life, is it very important, important, not very important or not at all important..."

Item 1: "... to be able to take on a job outside the home?"

Item 2: "... to be free to do as you wish?"

Each item was originally coded the same manner where 1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = not very important, and 4 = not at all important. Both items are recoded in the following manner:/

(1, 2 = 1)
(3, 4 = 0)

Where a low code of 0 = reflects respondents who did not report a need for a job or personal freedom in order to be happy, and code of 1 represents respondents who required a job and personal freedom in order to be content. Once again the index is comprised of two items, therefore the possible range of values is between zero and two. A low score of 0 denotes absolutely no desire for autonomy in order to be happy, while a value of 3 denotes a strong desire for autonomy in order to be happy.

14. SEX ROLE ATTITUDES (EGSXRA)

As is theorized in feminist and social-exchange literature, sex role attitudes is an important element influencing women's daily decisions. In this study, the concept of sex role attitudes is operationalized by creating an index based on two items which tested respondents sex role attitudes concerning the division of household labour. The following two items are computed to form a scale of sex role attitudes:

Item 1: "Do you think that looking after the children should be done only by the woman, mostly by the woman, woman equally shared by both partners, mainly by the man?"

Item 2: "Do you think that household chores such as cooking or housework should be done only by the woman, mostly by the woman, equally shared by both partners, mainly by the man?"

Each item is coded in the same manner, where lower codes of (1) and (2) indicate more traditional/conservative sex role attitudes concerning childrearing and household labour, while (3) and (4) indicate more egalitarian/liberal sex role attitudes towards childrearing and household chores. These four categories are then collapsed into two categories as follows:

Code	Label	Description
0	Traditional/conservative sex role attitudes	Respondents who reported that childrearing should be done only by women or mostly by women;

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respondents who reported that household chores should be done only by the woman or mostly by the woman |
| 1 | Liberal/egalitarian sex role attitudes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respondents who reported that childrearing should be equally shared by both partners or done mostly by men; - Respondents who reported that household chores should be equally shared by both partners or done mostly by men. |

This variable is limited because it reflects sex role attitudes towards housework and childrearing only. Noting that two items make up the index, the possible range of values is between 0 and 2. Where 0 reflects highly traditional/ conservative sex role attitudes, and 2 highly liberal/ egalitarian sex role attitudes.

15. ATTITUDE TOWARDS FEMALE SINGLE-PARENT FAMILIES (SNGPF)

Attitude towards female single-parent families (a nontraditional family structure), is included in this model because it reflects a conservative/liberal value orientation. This variable reveals women's acceptance of female single-parent families for others as well as the possibility for creating her own single-parent family, thus it is more complete. Acceptance of unconventional family forms (i.e. female single-parent families) is measured by computing the following two items:

Item 1: "Do you find it acceptable for a woman to have a child without a husband/partner in the house?"

Item 2: "Could you make a decision to have a child without the presence of a husband/partner in the house?"

Each item was coded in the same manner; 1 = Yes, 2 = No. These items are then computed as; (0) = respondents who reject female single-parent families, and (1) = respondents who accept female single-parent families. Given that this index consists of only two items, the possible range of values is between 0 and 2.

16. ATTITUDE TOWARDS ABORTION (ABORATT)

In order to determine whether a respondent's attitudes towards abortion (ABORATT) have a bearing on women's propensity to cohabit as opposed to opting for marriage, an index is constructed using the following six items:

"Assuming abortion were legal, would you be for or against a woman having an abortion..."

Item 1:"... if the pregnancy is endangering the mother's life?"

Item 2:"... if the pregnancy puts the mother's health in danger?"

Item 3:"... if the woman had been raped?"

Item 4:"... if there were good reasons to believe that the child would be physically or mentally handicapped?"

Item 5:"... if the woman were not married?"

Item 6:"... if the household does not have the financial means to support a child?"

Each item was originally coded in the same way, whereby a code of 1 = for abortion, and a code of 2 = against abortion. These indicators are recoded so that a low code of 0 = reflects negative/conservative attitudes towards abortion and a higher code of 1

= reflects positive/liberal attitudes towards abortion. Given that the index consists of six indicators, the possible range of values is between zero and six, with the value of zero indicating highly conservative/ negative attitudes towards abortion and a value of six is highly liberal/favourable attitudes towards abortion.

APPENDIX B
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION TABLES

Table 1.0 COHABITATION BY PRESENCE OF CHILDREN

	Children Present	Childless Women
Cohabiting	8.3%	44.0%
	(2479)	(559)

Table 1.1 COHABITATION BY AGE COHORT DISTRIBUTION

	18 - 25	26 - 39	40 - 49
Cohabiting	41.3%	12.4%	6.1%
	(463)	(1627)	(961)

Table 1.2 COHABITATION BY MARITAL STATUS

	Never Married	Previously Married
Cohabiting	9.7%	59.0%
	(2785)	(210)

Table 1.3 COHABITATION BY ATTITUDE TOWARDS MARRIAGE

Number of times respondents report a negative attitude towards marriage:			
	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	8.2%	17.7%	65.6%
	(1664)	(1160)	(154)

¹ Number of times respondents reported a negative attitude towards marriage: (1) married does not add anything positive to the relationship that helps the couple get through difficult times; (2)

Table 1.4 COHABITATION BY IMPORTANCE OF A LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIP

Number of times respondents affirm that: (1) a long term relationship and (2) marriage, are important in order to be happy.

	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	8.3%	35.0%	38.1%
	(2300)	(672)	(63)

Table 1.5 COHABITATION BY RELIGIOSITY

Frequency of attendance at religious services:

	Weekly	Monthly	A few times a year	Rarely	Never
Cohabiting	3.7%	6.8%	18.1%	24.0%	32.9%
	(954)	(424)	(764)	(545)	(359)

Table 1.6 COHABITATION BY SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF COHABITING COUPLES

Respondents who report that cohabiting couples known to them are accepted in the same way as married couples:

	Yes	No
Cohabiting	18.1%	7.4%
	(2171)	(753)

marriage creates certain obligations which have a negative effect on the relationship.

Table 1.7 COHABITATION BY ACCEPTANCE OF FEMALE SINGLE-PARENT FAMILY

Number of times respondents report that it is acceptable to have a child without the presence of a man: (1) for others, and (2) for themselves.

	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	9.4%	19.0%	41.0%
	(1867)	(638)	(491)

Table 1.8 COHABITATION BY ATTITUDE TOWARDS CHILDREN

Number of times respondents report that children are unimportant in their lives: (1) it is unimportant to have at least one child in their life, and (2) children do not provide an irreplaceable goal in life.

	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	12.0%	16.3%	25.9%
	(1821)	(860)	(340)

Table 1.9 COHABITATION BY ACCEPTANCE OF COHABITATION AS AN ALTERNATIVE LIVING-ARRANGEMENT

Number of times respondents report that cohabitation is an acceptable living-arrangement as (1) a form of trial-marriage or (2) an extension of the courtship process.

	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	2.1%	14.1%	21.9%
	(768)	(732)	(1508)

Table 2.0 COHABITATION BY ATTITUDE TOWARDS ABORTION

Number of times respondents favour abortion under the following circumstances: (1) the pregnancy endangers the mother's life; (2) the pregnancy puts the mother's health in danger; (3) the woman has been raped; (4) there are good reasons to believe that the child would be physically or mentally handicapped; (5) the woman is not married; and (6) the household does not have the financial means to support a child.

	None	Once	Twice	Three	Four	Five	Six
Cohabiting	4.4%	5.1%	8.7%	15.0%	15.6%	14.4%	22.8%
	(113)	(99)	(173)	(321)	(786)	(417)	(605)

Table 2.1 COHABITATION BY SEX ROLE ATTITUDE

Number of times respondents express egalitarian sex role attitudes (equal sharing of tasks by partners, or done mostly by the man) towards: (1) childcare, and (2) household chores.

	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	5.5%	10.4%	17.2%
	(164)	(636)	(2172)

2

Table 2.2 COHABITATION BY AUTONOMOUS ATTITUDE

Number of times respondents express the importance of: (1) a job outside the home; (2) the freedom to do as one wishes, in order to be happy.

	Never	Once	Twice
Cohabiting	6.1%	11.4%	17.6%
	(198)	(994)	(1821)

² The original categories representing respondents' views that childcare and household chores should be done ...only by the woman, or ...mostly by the woman are recoded to form the "Never" affirmed sex role attitudes category.

Table 2.3 Means and Standard Deviations for Education and Attitude towards Abortion

	Means	Standard Deviations
Years of Education	12.562	2.895
Positive Attitude towards Abortion	3.988	1.639

Table 3.0 Stepwise Regression: Regression Coefficients for Cohabiting Women

Independent Variables	(b/standard error)	beta
MARSTAT (Previously Married)	.4418*** (.0581)	.3674
YOUNGEST (Age 18 to 25 yrs.)	.2447*** (.0538)	.3113
CHILD (Childless women)	.1943*** (.0436)	.2598
IMSTREL (Long-Term relationship is unimportant)	.1042*** (.0311)	.1645
MARATT (Negative attitude towards Marriage)	.0865*** (.0276)	.1515
YOUNG (Age 26 to 39 yrs.)	.1000*** (.0123)	.1407
EMPSTAT (Employed Women)	-.0884* (.0364)	-.1208
VAR56 (Less religious)	.0267*** (.0451)	.1037
Constant	-.2067*** (.0451)	
R ²	.441	

Significance Key

* .01 level of significance

** .0001 level of significance

*** .0000 level of significance

REFERENCES

Theoretical Works

Abrahams, B. and Feldman, S. and Nash, S.

1978 "Sex-role, self-concept and sex-role attitudes: enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations?" Developmental Psychology. Vol.14, No. 4, pp. 393-400.

Arafat, I. and Yorburg, B.

1973 "On living-together without marriage." Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 97-106.

Arkin, Robert M. and Dreyer N.

1976 "Effect of perceived choice, expected outcome, and observed outcome of an action on the causal attributions of actors", Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. Vol. 12, March:151-58.

Balakrishnan T.R. and Jijian Chen

1990 "Religiosity, nuptiality and reproduction in Canada." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology. Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 316-340.

Bardwick, Judith M.

1980 Women In Transition. Brighton, London: Harvester Press.

Barret, Michele

1980 Women's Oppression Today: Problems In Marxist Feminist Analysis. London: Verso Edition.

Bernard, Jessie S.

1982 The Future of Marriage.
New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Bower, D. and Christopherson, V.

1977 "University student: A regional comparison of selected attitudes and behaviour." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 447-453.

Brittan A. and M. Maynard

1984 Sexism, Racism, and Oppression. Oxford, UK; New York: Blackwell.

Bumpass, Larry L.

1990 "What's happening to the family? Interactions between demographic and institutional Change." Demography. Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 483-498.

- Bumpass, Larry L. and James A. Sweet
1989 "National estimates of cohabitation" Demography. Vol. 20, No.4, pp.615-625.
- Bumpass, Larry L. and Sara McLanahan.
1989 "Unmarried motherhood: Recent trends, composition, and black-white differences." Demography. Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.279-286.
- Burch, T.K. and A.K. Madan
1986 Union Formation and Dissolution: results From the 1984 Family History Survey.
Ottawa: Statistics Canada (Catalog No.99-963).
- Burstyn, V., Smith D. and Ng R.
1985 Women, Class, Family and the State. Toronto, Ontario: Garamond Press.
- Carden, Lockwood, Maren
1984 "The women's movement and the family: A socio-historical analysis of constraints on social change." in Women and The Family: Two Decades of Change by Beth B. Hess and marvin B. Sussman New York: The Haworth Press.
- Clatworthy, N.
1975 "Couples in quasi-marriage." in Old Family/New Family: Interpersonal Relationships Malbin-Glazer, Nona (ed.) New York: Van Nostrand.
- Clayton, Richard R. and Voss Harnin L.
1977 "Shacking up: Cohabitation in the 1970s'." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 39, pp. 273-283.
- Conover, Pamela Johnston
1983 Feminism and The New Right: Conflict Over the Family. New York: Praeger.
- Cole, C.L.
1977 "Cohabitation in social context." In Libby, R.W. and Whitehurst R.N. (eds.) Marriage and Alternatives: Exploring Intimate Relationships. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Cotten-Huston Annie L., Lunney, Sparks G., and Heard Edward
1984 "This is my...:How cohabitants introduce their partners." Alternative Lifestyles. Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 209-216.
- DeMaris, Alfred
1984 "Predicting premarital cohabitation: employing individuals versus couples as the unit of analysis. Alternative Lifestyles. Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 270-283.

DeMaris A., and G.Leslie

1984 "Cohabitation with the future spouse: Its influence upon marital satisfaction and communication." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 46, February:77-84.

Denmark F.L., Shaw J.S., and Ciali S.D.

1985 "The relationship among sex-roles, living arrangements, and the division of household responsibilities." Sex Roles. Vol. 12, Nos. 5/6, pp. 617-626.

Dreyer, N.A., Woods, N.F., and James, S.A.

1981 "ISRO:A scale of measure sex-role orientation." Sex-Roles. Vol.7, No. 2, pp.173-18.

Duncan, B., and O.D. Duncan

1978 Sex Typing and Social Roles: A Research Report. New York: Academic Press.

Eisenstein,Hester

1983 Contemporary Feminist Thought. Boston: G.K. Hall.

Erdwins C.J., Tyer Z.E., and Mellinger J.C.

1983 "A comparison of sex-role and related personality traits in young, middle-aged and older women." International Journal of Aging and Human Development. Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 141-152.

Fields, Rona M.

1985 The Future of Women. New York: General Hall.

Firestone, Shulamith

1979 The Dialectic of Sex: the Case for the Feminist Revolution. New York: Morrow and Co.

Glick, Paul C.

1988 "Fifty years of family demography: A record of social change." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 50, November:861-873.

Glick Paul C. and Norton Arthur J.

1977 "Marrying, divorcing and living together in the U.S. today." Population Bulletin. Vol. 32, pp. 2-38.

1980 "Married and unmarried cohabitation in the U.S." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 42, pp. 19-30.

Greenglass, Esther R.

1987 "A social-psychological view of marriage for women." in Greta Hoffman Nemiroff (ed.) Women and Men: Interdisciplinary Reading on Gender. Toronto, Ontario: Fitzhenry and Whiteside Publishing Co.

Gwartney-Gibbs, P.A

1986 "Institutionalization of premarital cohabitation." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 39, pp. 423-434.

Henze, L. and Hudson J.

1974 "Personal and family characteristics cohabiting and noncohabiting college students." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol.36, November:722-726.

Hobart, Charles W.

1983 "Marriage or cohabitation." Marriage and Divorce in Canada. Toronto: MethuenPublication.

Hobart, Charles W.

1981 "Sources of egalitarianism in young unmarried Canadians." Canadian Journal of Sociology. Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 261-281.

Hobart, Charles W.

1972 "Orientation to marriage among young Canadians." Journal of Comparative Family Studies. Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 171-193.

Holt, Robert W. and Mellinger J.

1982 "Perception of the equity and exchange processes in dyadic social relationships." Perception and Motor Skills. Vol. 54, pp. 303-20.

Holter, Harriet

1970 Sex Roles and Social Structure. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Horner, Matina and Nadelson C.

1983 The Challenge of Change: Perspectives on Family, Work, and Education. New York: Plenum Press.

Jacques, Jeffrey M. and Chason Karen J.

1979 "Cohabitation: It's impact on marital success." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 35-39.

Jagger, Alison M. and Rothenberg, Paula S.

1984 Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kotkin, Mark

1983 "Sex roles among married and unmarried couples." Sex Roles. Vol. 9, No. 9, pp. 975-985.

Lenz, Elinor and Meyerhoff, Barbara

1985 The Feminization of America: How Women's Values are Changing Our Public and Private Lives. New York: St. Martins Press.

Lewis, R.A., Spanier, G.B., Atkinson, V.L.S. and LeHecka, C.F.

1977 "Commitment in married and unmarried cohabitation." Sociological Focus. Vol.10, October:367-373.

Lipman-Blumen, Jean

1984 Gender Roles and Power. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Lopata, H.Z. and Norr K.F.

1980 "Changing commitments of american women to work and family roles." Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 43, pp. 3-14.

Lunney, G.S., Cotten-Huston, A.L.

1979 "Sex differences in attitudes and behaviour of college students following a college level course on human sexuality." Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, Vol. 1, No. 6, pp. 11-16.

Lyness, Judith L. and Lipetz Milton E.

1972 "Living together: An alternative to marriage" Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 34, May:305-311.

Macklin, Eleanor D.

1983 "Nonmarital heterosexual cohabitation: An overview." in Eleanor D. Macklin and Roger H. Rubin Contemporary Families and Alternative Lifestyles: Handbook on Research and Theory. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

1978 "Cohabitation: review of research on nonmarital cohabitation in the United States." in Bernard I. Murstein (ed.) Exploring Intimate Lifestyles. New York:Springer Publishing Co.

1976 "Unmarried heterosexual cohabitation on the university campus" in The Social Psychology of Sex. J.P. Wiseman (ed.) pp.108-142. New York:Harper and Row.

1972 "Heterosexual cohabitation among unmarried college students." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 21, No. 4., pp.463-472.

Mandle, Joan D.

1979 Women and Social Change in America. Princeton, New Jersey:Princeton Book Co.

McBroom, William H.

1987 "Longitudinal change in sex role orientations: differences between men and women." Sex Roles. Vol.16, Nos. 9/10, pp. 439-452.

McDonald Gerald W.

1978 "Reconsideration of the concept of sex-role identification in adolescent and family research." Adolescence. Vol. 13:215-20.

Meyer, Sibylle and Schulze, Eva.

1983 "Nonmarital living arrangements - Alternative for marriage. An international examination of data." Kolner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Soziopsychologie. Vol. 35, pp. 735-754.

Milardo, Robert M. and Murstein Bernard I.

1979 "The implications of exchange orientation on the dyadic functioning of heterosexual cohabiters." in Mark Cook and Glen Wilson (eds.) Love and Attraction: An International Conference. U.K.:Pergamon Press.

Murstein, Bernard I. and Associates.

1977 "A theory of investigation of the effect of exchange-orientation on marriage and friendship." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 39, No. 3 pp. 543-548.

Newcomb, Michael D.

1983-4 "Relationship qualities of those who live together." Alternative Lifestyles. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 78-102.

1981 "Sweet oranges for sinful apples: review of unmarried cohabitation." in J.Trost (ed.) Contemporary Psychology. Vol. 26, pp. 547-548.

1980 "Cohabitation before marriage: A comparison of couples who did and did not cohabit before marrying." Alternative Lifestyles. Vol. 3, pp. 65-85.

Newcomb, M.D. and Bentler P.M.

1980 "Assessment of personality and demographic aspects of cohabitation and marital success." Journal of Personality Assessment. Vol. 44, pp. 11-24.

Newcomb, Paul R.

1979 "Cohabitation in America: An assessment of consequences." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 41, pp. 597-603.

Nye, Ivan F. (ed.)

1982 Family Relationships: Rewards and Costs. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Oppenheim Mason K., Czajka, J.L. and Arber, S.

1976 "Changes in U.S. women's sex-role attitudes, 1964-1974." American Sociological Review. Vol. 41, No. 4, pp. 573-596.

Pearsall, Marilyn (ed.)

1986 Women and Values. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.

Peterman D.J., C.A. Ridley and S.M. Anderson

1974 "A comparison of cohabiting and noncohabiting college students." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 36 May:345-354.

Prochaska, J., and Prochaska, J.

1978 "Twentieth century trends in marriage and marital therapy." in T.J. Paolino, Jr., and B.S. Mc Crady (eds.) Marriage and Marital Therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel, pp. 1-24.

Quebec Provincial Government (editor)

1991 Loi sur le Code Civile de la Famille. Quebec: Government of Quebec publications.

Sabrosky, Judith A.

1982 From Revolution to Liberation: The Evolution of Feminist Ideology. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Scanzoni, John

1982 Sexual Bargaining: Power Politics in the American Marriage. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scanzoni, John and Greer, Litton Fox

1980 "Sex-roles, family and society: The seventies and beyond." Journal of Marriage and the Family Vol. 42 November:743-756.

Scanzoni, John and Szinovacz, M.

1980 Family Decision-Making: A Developmental Sex-Role Model. Vol. 3 Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

- Scanzoni, John.
1978 Sex Roles, Women's Work and Marital Conflict: A Study of Family Change. Lexington Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Scanzoni, John and Scanzoni Letha
1976 "Men, women and change." A Sociology of Marriage and the Family. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Schwartz P., and B.J. Risman
1989 Gender and Intimate Relationships. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Shapiro, Virginia
1986 Women in American Society. Wisconsin: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Skolnick Arlene and Skolnick, Jerome
1983 Family in Transition: Rethinking Marriage, Sexuality, Childrearing and Family Organization. 4th ed. Boston: Little Brown Co.
- Spanier, Graham B.
1983 "Married and unmarried cohabitation in the United States: 1980." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 277-88.
- Spitze, G., and Huber J.
1980 "Changing attitudes towards women's non-family roles: 1938 to 1978. Sociology of Work and Occupation. Vol. 7, pp. 317-335.
- Stafford, Rebecca.
1977 "Division of labour among cohabiting married couples." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 39:43-5.
- Strauss, A.
1978 Negotiations: Varieties Contexts, Process and Social Order. San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass Pub. Co.
- Steiger, John C.
1981 "The influence of the feminist subculture in changing sex-role attitudes." Sex Roles. Vol. 7, No. 6, pp. 627-633.
- Stinnett, N., Birdsong, C. and Stinnett Nancy.
1978 The Family and Alternative Lifestyles. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Straver, C.J.

1981 "Unmarried couples different from marriage?" Alternative Lifestyles, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 43-74.

Strong, Leslie.

1978 "Alternative marital and family forms: Their relative attractiveness to college students and correlates of willingness to participate in non-traditional forms." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 27, No. 3, pp. 237-244.

Szinovacz, Maximiliane E.

1984 "Changing family roles and interactions." in Beth B. Hess Marvin B. Sussman, Women and the Family: Two Decades of Change. New York: The Haworth Press.

Tanfer Koray

1987 "Patterns of premarital cohabitation among never-married women in the united states." Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 483-497.

Tavris, Carol

1976 The Longest War: Sex Differences in Perspective. (2nd ed.) San Diego: Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich.

Thorne, Barry and Yalome, Marilyn., eds.

1982 Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions. New York: Longman Inc.

Thornton A. and Freedman S.D.

1979 "Changes in sex role attitudes of women, 1962-1977." American Sociological Review. Vol. 44, No. 5, pp. 831-842.

Thornton, Arland

1988 "Cohabitation and marriage in the 1980s." Demography. No. 25, Vol. 4, pp. 499-507.

Voydanoff, Patricia

1988 "Women, work, and family: Bernard's perspective on the past, present, and future." Psychology of Women Quarterly. Vol. 12, pp. 269-280.

Whitehurst, Carol A.

1977 Women in America: The Oppressed Majority. Santa Monica, California: Good Year Publishing Co.

Wiersma, Greertje Else.

1983 Cohabitation An Alternative to Marriage?: A Cross-National Study. Boston: The Hague.

Yamaguchi, Kazuo and Kandel B. Denise

1985 "Dynamic relationships between premarital cohabitation and illicit drug use: An event-history analysis of role selection and role socialization." American Sociological Review. Vol. 50, No. 4.

Yllo, K.A.

1978 "Nonmarital cohabitation beyond the college campus." Alternative Lifestyles. Vol. 1, pp. 37-54.