

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

**EFFECTS OF PARENTAL COHABITATION ON THE ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS
OF ADULT CHILDREN**

A Thesis in

Sociology and Demography

by

Christina M. Wolfe

© 2010 Christina M. Wolfe

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2010

The thesis of Christina M. Wolfe was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Alan Booth
Distinguished Professor of Sociology, Human Development and Demography
Thesis Advisor

Valarie King
Professor of Sociology, Demography and Human Development and Family
Studies

David Johnson
Professor of Sociology, Human Development and Family Studies and
Demography

John McCarthy
Professor of Sociology
Head of the Department of Sociology

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Although an extensive body of literature has been written on cohabitation, little if any information exists on how parental cohabitation affects the lives of their adult children, including shaping the formation of offspring romantic relationships. This study presents evidence for an intergenerational effect of cohabitation. Additionally, the effects of parent cohabitation on the divorces and nonmarital births of adult children are also explored. Data used is from Cycle 20 of the Canadian General Social Survey (N: 18,481). Findings indicate that parental cohabitation significantly increases the likelihood of offspring cohabitation, even after inclusion of controls. Parent cohabitation also increases the likelihood of nonmarital birth for adult children through interactions between parent and child cohabitation. Successful parental cohabitations (i.e. not ending in divorce) decrease the likelihood of divorce for adult children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	v
Introduction.....	1
Prior Research and Research Hypotheses	4
Methods	8
Results.....	15
Discussion and Conclusions	27
Tables	31
References.....	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics.	32
Table 2: Logistic Regression of Factors Affecting Parental Cohabitation.	33
Table 3: Logistic Regression of Factors Affecting Parental Separation.	33
Table 4: Logistic Regression Predicting Respondent Cohabitation.	34
Table 5: Logistic Regression Predicting Respondent Divorce.	35
Table 6: Logistic Regression Predicting Respondent Nonmarital Birth.	37

Introduction

Premarital relationships have changed dramatically in the last forty years. Cohabitation has become a normative step in relationship formation, with over half of all marriages now beginning with cohabitation (Bumpass & Lu, 2000). Stigmas against cohabitation have also decreased, further spurring its integration into contemporary societal norms (Amato & Booth, 1997). Two facts have been widely cited in regards to this relationship type: rates of cohabitation have risen, and cohabitations are relatively unstable (Smock, 2000). Between 1990 and 1994, over 50% of couples cohabited prior to marriage compared to about 10% of those couples marrying between 1965 and 1974. Correspondingly, the number of women in their late 30s who reported ever having cohabited increased from 30% in 1987 to 48% in 1995 (Bumpass & Lu, 2000). The stability of cohabitation has also been called into question. Of couples who cohabit, Bumpass and Lu (2000) showed that approximately 40% of these relationships end within five years while 55% marry during that same time period. This leaves only 5% of cohabitational relationships continuing as nonmarital five years after their inception. Cohabitation is now a very pervasive aspect of premarital relationships in our society (Coontz, 2004).

However, much about cohabitation is still unknown, including how parental cohabitation affects children. Given increases of cohabitation rates, it stands to reason that even more children and adults will experience cohabitation in some form, either their parents or their own, at some point in their lives. What information does exist focuses largely on cohabiting partnerships which include the child's parent and non-biologically related boyfriend or girlfriend (Manning & Lamb, 2003; Raley & Wildsmith, 2004). Little is known about how cohabitation between two biological parents affects children. Further, no studies to date have focused on how parental cohabitation may affect the romantic and family relationships of their children into adulthood. Because family

context can exert a strong influence on the lives of children, understanding how parental cohabitation affects children even into adulthood is important in assessing how relationship patterns are formed across generations. Parent relationship histories may exert influence on the nonmarital cohabitations, marriages, divorces and childbearing patterns of their adult children. It is important to examine the relationship between parent and child family formation behavior because it may foretell how partnerships and other family relationships will unfold for children later in life.

This study explores the effect of parental cohabitation on adult offspring relationship formation. Four main questions are addressed. First, are children whose parents cohabited more likely to cohabit themselves? Research has shown that couples who cohabit prior to marriage are at greater risk of divorce (Axinn & Thornton, 1992; Lillard, Brien, & Waite, 1995). Axinn and Thornton (1992) found cohabitators to be less committed to their relationships and more accepting of marital dissolution. Selection effects, such as liberal personal ideologies and family of origin characteristics, are frequently used to explain why marriages formed by cohabiting couples are more likely to end in divorce. Moreover, parents who divorce are more likely to have children who also divorce (Amato, 1996). This intergenerational effect may be present for parental cohabitation as well, leading to a second and third research question. Does parental cohabitation increase the likelihood of divorce among adult children? And, does parental cohabitation moderate the effect of parental divorce on children's divorce such that the effect of parental cohabitation and parental divorce is much stronger than parental cohabitation by itself?

Fourth, does parental cohabitation affect the likelihood of offspring having a nonmarital birth? Increasing rates of births to cohabitators have largely been driven by increases in the overall number of people cohabiting and may suggest that cohabitation has been accepted by couples as a marriage alternative (Raley, 2001). Families formed by cohabitators with children are also less stable than married families, and children within cohabiting families often suffer from greater

disadvantages than do children growing up in married households (Wu, Bumpass, & Musick, 2001; Wu & Musick, 2008). As many nonmarital births are increasingly born into cohabitational relationships, knowing how parental factors influence the likelihood of nonmarital births among adult children will be advantageous to understanding family formation across generations. Finally, interaction effects will be tested in attempt to answer how parent cohabitation and divorce affects child relationship formation as well as how parent cohabitation may work through child cohabitation to affect likelihood of divorce and nonmarital birth.

Analyses are performed using Cycle 20 of the Canadian General Social Survey. This survey was collected in 2006 and is unique in that it includes retrospective questions about relationship history of the respondent's birth parents, including whether the parents cohabited nonmaritally prior to the respondent's birth, if their cohabitation continued after the birth occurred or transitioned to marriage, and if the parents remained together through the respondent's adolescence. The recentness (2006) of this data combined with its cross-sectional design offer an opportunity to assess parental cohabitation as an explanatory mechanism for a representative sample of adults.

Prior Research and Research Hypotheses

Much like in the United States, cohabitation in Canada has become increasingly common phenomenon for adults of all ages. Cohabitation is the first union type for fifty percent of young Canadians (Wu, 2000). For young people, cohabitation can be seen as a trial or test run at a more permanent union. However, couples who cohabit prior to marriage without being engaged or having plans to soon become so have been found to have less stable unions (Brown & Booth, 1996). These relationships dissolve frequently and have been found to be less satisfying than marriage (Smock, 2000; Carlson, McLanahan, & England 2004; Manning & Smock, 2005).

Previous work on cohabitation in the United States found that its meaning has changed across birth cohorts with younger people being more likely to cohabit and more likely to divorce (Dush, Cohan, & Amato, 2003). The authors assessed marital quality and stability for two marriage cohorts – couples married between 1964 and 1980 and those married between 1981 and 1997. As cohabitation increased, marital satisfaction and quality decreased regardless of economic and demographic factors. Other studies have shown that cohabitation is a less integrated union than marriage. Cohabiting couples are less likely to join finances and support each other monetarily (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Heimdal & Houseknecht, 2003; Winkler, 1997). Compared to those who are married, cohabitators are also more likely to be unfaithful to their partner, an effect that remains even after controlling for personal values regarding extramarital sex (Treas & Giesen, 2000).

Cohabitation has increasingly involved children as well. As rates of nonmarital births continue to rise, many single parent families are in reality constituted of cohabiting couples. Increasing rates of births to cohabitators have largely been driven by increases in the overall number of people cohabiting and may suggest that cohabitation has been accepted by couples as a marriage alternative (Raley, 2001). Families formed by cohabitators with children are also less

stable than married families, and children within cohabiting families often suffer from greater disadvantages than do children growing up in married households (Wu, Bumpass, & Musick, 2001; Wu & Musick, 2008). While both findings may be exacerbated by selection of the parents into cohabitation, recent work has found that lower marital quality among cohabitators, particularly for whites, is mainly driven by the influence of nonmarital births on the relationship (Tach & Halpern-Meekin, 2009).

Although cohabiting couples have fewer children than married couples and are more likely to remain childless (Bachrach, 1987; Rindfuss & VandenHeuvel, 1990), over one third of births in the United States now take place outside of marriage, with a large percentage of these nonmarital births occurring within cohabiting relationships (Freid, Prager, MacKay, & Xia, 2003). Among births to unmarried women under age 40, Bumpass and Lu (2000) estimated that those occurring to cohabiting parents increased from 29% in the early 1980s to 39% in the early 1990s. Furthermore, this increase accounts for nearly all the rise in nonmarital childbearing between these two periods (Bumpass & Lu, 2000).

New research on serial cohabitation has also suggested that individuals who cohabit with multiple partners are more likely to experience a divorce in their lifetimes (Lichter & Qian, 2008). This provides support for what has been termed the “cohabitation effect hypothesis,” suggesting that cohabitators select themselves into relationships which are more likely to end in divorce (DeMaris & MacDonald, 1993; Bennett, Blanc, & Bloom, 1988). This argument suggests that people who are less suitable for marriage are more likely to cohabit than are their peers. Rhoades, Stanley and Markman (2006) found that men who cohabit prior to engagement are less committed to their relationship than are their spouses which may lead to divorce.

Cohabitors have also been found to possess certain characteristics which make them more prone to divorcing later (Teachman, 2003). Number and type of family transitions experienced by children increased their likelihood of cohabiting as adults. Teachman (2003)

found that time spent in a cohabiting parent family as a child decreased marriage and increased cohabitation rates for adults as did living in a stepparent family. However, this study reflects whether the respondent's biological parents were cohabiting after the respondent was born, constituting only 2.3% of the sample, and did not assess whether the respondent's parents had ever cohabited. Teachman and Polonko (1990), however, found that this increased risk of divorce among cohabitators can be explained once duration of the relationship is measured at the beginning of the cohabitation, rather than at marriage. They found no increased risk of divorce among cohabitators once this had been taken into account.

Several studies have shown that cohabitators are more likely to come from divorced households (Axinn & Thornton, 1993; Thornton, 1985, 1991). Using data from the early 1980s, Axinn and Thornton (1993) showed that parental divorce increased likelihood of cohabitation, particularly among women, regardless of whether or not the parent had remarried. Attitudes toward cohabitation by mothers showed a strong influence on the likelihood of cohabitation for their children. Mothers were more likely to hold favorable attitudes toward cohabitation if their child had cohabited. Moreover, children reported more favorable attitudes toward cohabitation after cohabiting themselves, suggesting the behavior has a reciprocal effect for parent and child. However, this study looked only at child cohabitations and did not take into account whether or not the parents themselves had cohabited prior to marriage, further affecting their attitudes in regards to cohabitation.

In another study by the same authors, parental divorce was shown to increased acceptance of cohabitation and premarital sex by mothers, which was strongly correlated with favorable attitudes towards the same among children (Axinn & Thornton, 1996). This transmission of attitudes may also be linked to transmission of family formation behaviors. Amato (1996) found that parental divorce was linked to an increased risk of divorce among children. This effect multiplied when both partners grew up in divorced households and held true

regardless of attitudes toward divorce. Child cohabitation significantly increased likelihood of divorce, and this effect increased for respondents who experienced a parental divorce. Parental cohabitation may then work in a similar fashion.

This study expands upon current literature in several key ways. First, it addresses whether children whose parents cohabited are more likely to cohabit themselves. Second, this study addresses whether parental cohabitation increases the likelihood of divorce among adult children, either by itself or through its effects on respondent cohabitation. Third, it investigates if parental cohabitation moderates the effect of parental divorce on children's divorce. If so, the combined effect of parental cohabitation and parental divorce may be much stronger than the effect of parental cohabitation by itself. Fourth, it assesses whether parental cohabitation affects the likelihood of the respondent having a nonmarital birth. Finally, interaction effects are tested between parent cohabitation and divorce as well as parent cohabitation and child cohabitation to determine how these interactions affect child relationship formation and if the effect of parent cohabitation works through intervening variables.

Results of this study are expected to find positive associations between parent and child cohabitation. Additionally, positive associations are expected between parent cohabitation and respondent divorce and nonmarital childbearing for adult children. Attenuation of these findings is expected once other variables are introduced to the model, including parent divorce. It is also expected that accounting for respondent cohabitation will further attenuate the effect of parental cohabitation but that interaction effects between parent and child cohabitation will be substantiated. Prior research suggests that parent divorce will also have a positive association with the dependent variables in this study. Interactions between parent cohabitation and divorce are expected to have further positive associations with respondent cohabitation, divorce and nonmarital childbearing.

Methods

Data

Data used in these analyses were taken from Cycle 20 of the Canadian General Social Survey (GSS). This is one of the few datasets containing information on cohabitation for both parents and their adult children, making it ideal for this study. From June to October 2006, 23,608 people aged 15 or older and living in a private household in one of the ten Canadian provinces were interviewed. The target population for Cycle 20 was all Canadian residents ages 15 and older. The sampling frame excluded residents of the Yukon, Northwest, and Nunavut Territories, as well as full-time residents of institutions. Respondents contacted by the GSS were interviewed by telephone and were chosen according to a random digit dialing sampling method. This does introduce some bias to the study as it excludes residents without telephone access, estimated at 2% of the total population. This bias is likely minimal as some 88% of households in the lowest income bracket still reported having telephone access. Cellular telephones were also excluded from the sampling frame, excluding approximately 5% of the population. Of the telephone numbers dialed, 57% were households. One respondent was then randomly selected from a roster of eligible household residents. The overall response rate for the survey was 67%.

Cycle 20 of the General Social Survey (GSS) was the fourth cycle to collect detailed information on family life in Canada. This cycle focused on transitions experienced by respondents such as leaving the parental home, marrying or entering into a cohabitational union, having children, moving or buying a home, and separating or getting divorced. The GSS also gathered data on the respondent's main activity and other sociodemographic characteristics such as age, sex, and marital status.

The sample was restricted for this study by eliminating French-speaking households from the dataset. Within francophone Quebec, cohabitation has taken on a role in family formation that serves as a marriage substitute, similar to that within Scandinavian countries. Cohabitational childbearing is common within Quebec, and such relationships are of a longer mean duration than in the rest of Canada (Heuveline & Timberlake, 2004). It has been argued that Anglophone Canadians tend view it instead as a normative premarital step in which childbearing is rare (Wu, 2000; Le Bourdais & Lapierre-Adamcyk, 2004). Cohabitation in English-speaking Canada has also increased at a much slower rate than in Quebec. In 2002, twelve percent of Canadians outside of Quebec reported having a common-law partner – with the highest rates being seen in British Columbia and the Atlantic provinces – as opposed to thirty percent of Quebecois respondents. The former figure is close to estimates of cohabitation within the United States (Statistics Canada, 2002).

For analyses of cohabitation and nonmarital births, the full sample of 18,481 respondents was used. However, for analyses of divorce, only those respondents who reported having ever been married were included in the sample, giving a sample of 13,545. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Due to the probabilistic nature of the GSS sampling frame, person weights were used to make the sample representative of the Canadian population in 2006. Analyses presented in this study are based on weighted data.

Measures

Dependent Variables. Three main dependent variables were used in these analyses: whether the respondent has ever cohabited, whether the respondent has ever divorced and whether the respondent has given birth to a child outside of marriage. Twenty-eight percent of the sample report having cohabited at some point, either with their current partner or with a previous partner.

Respondent divorce is coded 1 if the respondent has ever experienced a divorce or is currently separated from a spouse. Sixteen percent of respondents reported being divorced or separated.

Non-marital birth is a binary variable, coded 1 if the respondent gave birth to or fathered a child prior to the self-reported age at first marriage. This variable does not take into account births which may have taken place after respondent divorce or between a subsequent divorce and remarriage. Twelve percent of the sample gave birth to or fathered a child prior to their first marriage.

Independent Variables. Independent variables included in these analyses reflected characteristics of both parents and adult children. Parent variables include measures of education and relationship characteristics as reported by their adult children. In order to assess whether children whose parents cohabited are more likely to exhibit family formation pathways similar to their parents, parent cohabitation is used as the focal independent variable. Parental cohabitation is based on a question as to whether the respondent's parents ever lived together outside of marriage.

Additionally, parental divorce is included to determine if parent cohabitation has an effect over and above the effect of the parents' marital dissolution on respondents' family formation. Parental divorce or separation is recoded from a question which asked respondents if their parents were still living together when the respondent was fifteen years of age.

Father's education is used here as a crude proxy for the socioeconomic status in which the respondent grew up. Although education as an indicator of socioeconomic status may not be a perfect measure, prior research has shown it is strongly correlated with future life outcomes and overall well-being (Axinn, Thornton, & Teachman, 1995; Landale, Oropesa, & Llanes, 1998). Categories included less than a high school education, high school graduate, some college, associate's degree or trade school diploma, college graduate and graduate or professional degree.

These categories were condensed into separate dummy variables indicating less than a high school education, high school graduate, associate's degree and trade school diploma, and college graduate. Less than high school has been assigned as the reference category.

Adult child characteristics include controls for age, sex, and educational attainment as well as measures of first language, personal income and church attendance. Because older respondents have had a longer exposure period, the effect of age is controlled. Age is a continuously coded variable reflecting the self-reported age of the respondent. Women may also be at greater risk of cohabitation and nonmarital birth. Respondent sex has been coded 1 for female. No missingness was present in the sample for either variable.

Race and ethnicity are composed of a single question, which asks if the respondent is considered a "visible minority." This term is used by Statistics Canada, the statistical arm of the Canadian federal government, to differentiate racial and ethnic minorities other than First Nations peoples from Caucasians in accordance with the Canadian Employment Equity Act of 1986. It includes the following racial and ethnic groups: Black, South Asian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Southeast Asian, Filipino, Arab/West Asian, and Latin American. The vast majority of minority residents in Canada are of Asian descent, mainly Chinese, Filipino and Southeast Asian immigrants and their descendants (Statistics Canada, 2009). Respondents who report being a visible minority are coded 1. A separate question is asked of respondents to determine if they are of First Nations or Métis (French-speaking Aboriginal peoples) descent and has been coded 1 for respondents who report being a member of these groups.

As with father's education, respondent education is used as a measure of current socioeconomic status. It was determined from a single question with categorical responses for less than a high school education, high school graduate, some college, associate's degree or trade school diploma, college graduate and graduate or professional degree. These categories were condensed into dummy variables for less than a high school education, high school graduate,

associate's degree and trade school diploma, and college graduate. Here, high school graduates have been assigned as the reference category.

Although French-speaking households have been eliminated from the sample, those Francophone respondents living in English-speaking households remain within the study as have those respondents who reported speaking a non-English and non-French language at home. In order to control for the effect of being exposed to a non-Anglophone culture, this study controls for native language. Respondent first language was taken from a question asking the childhood language of the respondent. Nominal categories were given as English only, French only, other language only, English and French equally, English and other equally, French and other equally, and English, French and other equally. To create non-overlapping dummy variables, categories are condensed so that respondents who spoke English only comprise the first binary coded variable. A second group of respondents, those who spoke French only or English and French equally as a child, are coded as 1 for French being their first language. This was done in order to account for the liberalizing effect of French-Canadian culture. Respondents who reported speaking another language as a child, including those who reported speaking English or French as well, are coded as 1 in the third dummy variable. Because the largest minority group in Canada is Asians, this category accounts for effect of more conservative cultural groups. English only serves as the reference category.

In order to further control for the effect of socioeconomic status on family formation outcomes, personal income is included as an additional covariate. Respondent annual income was given as a bracketed range with categories (in Canadian dollars) for no income, under \$5,000, \$5,000 to \$9,999, \$10,000 to \$14,999, \$15,000 to \$19,999, \$20,000 to \$29,999, \$30,000 to \$39,999, \$40,000 to \$49,000, \$50,000 to \$59,999, \$60,000 to \$79,000, \$80,000 to \$99,999 and over \$100,000. Dummy variables dividing the income distribution roughly into thirds were created, reflecting categories for low (annual income below \$20,000), moderate (between

\$20,000 and \$49,999), and high (over \$50,000). Moderate income is used as the reference category.

As an extension of the proscriptions most religions have against premarital sex, high levels of religiosity are expected to decrease the likelihood that a respondent would engage in cohabitation and nonmarital childbearing (Lehrer, 2000). Further, the pro-familial nature of religion is in conflict with marital dissolution (Teachman, 2002). Odds of divorce are then expected to decrease for respondents with moderate to high levels of religious attendance. Religious service attendance was reflected by five ordinal categories: at least once per week, at least once per month, a few times per year, at least once per year and not at all. These categories were reverse coded and condensed into dummy variables for low, moderate and high attendance. Low attendance is defined as attending less than once per month and is the reference category in analyses. Moderate attendance incorporates respondents who attend religious services at least once per month while high attendance is characterized by attendance at one or more services per week.

Analytic Strategy

Due to the binary nature of the dependent variables of interest, logistic regression is used in these analyses. The key independent variable, parent cohabitation, is included in all models. Its effects are first shown in a zero-order model. For all regressions, Model 2 adds control variables as well as measures of parental separation. Predicting respondent cohabitation, Model 3 includes an interaction between parent cohabitation and separation. For regressions predicting respondent divorce and nonmarital birth, Model 3 adds the respondent's own cohabitation. The last stage of analyses, Models 4 and 5, then add interaction terms between parent and child cohabitation and parent cohabitation and divorce, respectively. Results are presented as odds ratios in each model, which are equal to exponentiating the log odds coefficients, for ease of interpretation.

Missing Data

Missing values were present in the Canadian General Social Survey if a respondent answered “don’t know”, refused to answer a question or if skip patterns were initiated due to a respondent’s answers to previous questions. For the majority of variables used in this study, missingness was present for under 3% of cases, including parent cohabitation (3%), parent divorce (0.6%), minority status (2.2%), First Nations status (2.4%), respondent education (1.8%), childhood language (1.8%), religious attendance (2.9%). Missing data was a larger concern for measures of father’s education and respondent income. 19.2% of respondents were missing for father’s education. 21.3% of respondents did not report information on their personal income.

To retain as many cases as possible in order to maximize statistical power, missing values were imputed using multiple imputation (ICE) in Stata, which uses iterative multivariate regression (Royston, 2004). Forty datasets were created to minimize power falloff (Graham, Olchowski, & Gilreath, 2007). The imputation model included all variables included in this study as well as information about the respondent’s province within Canada. Responses imputed for missing values due to skip patterns were reset to missing after the imputation was complete.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1 for dependent and independent variables. Twenty-six percent of respondents in the sample report having ever cohabited with a partner. Of respondents who ever been married, nearly 13% divorced at least once. Eleven percent of all respondents in the sample had given birth to or fathered a child outside of marriage. Mean respondent age was forty-four years old. The sample was slightly more than half female, and 16% of the sample was considered a visible minority. Four percent of the sample reported being of First Nations or Métis descent.

Only 18% of respondents reported having less than a high school education. Associate's degrees or trade school diplomas were reported by about 26% of the sample, and 24% had obtained a college degree or greater. For respondents from English or other language households, nearly 72% reported that English was their first language. Twenty-four percent reported being native speakers of a language other than English or French. Very few respondents from English speaking households were native French-speakers (4%). A sizeable majority of respondents reported low attendance at religious services (less often than monthly). Only 20% of respondents reported high religious attendance of once a week or more. Age at first marriage is included as a control for logistic regressions assessing probabilities of divorce. Mean age at first marriage was about twenty-five years old.

In retrospective questions about the respondent's biological parents, 6% of respondents reported that their biological parents had cohabited prior to marrying, while 17% of respondents reported that their parents were no longer living in the same household by his or her fifteenth birthday. Respondents were also asked to recall highest level of paternal education. About 40% of

respondents' fathers in the full sample had less than a high school education. Over 18% of fathers were college graduates.

Parents' Unions

Logistic regression results predicting likelihood of parents' cohabitation are shown in Table 2. This is done in attempt to tease apart factors influencing parents' relationship formation that may later affect adult children. The sample here was limited to only parents of respondents who reported to speaking English as their childhood language to remove confounding effects of Francophone influence. No information was available on parents' ages. Respondent's age by ten year birth cohort is used a proxy measure. As the respondent's age increases in ten year increments, the odds of their parents cohabiting decreased by half. Fathers with associates or trade school degrees had odds of cohabiting which were about 27% lower than did fathers who did not graduate from high school. Odds of cohabiting for fathers without a high school diploma did not differ significantly from high school or college graduates.

Based on results of the studies previously cited, analyses are then turned to how parent cohabitation affects likelihood of parental divorce. In Table 3, logistic regression results showed parents who cohabited had odds of divorcing 2.64 times higher than the odds of parents who did not cohabit. As the respondent's ten year age cohort increased, the odds of their parents having divorced before the respondent was fifteen decreased by 4%. Odds of divorce for fathers who were high school and trade school/associate's degree graduates were not significantly different than the odds of non-high school graduates. Fathers with a college degree had odds of divorcing which were 23% lower than those of fathers who did not complete high school.

These results indicate that parents of older respondents in the sample were both less likely to cohabit and less likely to divorce, suggesting that the same may be true for older respondents themselves. College educated fathers were also less likely to have cohabited or divorced. This suggests that highly educated respondents may also engage in these behaviors less

often than respondents with lower educational achievement. In keeping with previous literature on cohabitation, parents who cohabited prior to their marriage were more likely to experience divorce.

Respondent Cohabitation

Analyses now address whether children whose parents cohabited are more likely to cohabit themselves. Table 4 begins with a zero-order model predicting the effect of parents' cohabitation on likelihood of the respondent ever having cohabited himself. Respondents' whose parents cohabited had odds of cohabiting themselves which were 70% higher than the odds of respondents whose parents had no history of cohabitation. Model 2 of this table adds respondent- and parent-level control variables. Even after controlling for parental divorce, respondents whose parents cohabited had significantly higher odds (21%) of their own cohabitation than those of respondents whose parents did not cohabit. This suggests an intergenerational effect of cohabitation.

Similar to results for their parents, older respondents were less likely to cohabit. This may reflect both changes in the societal acceptance of cohabitation over time as well as greater conservatism among older adults. Women were more likely to cohabit, as were Caucasian respondents. However, odds of having participated in a cohabitational union for respondents of First Nations or Métis descent were 2.43 times higher than those of Caucasians.

Respondent education presented mixed results. When compared to high school graduates, respondents with less than a high school education had odds of cohabiting which were 24% lower. However, graduates of two-year colleges and trade schools were 33% as likely to cohabit. College graduates were no more likely to cohabit than high school graduates based on the lack of statistical difference between their odds ratios.

Childhood language of the respondent was strongly associated with likelihood of cohabitation. Respondents who spoke French as children had odds of cohabiting 1.5 times greater

than Anglophone-only children. Similar to odds ratios shown here for visible minorities, Canadians who spoke a non-English and non-French language as children also had significantly lower odds (43%) of cohabiting.

Income was included as a socioeconomic control and proved a significant predictor of likelihood of cohabiting. Respondents who earned less than \$20,000 per year had odds of cohabiting 38% lower than the middle income category. This may reflect a limited financial ability of respondents in this category to form their own households. Respondents who earned more than \$50,000 had slightly higher odds (16%) of cohabiting, corroborating an income effect on family formation.

Based on results shown in Tables 2 and 3, father's education is included here as an intergenerational socioeconomic control. Adult children of fathers without a high school diploma were more likely to cohabit. Although differences in odds ratios were only significant when compared to respondents whose fathers were college graduates, odds of cohabiting were lower for all groups compared to respondents with non-high school graduate fathers. Children of college graduate fathers had 18% lower odds of cohabiting.

As hypothesized, religious attendance was also associated with lower overall odds of cohabitation. Compared to respondents with low religious attendance (less than once per month), respondents with moderate levels of attendance (at least once monthly) saw odds of cohabitation which were 48% lower. Respondents who attended services frequently were even less likely to cohabit and had 71% lower odds of cohabiting than infrequent attendees.

Parental divorce was also an important predictor of child cohabitation. If the respondent's parents divorced, his or her odds of cohabiting were 61% higher than respondents who grew up in intact families. Results shown for parents indicate that those who cohabited were also more likely to divorce. Model 3 includes an interaction between parent cohabitation and parent separation, testing whether cohabitation moderates the affect of parent divorce. This also allows us to

determine if and how the “cohabitation effect” affects family formations for offspring. The significance of this interaction shows that the effect of parent cohabitation on offspring cohabitation varies by whether the parents divorced, but both are positively associated with offspring cohabitation.

The inclusion of the interaction to the model changes the reference category for each of the constituent variables. The odds ratio for parent cohabitation in Model 3 reflects the odds for respondents whose parents cohabited but did not divorce. These respondents were 42% as likely to have cohabited. The odds ratio for parent separation reflects odds for respondents whose parents separated but had not cohabited prior to marriage. Here, the respondent’s odds of having cohabited themselves increased by 70%.

Parent cohabitation and divorce is a multiplicative effect ($1.42 \times 1.70 \times 0.63$) equal to an odds ratio of 1.52. Respondents whose parents both cohabited and divorced were then less likely to cohabit as compared to children of divorced parents and were more likely to cohabit than both the adult children of non-divorcing cohabitators and of non-cohabitor intact families. This is a strong positive effect for both parent cohabitation and divorce on likelihood of respondent cohabitation. This interaction suggests the combined effect of parental cohabitation and parental divorce increases their odds of cohabitation compared to the effect of parent cohabitation alone. Effects of control variables were of similar magnitude to the previous model.

Respondent Divorce

Analyses now focus on the second and third questions posed by this study: whether parental cohabitation increases the likelihood of divorce among adult children and if parental cohabitation moderates the effect of parental divorce on children’s divorce. Among respondents who have ever been married, parental cohabitation was linked to a decreased risk of divorce after controlling for age at first marriage. Respondents who married at a younger age had higher odds of divorce. Model 2 introduced control variables. Parent separation was associated with a 27%

increase in odds of divorcing, while the effect of parent cohabitation was significant at $p < 0.06$ and showed 29% decrease in odds of divorce for adult children whose parents cohabited. Older respondents had greater odds of divorce than did younger respondents. Women in the sample had a slightly lower likelihood of divorce compared to men. Minority respondents were 30% less likely to divorce than Caucasians. Odds for First Nations and Métis respondents were 57% higher than those for Caucasian respondents. Respondents who did not graduate from high school had lower odds of divorce (28%) than did respondents with a high school diploma. This may reflect increased high school graduation rates as well as the increased acceptance of divorce for younger birth cohorts. Neither a college degree nor an associate's or trade school diploma were significantly associated with risk of divorce.

Respondents who spoke French as children did not see an increased risk of divorce. However, speaking a non-English and non-French language in childhood served as an insulating factor. Compared to Caucasian respondents, these respondents showed a decrease in their odds of divorce by 28%. Neither respondent income nor father's education was significantly associated with likelihood of divorce, suggesting socioeconomic factors are less influential here.

As hypothesized, frequent attendance of religious services was associated with a strong decrease in a respondent's likelihood of divorce. If a respondent attended services at least monthly, he or she had odds which were 35% lower of divorcing than someone who attended services less frequently. This effect was even stronger for respondents who attended services weekly. High frequency attendees were half as likely to divorce as were respondents with low attendance.

In order to determine if parents' cohabitation influences their child's divorce through its effects on the child's cohabitation, Model 3 adds whether the respondent has ever cohabited. In this sample, odds of divorce among respondents who have cohabited are 6.3 times greater than the odds of divorce for respondents who did not cohabit prior to marrying. After controlling for

respondent cohabitation, respondents whose parents cohabited see 44% lower odds of divorce than respondents whose parents did not cohabit. The intergenerational effect of divorce ceases to be significant once the respondent's cohabitation is included in the model.

Model 4 further tests how parents' cohabitation influences their child's divorce by introducing an interaction term between parent and child cohabitation. This effect is nonsignificant. To test multiplicative effects between parent-level family formation and dissolution, Model 5 includes an interaction between parents' cohabitation and parents' divorce. While this interaction was not significant, the coefficient for parent cohabitation shows that respondents whose parents cohabited and remained married have a likelihood of divorce which is 54% lower than respondents whose parents did not cohabit and divorced as well as respondents whose parents both cohabited prior to marriage and later divorced. This suggests that a successful cohabitation for parents insulates their adult children from divorce in their own marriages.

Nonmarital Birth

The final question of this study asked whether parental cohabitation affects the likelihood of the respondent having a nonmarital birth. Model 1 shows that parental cohabitation is associated with an increase in the odds of a nonmarital birth for respondents by 45%. Model 2 introduces control variables, including parental divorce. Odds of having a nonmarital birth were 76% higher for adult children if their parents separated before the respondent was 15 years old. After controlling for parent divorce, odds of having a nonmarital birth remained positive but ceased to be statistically significant; respondents had 10% greater odds of a nonmarital birth if they reported having parents who cohabited.

Age of respondents in years was not associated with a change in their odds of a nonmarital birth. Women, visible minorities and First Nations respondents were all more likely to have a child outside of marriage. Visible minorities had 27% greater odds while respondents of

First Nations or Métis descent saw odds which were 3 times greater than their Caucasian counterparts.

Education was a significant influence on odds of nonmarital birth. Respondents with less than a high school education as well as those who graduated from two-year colleges and trade schools had slightly greater odds of a nonmarital birth compared to high school graduates. College graduates were less likely to give birth outside of marriage. Their odds of having a nonmarital birth were 43% lower than the odds for high school graduates.

Post-secondary educational achievement among fathers was also associated with decreased odds of nonmarital childbearing for respondents. If the respondent's father had at least an associate's or trade school degree, he or she had odds of a nonmarital birth which were 20% lower than the odds for a respondent whose father did not graduate high school. Father's who were college graduates had children who were 33% less likely to have a child outside of marriage.

Adult francophone children saw no significant association between first language and odds of a nonmarital birth when compared to Anglophones. However, respondents who spoke another language as a child had 42% lower odds than those of English-speakers.

Respondent income was associated with decreased odds of nonmarital birth in this model. Low income respondents had 23% lower odds of giving birth to a child outside of marriage when compared to middle income respondents. No significant difference in the odds of high income respondents having a nonmarital birth was detected.

Religious attendance was associated with lower odds of nonmarital birth. Respondents who attended services at least once a week saw a significant decrease in their odds compared to the reference category. Odds of a nonmarital birth for respondents with high attendance were 40% lower than odds for respondents who attended services a few times per year or less. Odds for

those respondents in the moderate attendance category, while lower, were not statistically different than those respondents who reported low attendance.

Model 3 controls for whether the respondent has ever cohabited. Compared to respondents who have never lived in a cohabitational relationship, cohabitators had odds of giving birth to a child outside of marriage which are 5.7 times greater. After controlling for this effect, parent cohabitation and respondent gender were no longer significant. However, respondents whose parents divorced prior to their fifteenth birthday had odds of giving birth to a child outside of marriage which were 53% higher than odds of a nonmarital birth for respondents living in with both parents through adolescence. Compared to Model 2, odds of nonmarital birth for visible minorities increased in comparison to Caucasians. Those for First Nations and Métis respondents decreased slightly compared to the previous model but remain significantly higher than the odds for Whites.

The effect of education changed slightly after controlling for respondent cohabitation. In Model 3, respondents without a high school diploma had odds of a nonmarital birth which are 36% higher than the odds for high school graduates. The effect of a college degree remained salient and strongly negative. College graduates had odds of having a child outside of marriage which were 45% lower than did high school graduates. Having an associate's or trade school degree for neither respondents nor fathers was associated with a nonmarital birth after controlling for cohabitation. A respondent whose father was college graduate was 29% less likely to have a child outside of marriage.

Respondent language also remained a factor. While odds for Francophones were still not significantly different than those of Anglophones, respondents who spoke a non-English and non-French language as a child had 33% lower odds of nonmarital birth after controlling whether he or she had ever cohabited. Respondent income and frequency of religious attendance ceased to be significant predictors of nonmarital birth once the model controlled for cohabitation.

Model 4 introduces an interaction term between parent and child cohabitation to determine if the effect of parent cohabitation on their child's odds of a nonmarital birth works through the increased odds of the child cohabiting. The significance of this interaction confirms the influence of an intergenerational cohabitation effect. Individuals who had cohabited and whose parents cohabited were significantly more likely (699%) to have a child outside of marriage based on their multiplicative odds ratio (0.71 X 5.44 X 1.81). This is strong evidence that the combined effect of parent and child cohabitation increases the respondent's odds of having a nonmarital birth over and above the effect of his or her own cohabitation alone. Odds for those cohabitators whose parents did not cohabit remained significantly higher than the odds of non-cohabiting respondents. This group was 5.44 times as likely to have a child outside of marriage as were respondents with no history of cohabitation for themselves or their parents. The effect of parental cohabitation on its own was not significant in this model, suggesting that respondents whose parents cohabited but who did not cohabit themselves were at no significant increased risk of a nonmarital birth. In this model, respondents from divorced families still saw increased odds of a nonmarital birth (53%) compared to respondents from intact families.

Model 5 tests for interaction effects between parent cohabitation and subsequent divorce. This interaction was not significant. Based on these findings, the hypothesized relationship between parents' cohabitation and child's nonmarital birth through influences on the child's cohabitation is given additional credence.

Summary of Results

Parental cohabitation as well as parental divorce was shown here to increase the likelihood of cohabitation for adult children. Further, the effect of parent cohabitation, working through its effect on child cohabitation, increased the likelihood nonmarital birth for respondents. Parental divorce also increased the odds of divorce and nonmarital birth for adult children. Only

in regards to cohabitation did parental cohabitation and divorce serve to increase odds for respondents through an interaction effect. However, successful parental cohabitations (i.e. not ending in divorce) decreased the likelihood of divorce for adult children.

While younger respondents and women were more likely to experience cohabitation, older respondents and men were more likely to see their marriages dissolve. Visible minorities were at greater risk of a nonmarital birth than Caucasians but were significantly less likely to cohabit or divorce. However, First Nations and Métis respondents showed increased odds of cohabitation, divorce (not significant after controlling for cohabitation) and having a nonmarital birth.

The effect of education was not constant across all models. Lacking a high school diploma was associated with lower odds of cohabitation and divorce but greater odds of nonmarital birth. However, having an associate's or trade school degree meant having increased odds of all three outcomes. Only in regards to having a nonmarital birth was having graduated from college a significant factor, decreasing the odds of this outcome by nearly half. While respondents who spoke French as children were more likely to cohabit, they were no more likely than Anglophone children to divorce or have a child outside of marriage.

While high income respondents were slightly more likely to cohabit, low income respondents were less likely to do so as well as being less likely to have a nonmarital birth. This effect disappeared after controlling for whether the respondent had cohabited. Income was not associated with odds of divorce. As a second socioeconomic control, father's education was included. It also did not affect odds of divorce for respondents. However, children of college education fathers were both less likely to cohabit and to have a nonmarital birth.

The effect of religion was constant across all models. As religious attendance increased, the odds of a respondent participating in any of the three outcomes decreased. However, if the

respondent had cohabited, religious attendance was no longer associated with a decrease in odds of nonmarital birth.

Discussion and Conclusions

Discussion

The results of this study present new information on how parents' cohabitation affects the family formations of their adult children. The issue of intergenerational effects of cohabitation has received little empirical attention due to the lack of adequate data sources on the subject. This study improves current knowledge about cohabitation in several key ways. First, it has addressed whether children whose parents cohabited are more likely to cohabit themselves. Findings from this study show strong evidence that parents who cohabited are more likely to have children who cohabit as well. Second, this study addressed whether parental cohabitation increases the likelihood of divorce among adult children. No support was found for this hypothesis. Third, it investigated if parental cohabitation moderated the effect of parental divorce on children's divorce. Partial support was given to this hypothesis once respondent cohabitation is controlled but was not born out by further introduction of interactions to the model. Fourth, this study addressed whether parental cohabitation affects the likelihood of the respondent having a nonmarital birth. Support for this hypothesis was substantial in zero-order models. However, after controlling for respondent cohabitation, the effect of parent cohabitation diminished, bringing us to the final question of this study.

Results show that both respondents who cohabited prior to marriage and respondents who experienced the divorce of their parents are more likely to divorce themselves. Additionally, respondents whose parents cohabited prior to marrying and remained married had lower odds of divorcing than individuals whose parents did not cohabit. This suggests that while cohabitation continues to have a strong positive effect on divorce for individuals, intergenerational effects of cohabitation are not the main contributing factor. Rather, results shown here confirm findings

from previous studies suggesting that the experience of parental divorce has a deleterious effect on marital stability for adult children.

Interaction effects between parent cohabitation and divorce as well as parent cohabitation and child cohabitation were then tested to determine how these interactions affect child relationship formation and if the effect of parent cohabitation works through intervening variables. This hypothesis was supported for two of the three dependent variables. Respondents whose parents both cohabited and divorced were more likely to cohabit than adults growing up in an intact family whose parents did not cohabit prior to marriage. However, they were equally likely to cohabit as children of divorced parents who never cohabited. This strong positive effect for both parent cohabitation and divorce on likelihood of respondent cohabitation shows that the combined effect of parental cohabitation and parental divorce is stronger than the effect of parental cohabitation by itself but equal to the effect of parent divorce alone. Findings are further supported by the lack of significance for the same interaction (parent cohabitation x parent divorce) when assessing odds of respondent divorce and nonmarital birth. These results suggest that the attitudes parents possess about relationship formation influence the behaviors of their adult children. Even though parent cohabitation in this study occurred prior to the respondent's birth, it may affect the parents' marital quality, shaping the environment experienced by the respondent throughout childhood. This effect may then combine with the effect of parental divorce. Results from this study stress that both are factors in relationship formation when children reach adulthood.

Study Limitations

This study could be improved in several ways. Information on respondents' parents is sparse and limits the ability to fully explain factors affecting parents' cohabitation and divorce. A

more complete relationship history for parents may provide important details in order to more accurately assess the effects generated by the parents' marital relationship.

The cross-sectional nature of the Canadian General Social Survey prevents further analysis of respondents over time. Longitudinal data following children into adulthood would allow the collection of better information as to the effect of parental cohabitation on offspring romantic relationships. To date, the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health has been able to assess short term effects. Although data collection began in the mid 1990s, adolescents included in this study have only recently entered into relationships. Most relationships are cohabitational with very few respondents having married thus far (Schoen, Landale, & Daniels, 2007). However, future waves of this study offer opportunities to determine parental influence.

Additionally, the dataset lacks the ability to assess effects among minority respondents because it does not differentiate between different minority groups. Because the Canadian government does not ask more detailed questions about race and ethnicity, it is impossible to make between group comparisons. This study also eliminates respondents living in Francophone households from the sample. Previous work addressing cohabitation in Quebec has emphasized the cultural differences between Francophone and Anglophone Canadians (Le Bourdais & Lapierre-Adamcyk, 2004). Results shown here confirm those differences based on the increased likelihood of cohabitation for Francophone children but nonsignificance of odds ratios predicting divorce or nonmarital birth. Clearly, cohabitation does not have the same detrimental effects for Francophones. Future research is needed to explore how parent effects differ by racial groups and between language groups in Canada.

Conclusions and Policy Implications

Cohabitation literature has not yet addressed the lives of adult children whose parents cohabited before marriage. The analyses here present strong evidence of intergenerational

transmission of cohabitation as well as the how this effect plays out in the lives of adult children of cohabitators. Parent cohabitation and the child's knowledge of it may then liberalize child attitudes, increasing the child's own acceptance of cohabitation. However, many studies have assumed this attitudinal shift took place as a by-product of cohabitation itself (Axinn & Thornton, 1993). This study suggests that interaction with someone who cohabited can also affect attitudes toward cohabitation. In the case of parents who cohabit, this interaction primes the pump for their children.

However, cohabitation has far-reaching consequences for parents and children. Adults who cohabit are more likely to have marriages that fail, having long-term implications for themselves and for their children. If children model their own relationships on that of their parents, what does this mean for the children of cohabitators? It may mean that cohabitation will seem like an important step in family formation for this group in adulthood. Because their parents cohabited, they may feel increased pressure to do so themselves. More likely, they will see it as a good way to test the relationship waters and use cohabitation as a precursor to their own marriages. Considering that cohabiting couples are also more likely to have a child outside of marriage, effects of cohabitation may then affect not only parents and children but grandchildren as well.

Family policy would do well to take these intergenerational effects into account when promoting marriage to cohabitators, particularly those who are unmarried parents. Education on what makes a healthy marriage and how their own relationship acts as a model for their children should be addressed as part of marriage promotion agendas aimed at these couples. Cohabitators who marry seem to have relationships which are qualitatively different from couples who marry with no cohabitation. This difference also affects the lives of their children and potentially future generations.

Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Weighted

Variable	Mean	SD
<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
Respondent has ever cohabited	25.72%	
Respondent has ever divorced	12.70%	
Respondent has had a nonmarital birth	11.44%	
<i>Parent Relationship Characteristics</i>		
Parents cohabited before marriage	5.76%	
Parents divorced before R. was age 15	16.69%	
<i>Individual Characteristics</i>		
Age of respondent in years	44.32	0.16
Female	50.69%	
Visible minority	15.68%	
First Nations or Métis	3.79%	
Did not graduate from High School	17.97%	
High School graduate	32.00%	
Associate's or Trade School graduate	26.34%	
College graduate	23.70%	
<i>Respondent First Language</i>		
First Language is English	71.82%	
First language is French	4.26%	
First language other than English or French	23.92%	
<i>Respondent Income</i>		
Annual income below \$20,000 CAN	33.60%	
Annual income between \$20,000 and \$50,000 CAN	37.44%	
Annual income above \$50,000 CAN	28.96%	
<i>Respondent Religious Attendance</i>		
Attends services less than monthly	69.09%	
Attends services at least once per month	10.54%	
Attends services once a week or more	20.38%	
<i>Parent Education</i>		
Father did not graduate high school	40.09%	
Father is a high school graduate	30.36%	
Father has associate's or is a trade school graduate	10.98%	
Father is a college graduate	18.58%	
N	18481	
Age at first marriage	25.02	0.05
N	13545	

Table 2: Logistic Regression of Respondent Age and Parental Education on Parental Cohabitation, Weighted, English or Other First Language Respondents Only (N: 17,860)

Variable	Odds Ratio	Sig.
Respondent's age (10 year cohorts)	0.49	***
Father is a high school graduate	0.98	
Father has associate's or is a trade school graduate	0.73	*
Father is a college graduate	0.78	
Constant	0.51	***

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. Respondents with fathers without a high school diploma are the omitted category.

Table 3: Logistic Regression of Parental Cohabitation and Education on Parental Divorce, Weighted, English or Other First Language Respondents Only (N: 17,860)

Variable	Odds Ratio	Sig.
Parents cohabited before marriage	2.64	***
Respondent's age (10 year cohorts)	0.96	*
Father is a high school graduate	1.01	
Father has associate's or is a trade school graduate	0.95	
Father is a college graduate	0.77	**
Constant	0.21	***

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. Respondents with fathers without a high school diploma are the omitted category.

Table 4: Logistic Regression Models Predicting Likelihood of Ever Having Cohabited, Weighted (N: 18,481)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.
Parents cohabited before marriage	1.698	***	1.213	*	1.416	**
<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>						
Age of respondent in years			0.989	***	0.989	***
R. is female			1.333	***	1.335	***
R. is a visible minority			0.517	***	0.518	***
R. is First Nations or Métis			2.431	***	2.428	***
R. did not graduate from high school			0.763	***	0.761	***
R. is associate's or trade school graduate			1.333	***	1.339	***
R. is a college graduate			1.054		1.057	
<i>Respondent First Language</i>						
First language is French			1.493	***	1.494	***
First language other than English or French			0.576	***	0.575	***
<i>Respondent Income</i>						
Annual income below \$20,000 CAN			0.620	***	0.618	***
Annual income above \$50,000 CAN			1.159	**	1.160	**
<i>Parental Education</i>						
Father is a high school graduate			0.929		0.928	
Father has associate's or is a trade school graduate			0.927		0.923	
Father is a college graduate			0.820	**	0.818	**
<i>Religious Attendance</i>						
Attends services at least once per month			0.513	***	0.512	***
Attends services once a week or more			0.286	***	0.287	***
<i>Parent Relationship Characteristics</i>						
Parents separated before R. was age 15			1.606	***	1.693	***
Parent Cohabitation x Parent Divorce					0.625	*
Constant	0.369	***	0.720	***	0.712	***

Note: *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. Omitted categories are high school graduates, native English speakers, annual income between \$20,000 and \$49,999 CAN, respondents with fathers without a high school diploma, and attending religious services less than monthly.

Table 5: Logistic Regression Models Predicting Likelihood of Ever Having Divorced, Weighted (N: 13,545)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.
Parents cohabited before marriage	0.750	†	0.713	†	0.558	***	0.897		0.463	**
Age at R. first marriage	0.930	***	0.912	***	0.892	***	0.891	***	0.891	***
<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>									1.000	
Age of respondent in years			1.009	***	1.027	***	1.027	***	1.027	***
R. is female			0.942		0.871	*	0.870	*	0.871	*
R. is a visible minority			0.691	**	0.896		0.894		0.894	
R. is First Nations or Métis			1.573	***	1.213		1.221		1.215	
R. did not graduate from high school			0.716	***	0.666	***	0.666	***	0.667	***
R. is associate's or trade school graduate			1.123		1.143		1.141	†	1.143	†
R. is a college graduate			0.955		1.047		1.047		1.047	
<i>Respondent First Language</i>										
First language is French			1.166		1.097		1.095		1.095	
First language other than English or French			0.719	***	0.855	†	0.851	*	0.857	
<i>Respondent Income</i>										
Annual income below \$20,000 CAN			0.897		0.872		0.872		0.874	
Annual income above \$50,000 CAN			1.033		1.015		1.016		1.015	
<i>Parental Education</i>										
Father is a high school graduate			1.027		1.012		1.012		1.012	
Father has associate's or is a trade school graduate			0.978		0.963		0.963		0.966	
Father is a college graduate			1.077		1.085		1.084		1.086	
<i>Religious Attendance</i>										
Attends services at least once per month			0.646	***	0.798	**	0.797	**	0.797	**

Attends services once a week or more	0.482	***	0.660	***	0.662	***	0.660	***		
<i>Parent Relationship Characteristics</i>										
Parents separated before R. was age 15	1.270	***	1.080		1.079		1.057			
Respondent ever cohabited			6.291	***	6.382	***	6.301	***		
Parent Cohabitation x Respondent Cohabitation					0.510					
Parent Cohabitation x Parent Divorce							1.558			
Constant	1.597	***	1.768	**	0.612	*	0.612	*	0.613	*

Note: †p<.06 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. Omitted categories are high school graduates, native English speakers, annual income between \$20,000 and \$49,999 CAN, respondents with fathers without a high school diploma, and attending religious services less than monthly.

Table 6: Logistic Regression Models Predicting Likelihood of Ever Having a Nonmarital Birth, Weighted (N: 18,481)

Variable	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.	Odds Ratio	Sig.
Parents cohabited before marriage	1.452	***	1.102		1.049		0.712		1.034	
<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>										
Age of respondent in years			0.998		1.002		1.002		1.002	
R. is female			1.178	**	1.071		1.071		1.071	
R. is a visible minority			1.269	*	1.612	***	1.613	***	1.611	***
R. is First Nations or Métis			3.224	***	2.580	***	2.578	***	2.581	***
R. did not graduate from high school			1.200	*	1.358	***	1.368	***	1.358	***
R. is associate's or trade school graduate			1.226	**	1.119		1.119		1.119	
R. is a college graduate			0.571	***	0.546	***	0.546	***	0.546	***
<i>Respondent First Language</i>										
First language is French			1.168		1.036		1.038		1.036	
First language other than English or French			0.580	***	0.671	***	0.672	***	0.671	***
<i>Respondent Income</i>										
Annual income below \$20,000 CAN			0.777	***	0.912		0.917		0.912	
Annual income above \$50,000 CAN			0.954		0.897		0.898		0.897	
<i>Parental Education</i>										
Father is a high school graduate			0.906		0.938		0.940		0.938	
Father has associate's or is a trade school graduate			0.807	*	0.832		0.836		0.833	
Father is a college graduate			0.670	***	0.714	**	0.714	**	0.714	**
<i>Religious Attendance</i>										
Attends services at least once per month			0.829		1.069		1.070		1.069	
Attends services once a week or more			0.603	***	0.885		0.878		0.885	

Parent Relationship Characteristics

Parents separated before R. was age 15	1.756	***	1.526	***	1.530	***	1.520	***
Respondent ever cohabited			5.677	***	5.438	***	5.678	***
Parent Cohabitation x Respondent Cohabitation					1.808	*		
Parent Cohabitation x Parent Divorce							1.037	
Constant	0.122	***	0.156	***	0.058	***	0.060	***

Note: †p<.06 *p<.05 **p<.01 ***p<.001. Omitted categories are high school graduates, native English speakers, annual income between \$20,000 and \$49,999 CAN, respondents with fathers without a high school diploma, and attending religious services less than monthly.

References

- Amato, P. R. (1996). Explaining the intergenerational transmission of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58(3), 628-640.
- Amato, P. R., & Booth, A. (1997). *A generation at risk: Growing up in an era of family upheaval*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Axinn, W. G., & Thornton, A. (1992). The relationship between cohabitation and divorce: Selectivity or causal influence? *Demography*, 29(3), 357-374.
- Axinn, W. G., & Thornton, A. (1993). Mothers, children, and cohabitation: The intergenerational effects of attitudes and behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 58(2), 233-246.
- Axinn, W. G., & Thornton, A. (1996). The influence of parents' marital dissolutions on children's attitudes toward family formation. *Demography*, 33(1), 66-81.
- Bachrach, C. A. (1987). Cohabitation and reproductive behavior in the US. *Demography*, 24(4), 623-637.
- Bennett, N. G., Blanc, A. K., & Bloom, D. E. (1988). Commitment and the modern union: Assessing the link between premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital stability. *American Sociological Review*, 53(1), 127-138.

- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). *American couples*. New York: Morrow.
- Bumpass, L., & Lu, H. H. (2000). Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the United States. *Population Studies*, 54(1), 29-41.
- Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., & England, P. (2004). Union formation in fragile families. *Demography*, 41(2), 237-261.
- Coontz, S. (2004). The world historical transformation of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 974-979.
- DeMaris, A., & MacDonald, W. (1993). Premarital cohabitation and marital instability: A test of the unconventionality hypothesis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55(2), 399-407.
- Dush, C. M. K., Cohan, C. L., & Amato, P. R. (2003). The relationship between cohabitation and marital quality and stability: Change across cohorts? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65(3), 539-549.
- Freid, V., Prager, K., MacKay, A., & Xia, H. (2003). Chartbook on trends in the health of Americans: Health, United States, 2003. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Graham, J. W., Olchowski, A. E., & Gilreath, T. D. (2007). How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. *Prevention Science*, 8(3), 206-213.

- Heimdal, K. R., & Houseknecht, S. K. (2003). Cohabiting and married couples' income organization: Approaches in Sweden and the United States. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65(3), 525-538.
- Heuveline, P., & Timberlake, J. M. (2004). The role of cohabitation in family formation: The United States in comparative perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(5), 1214-1230.
- Landale, N. S., Oropesa, R. S., & Llanes, D. (1998). Schooling, work, and idleness among Mexican and Non-Latino white adolescents. *Social Science Research*, 27(4), 457-480.
- Le Bourdais, C., & Lapierre-Adamcyk, E. (2004). Changes in conjugal life in Canada: Is cohabitation progressively replacing marriage? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 929-942.
- Lehrer, E. (2000). Religion as a determinant of entry into cohabitation and marriage. In L. J. Waite, & C. Bachrach (Eds.), *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation* (pp. 227-252). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lichter, D. T., & Qian, Z. (2008). Serial cohabitation and the marital life course. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(4), 861-878.
- Lillard, L. A., Brien, M. J., & Waite, L. J. (1995). Premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital dissolution: A matter of self-selection?". *Demography*, 32(3), 437-457.

- Manning, W. D., & Lamb, K. A. (2003). Adolescent well-being in cohabiting, married, and single-parent families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65(4), 876-893.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2005). Measuring and modeling cohabitation: New perspectives from qualitative data. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 67(4), 989-1002.
- Raley, R. K. (2001). Increasing fertility in cohabiting unions: Evidence for the second demographic transition in the United States? *Demography*, 38(1), 59-66.
- Raley, R. K., & Wildsmith, E. (2004). Cohabitation and children's family instability. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(1), 210-219.
- Rindfuss, R. R., & VandenHeuvel, A. (1990). Cohabitation: A precursor to marriage or an alternative to being single? *Population and Development Review*, 16(4), 703-726.
- Royston, P. (2004). Multiple imputation of missing values. *Stata Journal*, 4, 227-241.
- Schoen, R., Landale, N. S., & Daniels, K. (2007). Family transitions in young adulthood. *Demography*, 44(4), 807-820.
- Smock, P. J. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings, and implications. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 1-20.
- Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., & Markman, H. J. (2006). Sliding versus deciding: Inertia and the premarital cohabitation effect. *Family Relations*, 55(4), 499-509.

- Statistics Canada. (2002). *Changing conjugal life in Canada* No. Catalogue no. 89-576-XIE). Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2009). *Ethnic origin and visible minorities, 2006 census* No. Catalogue no. 97-562-GWE2006025). Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Tach, L., & Halpern-Meehin, S. (2009). How does premarital cohabitation affect trajectories of marital quality? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(2), 298-317.
- Teachman, J. D. (2002). Childhood living arrangements and the intergenerational transmission of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64(3), 717-729.
- Teachman, J. D. (2003). Premarital sex, premarital cohabitation, and the risk of subsequent marital dissolution among women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65(2), 444-455.
- Teachman, J. D., & Polonko, K. A. (1990). Cohabitation and marital stability in the United States. *Social Forces*, 69(1), 207-220.
- Thornton, A. (1985). Reciprocal influences of family and religion in a changing world. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 47(2), 381-394.
- Thornton, A. (1991). Influence of the marital history of parents on the marital and cohabitational experiences of children. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 96(4), 868-894.

- Thornton, A., Axinn, W. G., & Teachman, J. D. (1995). The influence of school enrollment and accumulation on cohabitation and marriage in early adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 60(5), 762-774.
- Treas, J., & Giesen, D. (2000). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(1), 48-60.
- Winkler, A. E. (1997). Economic decision-making by cohabitators: Findings regarding income pooling. *Applied Economics*, 29(8), 1079-1090.
- Wu, L. L., Bumpass, L. L., & Musick, K. (2001). Historical and life course trajectories of nonmarital childbearing. In L. Wu, & B. L. Wolfe (Eds.), *Out of Wedlock: Causes and Consequences of Nonmarital Fertility* (pp. 3-48). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Wu, L. L., & Musick, K. (2008). Stability of marital and cohabiting unions following a first birth. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 27(6), 713-727.
- Wu, Z. (2000). *Cohabitation: An alternative form of family living*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.