

Love or Money?

Marriage Intentions among Young Cohabitors in Norway and Sweden

Kenneth Aarskaug Wiik*, Eva Bernhardt**, and Turid Noack***

Preliminary version: Please do not quote without permission of the authors

Abstract

Most studies find that cohabitators report lower level of relationship quality, are poorer, less educated, and have a higher risk of splitting up. Union formation is, however, a process whereby many cohabitators eventually marry. This could imply that some of the differences between the union types are due to the fact that cohabiting and married couples are at different stages in this process. Using survey data from Norway and Sweden on individuals aged 25 to 35 ($N = 1,597$), this paper examines the association between own and partner's socioeconomic resources, demographic and attitudinal variables, and variables related to relationship quality on the one hand and cohabitators' marriage expectations on the other. Of the 1,552 cohabitators who responded to the question, 20% ($n = 310$) are planning to marry their current partners within the next two years. Preliminary multivariate results indicate that being university educated and having a highly educated partner significantly increase the likelihood that cohabitators intend to marry. Further, cohabiting couples who have common children are more likely to express an intent to marry than childless. Our results also show that cohabitators whose most friends are married are more inclined to have marriage plans. Also, being satisfied with, and committed to, the current union significantly increases the likelihood of intending to marry. Separate analyses for men and women reveal that age and union commitment are stronger predictors of women's marriage intentions. Men's marriage intentions, on the other hand, seem to be stronger influenced by the duration of the relationship.

*Statistics Norway, Research Department (kaw@ssb.no)

**Stockholm University, Sociology Department (eva.bernhardt@sociology.su.se)

***Statistics Norway, Research Department (tno@ssb.no)

Introduction

The literature on differences and similarities between married and cohabiting couples is fairly extensive, in particular with respect to relationship quality and socioeconomic status. Previous studies find that cohabitators in general are less satisfied and committed (Nock, 1995; Hansen, Moum, & Shapiro, 2007; Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004), poorer and less educated (Kravdal, 1999; Xie, Raymo, & Goyette, 2003), and have a higher risk of splitting up, even when they have common children (e.g. Liefbroer & Dourleijn, 2006; Skrede, Noack, Seierstad, & Wiik, 2007). A problem with parts of this research is, however, that cohabitation and marriage are not mutually exclusive phenomena. Rather, union formation is more often a process whereby many cohabitators eventually marry. This could imply that some of the differences between individuals and couples living in the two union types are due to the fact that they are at different stages in this process.

When researchers started to pay attention to the phenomenon of cohabitation, family scholars discussed whether unmarried cohabitation should be interpreted as a prelude to marriage or as an alternative to marriage (cf. Heuveline & Timberlake, 2004). In opposition to this, Rindfuss and VandenHeuvel (1990) argued that cohabitation should be seen as an alternative to being single. So, two aspects of cohabiting relationships seem to be crucial: the degree to which they are committed to each other and/or the relationship, and whether or not the partners have plans to marry. Accordingly, controlling for such aspects as length of relationship, presence of and/or plans to have children, and socioeconomic characteristics, Bernhardt, Noack, and Wiik (2007) found that cohabitators without marriage plans are less serious, less satisfied, and more often consider to split up from their current relationships than married respondents. Cohabiting couples with plans to marry are, on the other hand, more similar to those already married than to cohabitators without marriage plans.

Taking advantage of recent survey data from Norway and Sweden, this paper sets out to examine the association between own and partner's socioeconomic resources, demographic and attitudinal variables, and variables related to relationship commitment and quality on the one hand and young cohabitators' marriage expectations on the other. By including relationship commitment and satisfaction variables, we will try to determine whether "love" or demographic and socioeconomic variables are the most important predictors of cohabitators' marriage intentions.

Background and previous research

Norway and Sweden are countries where living together without being married is more widespread than in most other countries, and where cohabitation is nearly completely socially acceptable and has been a well-established phenomenon for several decades. For instance, about 90% of first partnerships are cohabitations (Duvander, 1999; Wiik, forthcoming) and nearly half of all first births are born in consensual unions in Sweden and Norway (Statistics Norway, 2008a; Statistics Sweden, 2008). Also, cohabiting couples have gradually been given many of the same rights and obligations as married couples (Noack, 2001).

Nonetheless, the majority will still end up getting married. According to official statistics for 45-year olds, it applies to 63% of men and 72% of the women in Sweden and the corresponding figures for Norway are 73% for men and 81% for women (Statistics Norway, 2008b; Statistics Sweden, 2008). Survey data also show that a majority of young cohabitators expect to get married eventually (Bernhardt, 2002; Lyngstad & Noack, 2005).

Economic determinants of marriage among cohabitators

A broad range of empirical research has documented that single individuals are more likely to marry or cohabit the higher their own as well as their partners' socioeconomic resources are.

For instance, several studies have found that education and earnings affect men's and women's union formation positively (Ono, 2003; Wiik, forthcoming), and that both men and women are more likely to marry a partner with higher education and earnings than themselves (Raley & Bratter 2004; Sweeney & Cancian, 2004). Further, being employed full-time increases the likelihood that both men and women marry (Oppenheimer, Kalmijn, & Lim, 1997; Sassler & Goldscheider, 2004). There is also some evidence that home ownership increase the likelihood of marrying, at least for men (Lloyd & South, 1996).

Numerous studies have underscored the importance of economic factors on the transition to marriage for cohabitators. Regarding cohabitators' transition to marriage, several authors have found positive effects of socioeconomic factors. First, higher educated male and female cohabitators display a significantly higher likelihood of marrying their partners compared with lower educated cohabitators (Bernhardt, 2002; Manning & Smock, 2002). In Sweden, Duvander (1999) found that female cohabitators whose partners' education was high had an increased likelihood of marrying. Further, Manning and Smock (2002) showed that being employed part time is positively associated with marriage expectations compared to full-time employment, whereas Wu and Pollard (2000) reported that professional and semi-professional cohabiting men are more apt to marry their partners. Moreover, the findings of Manning and Smock (2002) indicate that cohabiting couples where both male and female partner have a high socioeconomic status or couples where female is low and male high have the highest probability of expecting to marry.

Also, having a partner whose income is high could be positively related to planning to marry. Such a partner is more likely to contribute to the household economy, and could bring social status and prestige to the couple. Although the distinct roles of men and women as breadwinners and homemakers are fading in Scandinavia (Ellingsæter, 2006), the effect of partners' income could depend on respondents' sex. That is, because men still do the majority

of paid work and women bear the main responsibility for home work, women's marriage intentions might be more influenced by their partners' earnings than vice versa. In line with this assumption, prior research from the U.S. has documented that the marriage intentions of female cohabitators might be more influenced by their partners' earnings than vice versa and that education have a stronger positive influence on men's decision to marry (Brown, 2000).

Drawing on in-depth interviews with cohabitators from the working and lower middle classes in the U.S., Smock, Manning, and Porter (2005) found that financial issues were important for the decision to marry. Their results showed that these cohabitators did not want to marry before they had an "economic package" including home ownership and financial stability (Smock, Manning, & Porter, 2005). Correspondingly, financial concerns were found to be an important obstacle to marriage among cohabiting parental couples in the U.S. (Gibson-Davis, Edin, & McLanahan, 2005). Investments in joint property can also encourage the formalization of a cohabiting relationship. In line with this assumption, Mulder and Smits (1999) have argued that the transition to home-ownership is primarily made by stable couples "settling down" to form a family. Moreover, it can be expensive to marry and to have a wedding party. Thus, one should expect wealthy individuals and couples to be more marriage prone than other couples. Accordingly, Kalmijn (2004) found that an improvement in the financial position increased the likelihood of giving a large wedding party.

Relationship assessments and marriage intentions

Although there is a strong association between socioeconomic variables and marriage, love is probably the most important reason to marry in present day western societies. In fact, romantic love is what characterizes the modern marriage (Coontz, 2005). As argued by Amato (2007), surprisingly little research on marriage has tried to incorporate romantic love into their models. Love can be defined as a strong emotional bond between partners that

involves sexual desire, a preference to put the other person's or the couple's interests ahead of one's own, and willingness to forgive the other person's transgressions (Amato, 2007, p. 307).

Stanley and Markman (1992) conceive of interpersonal commitment as having two components, namely “dedication” and “constraint.” Whereas “dedication commitment” refers to a desire to be with the partner and to prioritize the relationship, “constraint commitment” captures various actual or perceived costs of exiting a union (i.e., legal procedures to obtain a divorce or the possible loss of joint property or common friends). Dedication commitment could be conceptualized as one component of love, and we expect cohabitators who are committed to their current unions to be more likely to intend to marry than cohabitators who are less committed. Moreover, the findings of Brown (2000) show that cohabitators who were satisfied with their current partnerships were more likely to marry compared with those living in relationships of lower quality. Similarly, Gibson-Davis et al. (2005) reported that poor relationship quality was a barrier to marriage among cohabiting parental couples. Thus, we anticipate relationship quality to be positively related to marriage intentions.

Other non-economic determinants of cohabitators' decision to marry

Couples with common children are more committed to the union than couples with no common children (Bernhardt, Noack, & Wiik, 2007). One reason could be that joint children in the relationship act as “glue” in situations where a break-up would otherwise be a likely solution, and as shown for Sweden by Gähler, Hong, and Bernhardt (forthcoming) union dissolution risks are significantly lower when there are joint children in the relationship. According to Stanley and Markman (1992), joint children create “internal constraint commitment,” and they argue that the greatest increase in constraint commitment may come when couples have children. However, at the same time as children are viewed as evidence of commitment, they may act as relationship stressors (Brown & Booth, 1996). It has been

shown that both presence of children and prior cohabitation experience are significantly associated with lower levels of relationship quality (Brown, 2004). Having common children has been found to increase the chances of marrying a cohabiting partner (Manning & Smock, 1995). Bernhardt (2002) found, on the other hand, no significant effect of parenthood on the marriage plans of young adults in Sweden. Further, the presence of step children in the household have been found to be associated with a lower relationship quality (e.g., Brown, 2004), as well as a higher divorce risk (Clarke-Stewart & Brentano, 2006). Therefore, we anticipate a negative relation between prior union(s), the presence of step children in the household and cohabitators' marriage plans. On the other hand, the findings of Moors & Bernhardt (2008) indicate that cohabiting couples planning to have children are more likely to marry and less likely to separate. Accordingly, we expect to find that couples with plans to have children are more likely to have marriage plans than those without plans to have children.

Also, partner homogamy has been found to be related to union outcomes. Previous research has found that married and cohabiting couples that are heterogamous with respect to traits such as age and education have a higher risk of splitting up than what is the case for homogamous couples (Brines & Joyner, 1999; Goldstein & Harknett, 2006), whereas educational heterogamy influences marital satisfaction negatively (Tynes, 1990). One reason why homogamous couples should be more satisfied with and committed to their current unions and less likely to split up than heterogamous couples, could be that they fit together better and share "a common universe of discourse" (DiMaggio & Mohr, 1985, p. 1234). Because age and educational homogamy positively influence relationship quality, we expect homogamous cohabiting couples to be more likely to expect marriage than heterogamous couples. In the present analyses we test this assumption by including measures on age and educational homogamy.

Further, being religious is often associated with traditional attitudes toward marriage and family life in general. That is, young adults who are more religious have substantially higher marriage rates and lower cohabitation rates than those who are less religious (Wiik, forthcoming), and several studies find that religion decreases the risk of divorce (Clarke-Stewart & Brentano, 2006). In Norway, Lyngstad and Noack (2005) found that religiosity was associated with a significantly increase in marriage plans among young unmarried men. Bernhardt (2002) reported a positive effect on marriage intentions of being religious among Swedish unmarried men and women aged 22 to 30. However, she found no association between religiosity and cohabiting couples plans to marry.

Also, social approval of living together without being married could influence whether cohabitators decide to get married. Expectations from parents, families of origin, and friends could be of special importance, as shown in a Swedish study of choice of union type (Åberg, 2003). In the Netherlands, Kalmijn (2004) showed that individuals whose most friends married directly more often chose to have a church wedding.

Data and method

Sample

We utilize data from two nationally representative postal surveys conducted in 2003: The Swedish survey of *Family and Working Life in the 21st Century*, and the Norwegian *New Families Survey*. The data collection was carried out by Statistics Sweden and Statistics Norway for the two countries respectively. Both surveys include questions about respondents' plans, expectation, and attitudes regarding family and working life. Information about their current situation and background characteristics was also included. In addition, some information, such as the respondent's education, was taken from administrative registers.

For most questions (including our outcome variable) the wordings and scaling are very similar, so comparisons between data from the two countries should not be problematic. However, sampling designs differ slightly between the two surveys. The Norwegian sample consists of men aged 23 to 47 and women aged 20 to 44 years who have at least one Norwegian-born parent ($N = 6,317$), whereas the Swedish data set comprise a representative sample of individuals with two Swedish-born parents who were 22, 26, 30, or 34 years old at the time of the survey ($N = 2,273$). Overall response rates were 63.3 % in Norway and 70.7 % in Sweden. In the present analysis we are interested in individuals aged 25 to 35 who were living as cohabitators at time of the interview. After excluding respondents younger than 25 ($n = 1,317$, 15.3%) and Norwegian respondents older than 35 ($n = 2,683$, 31.2%), as well as married respondents ($n = 1,326$) and those without a co-residential partner ($n = 1,667$, 19.4%), our final combined data set comprises 1,597 male and female cohabitators.

Measure of dependent variable and statistical approach

Our dependent variable, marriage intentions, was measured by responses to a question asking currently cohabiting respondents whether or not they were planning to marry their partner. For cohabitators with marriage plans the response categories were: *yes, within the next two years*, or *yes, at some later time*. The dependent variable was then operationalized as follows: respondents who plan to marry within the next two years were coded 1, whereas those with no marriage intentions and those who intend to marry their partners eventually were coded 0. The respondents who had not responded to the question ($n = 45$, 2.8%) were omitted.

We use binominal logistic regression given our dichotomous dependent variable. The coefficients are interpreted as odds ratios (exponentiated β). The odds ratio is the relatively higher or lower likelihood that cohabitators in one group will intend to marry their partners compared with one in the reference group. Cohabitators with definite marriage plans could,

however, be different from those who think they will eventually marry their current partners. Treating cohabitators with less definite marriage plans as a separate category in supplementary multinomial logistic regression models revealed that the effects of the independent variables were in the same directions as for cohabitators with definite marriage plans.

We report two separate models of cohabitators' likelihood of intending to marry their current partner within the next two years versus not intending to marry (Table 2). To tap the possible relation between cohabitators' economic resources and marriage intentions, in the first model we analyze the importance of the cohabitators' and their current partners' level of annual income and education. In this model, we also address the influence of demographic factors (i.e., age, previous union(s), whether or not the couple has any common children, and/or step children). The second model includes the explanatory variables measuring relationship quality, religiosity, and intentions to have (more) common children. A variable measuring whether most of the cohabitators' friends are married captures any effect of a social pressure to marry. As these factors could influence male and female cohabitators' marriage intentions differently, separate regression models are computed for men and women (Table 3).

Independent variables

We include a range of variables that could influence cohabitators' marriage intentions. First, the respondents are grouped into three different age groups: 26, 30, and 34. As the Swedish survey sampled individuals at specific ages whereas the Norwegian survey sampled individuals over a longer age range, we group Norwegian individuals one year older and one year younger together with the actual age group. For example, for the Swedish age group 26, we use Norwegian respondents aged 25-27. Moreover, by subtracting the age of the partner from the age of the respondent, we made a dummy variable to control for age homogamy in the couple. When the age difference between the respondent and his or her partner is less than

five years, they are coded as age homogamous (1). Age heterogamous couples are coded zero. A four category variable captures the duration of the present co-residential relationship in years. The four categories are: 0-1 year; 2-4 years; 5-7 years; and 8 years and above. Also, a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent has experienced previous marital and/or non-marital union(s) was incorporated in the analyses. This dummy was coded one if he or she has experience from one or more previous unions and zero otherwise. Another dummy variable measures any effect of the respondent's sex.

Further, we include a variable to control for the presence of biological children of the couple in the household. This variable was coded one if the couple has one or more biological children. Couples with no common biological children in the household are coded zero. Also, an indicator for presence of step children in the household is included. If the respondent or his or her partner has prior children who are living in the household, this variable is set to one. When no step children are present in the household, this variable is set to zero.

Gross annual income before taxes and transfers in 2002 was reported by the respondent for him- or herself as well as for the partner in seven categories from "less than 100 000 Kroners" to "500 000 Kroners and over." Because the groupings of the original variables differ somewhat between the two surveys, these variables were regrouped as a dummy with the value of 1 if he or she was earning a "high" income and 0 otherwise. The threshold for earning a high income was set to more than 300 000 Kroners. Next, we made a variable measuring whether the respondent and his or her partner have the same level of annual income (1), or whether the partner's income is higher (2) or lower (3) than the respondent's. Information about respondents' education was taken from administrative registers, whereas information on partners' education was reported by the respondents. Both variables were measured at time of the survey. Individual educational attainment was grouped into two categories depending on whether respondents had completed any education at university level

(1) or not (0). The educational composition of the couple is captured by a variable measuring whether they have the same level of education (primary, secondary, tertiary) (1), or whether the respondents' partner has a higher (2), or lower education (3).

In order to capture various aspects of the degree to which cohabitators are satisfied with and committed to their present relationship, we utilize two variables. The first of these, *relationship seriousness*, was measured by responses to a question asking respondents to rate the seriousness of their present partnership (i.e., to what degree respondents are dedicated to the partnership). The wording and scaling of these questions were, however, slightly different in the two surveys. Whereas the Swedish respondents were asked to range the seriousness of their present union on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 (= *very serious*), the Norwegians were asked to scale their commitment from 1 through 10 (= *very committed*). Thus, for purposes of comparison, we dichotomized the answers according to whether respondents view their unions as more (1) or less (0) serious. Values 9 and 10 in the Norwegian survey and 5 in the Swedish were coded as more serious. Secondly, partnership quality was tapped by asking respondents how *satisfied they were with their current union*. Originally a variable with values ranging from 1 (= *very dissatisfied*) to 5 (= *very satisfied*), this variable was regrouped as a dummy variable indicating whether respondents were very (value 5 on the original variable) or moderately to less satisfied (values 1, 2, 3, and 4) with their partnership. We choose this method because the number of respondents rating their current relationship as not satisfying was low in both surveys (only about 6 % have a value 3 or lower).

Religious belief was measured by responses to a question asking respondents to rate the importance that she or he attaches to religion on a scale ranging from 1 to 5 (higher values indicate higher importance). This covariate was then dichotomized, with one meaning that religion is an important or very important aspect of the respondent's everyday life. Further, to tap any effect of the orientation of friends, we include a variable measuring whether most of

the cohabitators' friends are married. This variable is coded 1 if most of their friends are married and 0 otherwise. Also, respondents were asked if they plan to have (more) common children. Respondents with preferences for (more) children were coded one, whereas those without plans to have (more) children were coded zero. Last, a dummy variable was included to capture any effect of country, with Norwegian respondents being the reference group.

Results

Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 1. Of the 1,552 cohabitators who responded to the question, 20% ($n = 310$) were planning to marry their current partners within the next two years. Table 1 also shows that a significantly higher share ($p < .05$) of the cohabitators who intend to marry live in age homogamous relationships (± 4 years), and that more cohabitators with intentions to marry have completed education at university level and have a high annual income (i.e. more than 300,000 Kroners). Further, these descriptive statistics also indicate that cohabitators intending to marry are significantly more committed to and satisfied with their current unions than cohabitators without intentions to marry. Also, cohabitators with intent to marry have higher annual income and more frequently have common children or express a desire to have children in the future. Finally, a significantly higher share of cohabitators with marriage plans have friends who are married (See Table 1).

The results from the multivariate analyses of the full sample are shown in Table 2. First, we note that female respondents are less likely to report marriage intentions compared with male respondents. Net of the other variables included in the model, this reduction in the odds of planning to marry within the next two years by being a woman amounts to 25%. As expected, Model 2 of Table 2 indicates that having common children is positively associated with planning to marry; respondents who have one or more common children with their

current partner are 63% more prone to report marriage intentions relative to cohabitators without common children.

[About here Table 1]

Turning to the effects of the socioeconomic variables, Table 2 shows that being university educated significantly increases the likelihood that cohabitators intend to marry within the next two years. Controlling for sociodemographic variables and the variables related to relationship quality, satisfaction and plans and evaluations, cohabitators who have completed a university degree (any tertiary education) are over two times as likely to plan to marry their current partners relative to cohabitators who have not completed any university education. Further, cohabitators whose partners have higher education than themselves are more prone to plan to marry than those who are educational homogamous. When controlling for respondents' other characteristics, having a partner with a higher level of education than oneself is associated with 95% higher odds of marriage intentions compared with cohabitators whose partners have the same level of education as themselves.

We set out to assess the role of non-economic and non-demographic aspects of the cohabitators and their relationships by examining the effects of relationship commitment, birth plans, marital status of friends and religious orientation. Not surprisingly, our data confirm that cohabitators with plans to have children and those who are most serious and satisfied more often plan to marry their current partners, net of the socioeconomic and sociodemographic variables included. To begin with, cohabitators with plans to have (more) children with their current partner have a 37% increased likelihood of intending to marry their partners compared with cohabitators without such plans. Further, being satisfied with, and committed to, the current union significantly increases the likelihood of intending to marry within the next two years. Cohabitators who view their unions as very serious (i.e., committed) and those who are most satisfied with their relationships are twice as likely to intend to marry their partners

compared with cohabitators who are less committed and satisfied (see Table 2). Last, we note that having a majority of married friends positively influence the marriage intentions of young cohabitators in Norway and Sweden, net of their sociodemographic and socioeconomic characteristics and relationship quality. Cohabitators whose most friends are married are 89% more likely to planning to marry compared with cohabitators whose most friends are single or cohabiting.

[About here Table 2]

Comparing Model 1 and 2, we see that the effect of individual annual income loses its effect and becomes statistically non-significant ($p < .10$) when including the variables related to relationship quality, satisfaction, birth plans, and whether or not the majority of respondents' friends are married. Also, the effect of being age homogamous is reduced and becomes non-significant when adding these variables.

As mentioned, there are reasons to expect that different factors influence men's and women's marriage intentions. The results from the separate analyses for men and women are presented in Table 3. To assess whether the differences between women and men are statistically significant, we have added interaction terms between gender and the other independent variables in a pooled logistic regression model. These models reveal that age and union commitment are stronger predictors of women's marriage intentions, whereas duration of the current union influences the marriage intentions of the male respondents (statistically significant interactions ($p < .10$)). First, women in the oldest age group (34 years) are 47% less likely to have definite marriage intentions compared with women who are 30 years old. Next, women who are most committed to their unions are over four times as likely to plan to marry as those who are less committed.

Men's marriage intentions, on the other hand, seem to be significantly stronger influenced by the duration of their current relationship. As shown in Table 3, men whose current unions

have lasted for 0 to 1 year are 46% less likely to have marriage intentions relative to men who have lived their present partner between 2 to 4 years. And, although the interactions between these variables and gender fail to reach statistical significance ($p < .10$), men who have a high annual income (300,000 Kroner or more) and those whose partners have a higher annual income than themselves are more likely to plan to marry than other men. On the other hand, having children from prior unions positively influence the marriage intentions of the female sub sample.

[About here Table 3]

Results from separate analyses for Sweden and Norway are shown in the Appendix. With the exception of individual annual income and having a partner whose income is higher than ones own, the overall effects of the independent variables are similar in the two sub samples. None of the interactions between these variables and country are, however, significant.

References

- Amato, P. R. (2007). Transformative processes in marriage: Some thoughts from a sociologist. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 305-309.
- Becker, G. S. (1991). *A treatise on the family*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Bernhardt, E. (2002). Cohabitation and marriage among young adults in Sweden: Attitudes, expectations and plans. In J. Carling (Ed.), *Nordic demography: Trends and differentials* (pp. 157-170). Oslo: Unipub.
- Bernhardt, E., Noack, T., & Wiik, K. Aa. (2007). Cohabitation and commitment: Is cohabitation really indistinguishable from marriage in Norway and Sweden? Paper presented at the PAA Annual Meetings in New York, April 2007.
- Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 333-355.

- Brown, S. L. (2000). Union transitions among cohabitators: The significance of relationship assessments and expectations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 833-846.
- Brown, S. L. (2004). Moving from cohabitation to marriage: Effects on relationship quality. *Social Science Research*, 33, 1-19.
- Brown, S. L., & Booth, A. (1996). Cohabitation versus marriage: A comparison of relationship quality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 668 – 678.
- Coontz, S. (2005). *Marriage, a history: how love conquered marriage*. New York: Penguin.
- DiMaggio, P., & Mohr, J. (1985). Cultural capital, educational attainment, and marital selection, *American Journal of Sociology*, 90, 1231-61.
- Duvander, A. Z. (1999). The transition from cohabitation to marriage. A longitudinal study of the propensity to marry in Sweden in the early 1990s. *Journal of Family Issues*, 20, 698-717.
- Gähler, M., Hong, Y., & Bernhardt, E. (forthcoming). Parental divorce and union disruption among young adults in Sweden. *Journal of Family Issues*.
- Gibson-Davis, C. M., Edin, K., & McLanahan, S. (2005). High hopes but even higher expectations: The retreat from marriage among low-income couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1301-1312.
- Goldstein, J. R., & Harknett, K. (2006). Parenting across racial and class lines: Who are married, cohabiting, dating or no longer romantically involved? *Social Forces*, 85, 121-143.
- Hansen, T., Moum, T., & Shapiro, A. (2007). Relational and Individual Well-being among Cohabitators and Married Individuals in Midlife: Recent trends from Norway. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28, 910-933.
- Heuveline, P., & Timberlake, J. (2004). The role of cohabitation in family formation: The United States in comparative perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 1214-1230.

- Kalmijn, M. (2004). Marriage rituals as reinforcers of role transitions: An analysis of weddings in the Netherlands. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 582-594.
- Kravdal, Ø. (1999). Does marriage require a stronger economic underpinning than informal cohabitation? *Population Studies*, 53, 63-80.
- Liefbroer, A. C., & Dourleijn, E. (2006). Unmarried cohabitation and union stability: Testing the role of diffusion using data from 16 European countries. *Demography*, 43, 203-221.
- Lloyd, K. M., & South, S. J. (1996). Contextual influence on young men's transition to first marriage. *Social Forces*, 74, 1097-1119.
- Lyngstad, T. H., & Noack, T. (2005). Vil de velge bort familien? En studie av unge nordmenns fruktbarhets- og ekteskapsintensjoner. *Tidsskrift for Velferdsforskning*, 8, 120-134.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1995). Why marry? Race and the transition to marriage among cohabiters. *Demography*, 32, 509-520.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2002). First comes cohabitation and then comes marriage? *Journal of Family Issues*, 23, 1065-1087.
- Manning, W. D., Longmore, M. A., & Giordano, P. C. (2007). The changing institution of marriage: Adolescents' expectations to cohabit and to marry. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 559-575.
- Moors, G. & Bernhardt, E. (2008). Splitting up or getting married? Competing risk analysis of transitions among cohabiting couples in Sweden. *Stockholm research Reports in Demography*, 2008, 1.
- Mulder, C. & Smits, J. (1999). First-time home-ownership of couples: The effect of intergenerational transmission. *European Sociological Review*, 15, 323-337.
- Nock, S. L. (1995). A comparison of marriages and cohabiting relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 16, 53-76.

- Oppenheimer, V. K., Kalmijn, M., & Lim, N. (1997). Men's career development and marriage timing during a period of rising inequality. *Demography*, 34, 311-330.
- Rindfuss, R. & A. VandenHeuvel (1990). Cohabitation: A precursor to marriage or an alternative to being single? *Population and Development Review*, 16, 703-726.
- Sassler, S., & Goldscheider, F. (2004). Revisiting Jane Austen's theory of marriage timing. Changes in union formation among American men in the late 20th century. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25, 139-166.
- Skrede, K., Noack, T., Seierstad, A., & Wiik, K. Aa. (2007). Risk of dissolution of families with children. An analysis of cohabiting and married parental couples. Unpublished manuscript.
- Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Porter, M. (2005). "Everything's there except money": How money shapes decisions to marry among cohabitators. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 680-696.
- Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (1992). Assessing commitment in personal relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 54, 595 – 608.
- Stanley, S. M., Whitton, S. W., & Markman, H. J. (2004). Maybe I do. Interpersonal Commitment and Premarital or Nonmarital Cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues*, 25, 496-519.
- Statistics Norway (2008a). Population statistics. Births 2006. <http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/02/02/10/fodte_en/>[Retrieved February 19, 2008].
- Statistics Norway (2008b). Population statistics. Population by age, sex, marital status and citizenship. 1 January 2006. <<http://www.ssb.no/folkemengde/arkiv/tab-2006-03-09-31.html>>[Retrieved February 19, 2008].
- Statistics Sweden (2008). Special calculations from the population statistics.
- Tynes, S. R. (1990). Educational heterogamy and marital satisfaction between spouses. *Social*

Science Research, 19, 153-174.

Wiik, K. Aa. (forthcoming). You'd better wait! Socioeconomic background and timing of first marriage vs. first cohabitation. *European Sociological Review*.

Wu, Z. & Pollard, M. S., (2000). Economic circumstances and the stability of nonmarital cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues*. 21, 303-328.

Xie, Y., Raymo, J. M., Goyette, K., & Thornton A. (2003). Economic potential and entry into marriage and cohabitation. *Demography*, 40, 351-367.

Åberg, Y. (2003). *Social interactions. Studies of contextual effects and endogenous processes*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of cohabitators with and without intentions to marry their current partner within the next two years

Variables	<i>M</i> / %	<i>SD</i>	Range	Plans	No plans
				<i>M</i> / %	<i>M</i> / %
Intend to marry	0.20	0.40	0 – 1		
Age					
26	37.0%			33.9%	37.9%
30	34.9%			39.3%	33.8%
34	28.1%			26.8%	28.3%
Age homogamous *	0.73	0.44	0 – 1	0.80	0.72
Female	0.55	0.50		0.52	0.56
Duration union					
0 – 1 years	20.0%			17.4%	20.5%
2 – 4 years	33.2%			36.1%	32.4%
5 – 7 years	24.9%			27.1%	24.4%
> 7 years	22.0%			19.4%	22.7%
Previous union(s)	0.38	0.49	0 – 1	0.39	0.37
Common children	0.36	0.48	0 – 1	0.51	0.48
Step children	0.14	0.34	0 – 1	0.13	0.14
University education *	0.43	0.49	0 – 1	0.52	0.40
Couple's education					
Homogamous	58.1%			58.4%	58.5%
Partner >	15.4%			18.4%	14.7%
Partner <	26.5%			23.2%	26.7%
Own income high *	0.22	0.41	0 – 1	0.28	0.21
Couple's income					
Homogamous	39.6%			40.3%	39.8%
Partner >	31.9%			31.0%	32.2%
Partner <	28.4%			28.7%	28.0%
Birth plans *	0.61	0.49	0 – 1	0.70	0.59
Committed *	0.80	0.40	0 – 1	0.91	0.77
Satisfied *	0.63	0.48	0 – 1	0.79	0.59
Most friends married *	0.13	0.34	0 – 1	0.19	0.12
Religious	0.10	0.30	0 – 1	0.13	0.10
Country					
Norway	49.8%			45.5%	51.9%
Sweden	50.2%			54.5%	48.1%

*Results from *t*-tests significant at $p < .05$

Table 2 Logistic regression analyses of intending to marry the current partner within two years ($N = 1,527$)

Variable	Model 1			Model 2		
	<i>b</i>	<i>se b</i>	<i>e^b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>se b</i>	<i>e^b</i>
Sociodemographic variables						
Age (30 years = ref)						
26 years	-0.19	0.17	0.83	-0.23	0.17	0.80
34 years	-0.21	0.17	0.81	-0.23	0.18	0.80
Age homogamous	0.37*	0.16	1.45	0.26	0.17	1.30
Female	-0.20	0.16	0.82	-0.29†	0.17	0.75
Duration union (2 – 4 years = ref)						
0 – 1 year	-0.20	0.19	0.82	-0.23	0.21	0.79
5 – 7 years	-0.08	0.17	0.92	-0.13	0.18	0.88
> 7 years	-0.35	0.22	0.71	-0.36	0.23	0.70
Previous union(s)	0.09	0.16	1.09	0.03	0.16	1.03
Common children	0.36*	0.16	1.43	0.49**	0.16	1.63
Step children	0.17	0.21	1.19	0.25	0.22	1.29
Socioeconomic variables						
University education	0.75***	0.16	2.11	0.77***	0.17	2.15
Couple's education (Homogamous = ref)						
Partner >	0.59**	0.20	1.80	0.67**	0.21	1.95
Partner <	-0.34*	0.17	0.71	-0.20	0.18	0.81
Own income high	0.40*	0.19	1.50	0.30	0.19	1.36
Couple's income (Homogamous = ref)						
Partner >	0.13	0.17	1.14	0.15	0.18	1.16
Partner <	-0.11	0.18	0.89	-0.09	0.19	0.91
Relationship quality, plans etc.						
Birth plans				0.31†	0.17	1.37
Committed				0.74**	0.23	2.10
Satisfied				0.82***	0.17	2.28
Most friends married				0.64**	0.19	1.89
Religious				0.29	0.21	1.33
Country (Norway = ref)						
Sweden	0.33*	0.14	1.39	0.23	0.15	1.26
Constant	-2.13***			-3.53***		
$\chi^2(df)$		59.53 (17)			95.35 (22)	
% Planning to marry		24.8			25.0	

Note: e^b = exponentiated b (Odds ratio).

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 3 Logistic regression analyses of intending to marry the current partner within two years. Separate analyses for men and women

Variable	Men			Women		
	<i>b</i>	<i>se b</i>	<i>e^b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>se b</i>	<i>e^b</i>
Sociodemographic variables						
Age (30 years = ref)						
26 years	-0.47†	0.27	0.63	-0.08	0.24	0.92
34 years ^a	0.05	0.27	1.05	-0.64*	0.27	0.53
Age homogamous	0.29	0.27	1.33	0.32	0.24	1.37
Duration union (2 – 4 years = ref)						
0 – 1 year ^a	-0.62*	0.30	0.54	0.05	0.27	1.05
5 – 7 years	-0.08	0.26	0.92	-0.25	0.26	0.78
> 7 years	-0.67†	0.22	0.51	-0.16	0.32	0.85
Previous union(s)	0.19	0.24	1.21	-0.15	0.22	0.86
Common children	0.47†	0.25	1.60	0.62**	0.25	1.86
Step children	-0.03	0.34	0.97	0.60†	0.31	1.83
Socioeconomic variables						
University education	0.99**	0.26	2.70	0.60*	0.24	1.83
Couple's education (Homogamous = ref)						
Partner >	0.61*	0.29	1.83	0.97**	0.29	2.63
Partner <	0.11	0.27	1.12	-0.39	0.24	0.68
Own income high	0.42†	0.26	1.52	-0.17	0.33	0.84
Couple's income (Homogamous = ref)						
Partner >	0.63†	0.36	1.89	-0.01	0.21	0.99
Partner <	-0.14	0.24	0.87	0.45	0.36	1.57
Relationship quality, plans etc.						
Birth plans	0.33	0.25	1.40	0.38	0.23	1.49
Committed ^a	0.44	0.29	1.55	1.39**	0.45	4.03
Satisfied	0.75**	0.24	2.12	0.92***	0.24	2.51
Most friends married	0.53†	0.30	1.69	0.88**	0.27	2.41
Religious	0.60†	0.36	1.82	0.13	0.28	1.14
Country (Norway = ref)						
Sweden	0.27	0.22	1.30	0.25	0.21	1.28
Constant	-3.42***			-4.48***		
<i>N</i>		679			839	
$\chi^2(df)$		76.97 (21)			90.48 (21)	
% Planning to marry		27.2			23.2	

Note: ^a Gender difference is statistically significant ($p < .10$) in pooled model. $e^b = \exp b$ (Odds ratio). † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Appendix Logistic regression analyses of intending to marry the current partner within two years.
Separate analyses for Sweden and Norway

Variable	Sweden			Norway		
	<i>b</i>	<i>se b</i>	<i>e^b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>se b</i>	<i>e^b</i>
Sociodemographic variables						
Age (30 years = ref)						
26 years	-0.23	0.24	0.79	-0.17	0.26	0.85
34 years	-0.24	0.27	0.78	-0.23	0.25	0.79
Age homogamous	0.47†	0.26	1.60	0.12	0.23	1.13
Female	-0.16	0.24	0.87	-0.42†	0.25	0.66
Duration union (2 – 4 years = ref)						
0 – 1 year	0.02	0.28	1.02	-0.45	0.29	0.64
5 – 7 years	0.04	0.25	1.04	-0.31	0.27	0.73
> 7 years	-0.47	0.34	0.62	-0.16	0.33	0.85
Previous union(s)	0.09	0.23	1.09	0.03	0.24	1.03
Common children	0.52*	0.23	1.67	0.50*	0.24	1.64
Step children	0.29	0.36	1.33	0.23	0.30	1.26
Socioeconomic variables						
University education	0.83**	0.24	2.29	0.66**	0.25	1.93
Couple's education (Homogamous = ref)						
Partner >	0.78*	0.31	2.18	0.57*	0.28	1.77
Partner <	-0.15	0.23	0.86	-0.31	0.29	0.74
Own income high	0.71*	0.29	2.03	0.10	0.27	1.12
Couple's income (Homogamous = ref)						
Partner >	0.17†	0.25	1.19	0.15	0.27	1.16
Partner <	0.02	0.26	1.02	-0.25	0.28	0.78
Relationship quality, plans etc.						
Birth plans	0.36	0.24	1.43	0.27	0.24	1.31
Committed	1.18*	0.46	3.25	0.53†	0.27	1.70
Satisfied	0.79**	0.25	2.20	0.85**	0.23	2.35
Most friends married	0.61†	0.33	1.85	0.68**	0.25	1.97
Religious	0.40	0.31	1.50	0.17	0.31	1.19
Constant	-4.26***			-2.93***		
<i>N</i>		751			776	
% Planning to marry		27.9			22.1	

Note: ^a Country difference is statistically significant ($p < .10$) in pooled model.

† $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.