

Pamela J. Smock, Wendy D. Manning, and Meredith Porter

**"Everything's There Except Money": How Money
Shapes Decisions to Marry Among Cohabitors**

PSC Research Report

Report No. 04-564

PSC POPULATION STUDIES CENTER
AT THE INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The Population Studies Center (PSC) at the University of Michigan is one of the oldest population centers in the United States. Established in 1961 with a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Center has a rich history as the main workplace for an interdisciplinary community of scholars in the field of population studies. Currently the Center is supported by a Population Research Infrastructure Program Grant (R24) from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and by a Demography of Aging Center Grant (P30) from the National Institute on Aging, as well as by the University of Michigan, the Fogarty International Center, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

PSC Research Reports are prepublication working papers that report on current demographic research conducted by PSC-affiliated researchers. These papers are written for timely dissemination and are often later submitted for publication in scholarly journals. The PSC Research Report Series was begun in 1981. Copyrights for all Reports are held by the authors. Readers may quote from this work as long as they properly acknowledge the authors and the Series and do not alter the original work.

**“Everything’s There Except Money”:
How Money Shapes Decisions to Marry Among Cohabitors***

Pamela J. Smock¹

Wendy D. Manning²

Meredith Porter³

¹Department of Sociology & Population Studies Center

Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

734.615.6630 (office); 734.764.2377 (fax); pjsmock@umich.edu (email)

^{2,3}Department of Sociology &

Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University

Bowling Green, OH 43403

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Boston, MA, April 1- April 3. We thank Deborah Graefe, Peggy Giordano, and four anonymous reviewers for very helpful comments on earlier drafts. This research was supported by grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R03 HD039835 and R01 HD040910). It was also supported in part by the Population Studies Center at the University of Michigan and the Center for Family and Demographic Research at Bowling Green State University, which both receive core funding from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24 HD41028 and R21 HD042831, respectively).

**“Everything’s There Except Money”:
How Money Shapes Decisions to Marry Among Cohabitors***

ABSTRACT

Cohabitation is now the modal path to marriage in the United States. Drawing on data from 115 in-depth interviews with cohabitators from the working and lower middle classes, this paper explores how economics shape marital decision-making. We find that cohabitators typically perceive financial issues as important for marriage, and delineate several key themes. Whereas some social scientists speculate that cohabitators must think that marriage will change their lives in order to motivate marriage, our findings suggest that cohabitators believe marriage should occur once something has already changed – in this case, their financial status. Our results also imply that political and scientific discourse on financial problems as deterrents to marriage should be broadened beyond a focus on poor unmarried parents.

Keywords: cohabitation, economic well-being, family, marriage, qualitative methods

INTRODUCTION

As is well known, the last few decades have ushered in significant changes in family patterns -- in union formation, union dissolution, childbearing, and attitudes about a range of family issues (Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Thornton, Fricke, Axinn, & Alwin 2001; Thornton & Young-Demarco, 2001). After a brief period characterized by early marriage and low levels of divorce after World War II (during the Baby Boom), recent decades have been marked by lower levels of childbearing, higher divorce rates, increases in the average age at marriage, rising nonmarital childbearing, and rising levels of cohabitation.

Although most Americans still marry at some point and the vast majority express strong desires to marry, unmarried cohabitation has dramatically transformed the marriage process. Today, the majority of marriages and remarriages begin as cohabiting relationships. Most young men and women have cohabited or will cohabit, cohabitation has increased in all age groups, and cohabitation is increasingly becoming a context for childbearing and childrearing. In fact, it is estimated that two-fifths of children born in the early 1990s will spend time in a cohabiting-parent family (Bumpass & Lu, 2000; Casper & Bianchi, 2002; Manning, 2002).

Given that cohabitation is now the modal path to marriage, an important issue is whether and under what circumstances cohabitation leads to marriage. A long line of research in the social sciences has drawn on data from surveys or the Census to examine the economic determinants of marriage. More recently, studies have emerged examining similar issues for cohabiting unions (e.g., Clarkberg, 1999; Oppenheimer, 2003; Sassler & McNally, 2003; Smock & Manning, 1997).

Our paper builds on this body of work by analyzing in-depth interview data with a diverse sample of cohabiting young men and women. Our central goal is to elaborate the empirical findings of recent quantitative research about the impact of economics on marriage by exploring the meaning of economic factors and their influence on cohabitators' feelings and thinking about whether and when to marry. This aim is also a theoretical one, in that we seek to determine whether and how economic factors play a direct and conscious role in marital decision-making. Given that the majority of marriages now begin as cohabitations, this paper has important implications for what has become known as the "retreat" from marriage.

BACKGROUND

Quantitative studies in the fields of demography, sociology, and economics have generally demonstrated that the occurrence and stability of marriage are linked to good economic circumstances. That is, people with higher education and better economic prospects are more likely to become married, to stay married, and to have children within marriage (e.g., Carlson, McLanahan, & England, 2004; Lichter et al., 1992; Mare & Winship, 1991; McLaughlin & Lichter, 1997; Oppenheimer, 2000; Oppenheimer, Kalmijn, & Lim, 1997; Smock, Manning, & Gupta, 1999; Sweeney, 2002; Xie et al., 2003). Recent estimates by Raley and Bumpass (2003), for example, suggest that 60% of marriages among women without high school degrees will end in separation or divorce, compared to one third for college graduates.

To provide a context for the current study, Table 1 shows the findings of several quantitative studies that examine the economic determinants of marriage among single or cohabiting people. Studies were selected using three main criteria: (a) they were published after 1990, (b) they use longitudinal data, or cross-sectional data with retrospective histories, to predict marriage among cohabitators or single men and women, and (c) they use data that are representative nationally or at least representative of a large subpopulation (e.g., Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study).

Panel A shows the relatively few extant studies on the economic correlates of transitions out of cohabitation (marriage versus separation), and Panel B displays studies examining the transition into marriage. Some in the latter group treat all unmarried people as single, regardless of whether or not they

are cohabiting, whereas others focus on noncohabiting men's and women's transitions into marriage or cohabitation. As the third column shows, the independent variables used to tap economic circumstances typically include education, employment, occupation, and earnings, although these vary in how they are measured and operationalized. Also, although our discussion centers on the fourth column (marriage as the dependent variable), we also show results for cohabitation and separation, given that many of these studies use competing risk models (i.e., the dependent variable in such studies is (a) whether a cohabitation ends in marriage or separation, or (b) whether a single individual enters a cohabiting or marital union).

The results of studies that specifically focus on marriage (versus separation), among cohabitators, and summarized in Panel A, suggest three conclusions. First, five out of seven studies—Brown (2000), Duvander (1999), Oppenheimer (2003), Smock and Manning (1997), and Wu and Pollard (2002)—find that the male partners' earnings, occupation, or education are positively associated with the transition to marriage among cohabitators. However, Sassler and McNally (2003) find that cohabiting men's earnings have a statistically significant *negative* effect on marriage. Although drawing on the same data as some of the other studies (the National Survey of Families and Households), Sassler and McNally use imputed data to account for attrition. Second, none of these studies finds a significant association between cohabiting women's economic characteristics and marriage. Third, three of the seven studies suggest that employment or earnings have a negative effect on the likelihood of breakup (Manning & Smock, 1995; Oppenheimer, 2003; Sassler & McNally, 2003)

Panel B, focusing on marriage among single people (unmarried couples in one case), suggests similar conclusions. First, all of the 14 studies suggest that economic circumstances generally matter in the expected direction, with positive situations encouraging marriage. Second, all of the studies that include men in their samples (11 out of 14) find that men with higher educations, higher earnings, greater labor force attachment, and the like are more likely to marry. The three studies that do not include men (studies 11, 12, and 16) also suggest that women with better economic profiles are more likely to marry.

Third, of the six studies that include the characteristics of both men and women (8, 9, 18, 19, 20, 21), two (18 and 21) find effects for the economic characteristics of men but not women; four find effects for both; and most important, none finds effects for women but not men. For example, Sassler and Schoen (1999) find that men's full-time employment and educational attainment are positively associated with marriage, but the same characteristics for women do not attain statistical significance. Similarly, the Xie et al. (2003) study suggests that men's earnings and educational attainment have a significant impact on marriage although women's do not. Altogether these results suggest that men's economic profiles may matter more for marriage.

In sum, although not without exceptions, the weight of the quantitative research shown in Table 1 indicates that marriage, and marriage specifically among cohabitators, is sensitive to economic circumstances and especially to men's earnings, employment, and education profiles. Good economic circumstances tend to be positively linked to marriage generally and to marriage among cohabitators in particular.

Qualitative studies on low-income unmarried parents have also shown that economic circumstances are associated with marital decision-making. In her interviews with low-income single mothers, Edin (2000) finds that money is very much an issue and that the mothers expect that the male be a reliable breadwinner; his inability to do so is one basis of these mothers' hesitation to marry (see also Cherlin, 2004; Edin & Kefalas, forthcoming). Similarly, in their study of unmarried, new parents, Gibson, Edin, & McLanahan (2003) report that couples are hesitant to marry unless economic stability has been achieved.

CURRENT INVESTIGATION

The current study builds on prior work by exploring how cohabiting men and women link economic circumstances and the marriage decision-making process. One motivation for this work is that it is difficult with quantitative research alone to understand why education, income, or employment

measures are positively and significantly correlated with marriage. Our general aim is triangulate existing quantitative studies with new qualitative data to explore what positive economic circumstances mean to cohabiting men and women and how those meanings shape marriage decisions. As Lin (1998) argues, analyses based on quantitative data can often provide us with the “what” -- that two or more variables are related and that there may be a credible causal story -- but it cannot necessarily provide us with the “how” and the “why.”

We thus draw on data from 115 in-depth interviews with men and women who are now or were very recently cohabiting to explore whether and how financial issues are involved in cohabitators’ thoughts and feelings about marriage. Our approach is informed by the social psychological paradigm of symbolic interactionism, which posits that individual behavior is based not only on what is, but on individuals’ interpretations of “what is.” The interactionist perspective assumes that individuals categorize and construct their social world, subjectively define situations, and use these interpretations to adapt their behavior (Mead, 1934; Stryker, 1972). According to this perspective, it is important to determine the meanings that individuals ascribe to events and relationships, and such meanings emerge through interactions with the wider culture, family and peer groups, mass media, as well as through negotiations between partners themselves. Most broadly, the symbolic interactionist paradigm holds that identifying subjective meanings and interpretations is essential for understanding individual behavior. Thus, through in-depth interviews this paper seeks to uncover how young adults are interpreting the link between economic circumstances and their feelings and expectations about marriage.

Our study adds to extant knowledge in two additional ways. First, and perhaps most importantly, we focus on working- and lower-middle class individuals. The few qualitative studies on our general topic tend to focus on the disadvantaged, particularly low-income mothers. We purposefully set out to study “average” young men and women who have not made it solidly into the middle-class, but, for the most part, are not officially poor or involved in the welfare system. A quantitative study spanning the years from 1960 to 2000 underscores the importance of this endeavor in order to understand the forces behind changing family patterns. Ellwood and Jencks (2001) show that the increase in single parenthood over the past 40 years has been concentrated in the middle and lower thirds of the educational distribution, and not just the lower third.

Second, we interview both parents and nonparents and restrict our focus to cohabiting (or recently cohabiting) young adults rather than those in an array of relationship statuses. Our focus solely on cohabitators is an important one as the modal path to marriage is now through cohabitation. Including those who are childless also reflects the actual composition of cohabiting couples today; approximately 60% of cohabiting unions do not include children (Fields & Casper, 2001).

DATA

Our analysis is based on semistructured in-depth interviews with 115 young adults who were currently cohabiting or had recently cohabited. Although the number of interviews does not seem large by quantitative data analysis standards, it is by qualitative data collection standards. Our strategy for the interviews drew on the idea of the relationship as “career” by asking how and why cohabitating relationships began, perceptions of the future of the relationship at the beginning of the cohabitation, numerous aspects of the relationship itself, views on prerequisites for marriage, perceptions of how being married would differ from cohabiting, perceptions of how cohabitation differs from dating, and how and why the cohabitating relationship ended (if relevant).

At the time of interview, 47% of our sample were cohabiting, 26% were married (after having cohabited with their spouse or someone else), 26% were currently single after having recently cohabited, and one respondent was divorced after having cohabited and then married. The respondents were interviewed in 2002, largely between April and October. We focus on young adults 21 to 35 years old, although we have a few respondents outside of this range. Additionally, our sample is divided such that we have at least 15 interviews with each gender and race/ethnic group (White, Black, Latino/a) in order to attain racial, ethnic, and gender diversity in our sample.

The respondents all live in the vicinity of Toledo, Ohio, which has a sociodemographic distribution quite similar to that of the entire nation. For example, 2000 Census data indicate that the populations of the Metropolitan Statistical Area of Toledo and the nation are similar in terms of race (13% in Toledo and 12% in U.S. are Black); education (80% in Toledo and 84% in the U.S. are high school graduates); median income (\$50,046 in Toledo and \$50,287 in US); and marital status (74% in Toledo and 76% in U.S. are married couple families).

We recruited our sample by means of personal contacts, as well as encounters with potential respondents in various parts of the community (e.g., local coin laundry, grocery stores, restaurants, the neighborhood, parties). This was an extensive, time-consuming effort in that the key requirement was to interview a racially and ethnically diverse men and women who were currently cohabiting or recently cohabiting. In addition, to meet the demographic specifications of the sample, some respondents were referred by community organizations or agencies or were recruited in areas in which the pool of prospective participants had a greater probability of being a specific race or ethnicity. Note, though, that respondents were not necessarily clients of the agencies, but often employees of them; thus, we remained cognizant throughout of seeking interviews largely with working- and lower middle-class men and women. Some interviews were conducted immediately following an introduction, but most were scheduled for a later time. Additionally, the sample was partially a snowball sample, with approximately 30% of the respondents referred from the pool of participating respondents.

The interviews were semistructured and lasted, on average, two hours, with the mean length of a single transcribed interview being 36 pages. Although semistructured interviews provide some organization, they also allow the interviewer to probe with follow-up questions and pursue additional lines of inquiry. Generally, in-depth interviews are an excellent method for exploring perceptions, behavioral patterns, and their cognitive justifications, ultimately helping to illuminate the causal processes that quantitative social science seeks to uncover (Weiss, 1994). We used one interviewer for all interviews: She is a member of the community who is experienced in interviewing racially and economically diverse populations in the area and our reading of the transcripts suggests that she achieved outstanding rapport with the vast majority of respondents.

Table 2 shows the distribution of our sample according to education, personal income, and employment status. Our sample can be characterized as largely working class and lower middle class (i.e., high school graduates and those with some college or technical school training). The educational breakdown of our sample is as follows: less than high school (12.2%), high school (25%), some college (44.7%), college graduate or more (18.3%). The majority of our respondents are currently employed (82%), although a few are enrolled in school full time, and some are both employed and enrolled in school part time. Yearly individual incomes range from about \$10,000 per year to \$55,000 per year, with the majority (57%) earning less than \$20,000 per year and only 7% earning more than \$40,000. Couple incomes range from approximately \$15,000 to \$60,000, with most reporting combined incomes in the \$20,000 to \$40,000 range (not in table). Income varies significantly by race/ethnicity and gender. White men and women are the most highly educated; White men are most likely to earn at least \$40,000 per year; and over half of all Latinos and Blacks earn less than \$20,000 per year. Also noteworthy is that Latinos and Latinas are least likely to be currently employed. Finally, a range of parenthood statuses is represented in our data: 45% are childless, 23% have a biological child with their partner, 6% have a biological child from a prior relationship, 10% have a stepchild(ren), with the remainder having some combination of stepchildren and biological children from a prior relationship (not in table).

Our coding proceeded whereby categories were derived as they emerged from the data. We used a computer program called Atlas/ti to aid in our data management and analyses. The program assists with coding and analysis of qualitative data (Weitzman, 1999), and provides tools to manage, store, extract, compare, explore, and reassemble meaningful pieces of our data flexibly and systematically. The development of our coding scheme was an intensive, evolving, iterative analytic task. Essentially, coding applies a meaning or interpretation to a segment of data -- in our case, textual data from the interviews. It consists of creating categories and marking segments of the data with these codes. A single paragraph or sentence may have one code or several and these may be overlapping with other text segments.

The authors each read a subset of transcripts, coding them independently. We then examined “intercoder reliability” by using a merge function in the program to juxtapose codes, review similarity of code lists, compare the number of codes derived, and assess consistency between coders in segments of text coded (i.e., where segments begin and end). Although we had few interpretive disagreements, we used this as a tool to explore and discuss the meaning of minor discrepancies in our interpretations and, eventually, to generate a coding scheme capturing our consensus on the issues.

Our analyses for this paper involved first searching for instances in the interviews in which the issue of money was raised by the respondent either in response to a question about “what would need to be in place for marriage” or at other points in the interview in which respondents raised the issue themselves. We then analyzed the context in which finances were raised – that is, whether and how respondents themselves made the connection between economic factors and marriage. We organize our results around several emergent themes regarding aspects of finances, providing representative quotations to illustrate these themes.

Finally, it is important to note that the interviewer did not probe to specifically seek “economic” prerequisites for marriage. In addition, the interview schedule was long and comprehensive, leaving relatively little time for this particular question. Thus, the findings we report here may be conservative estimates of the salience of economics in marital decision-making among cohabitators.

RESULTS

We asked current and recent cohabitators about their views on marriage prerequisites, or what kinds of things needed to be “in place” to decide to marry; we also take account of instances in which these issues were raised or elaborated by the respondent at other points in the interview. To obtain a broad view of this issue, Table 3 categorizes individuals into four groups: mentioned only economic issues, mentioned only relationship/individual qualities, mentioned both types of issues, and gave no response. Economic aspects include money, jobs, assets (e.g., houses, savings), or education. Relationship/individual factors include concerns such as needing more time in the relationship, quality of the relationship, age/maturity, and substance abuse or violence.

As shown in Table 3, most respondents perceive both relationship and economic factors as important for marriage. Approximately 23% named only economic criteria or only relationship criteria; nearly 50% named both. Thus, overall, 72% of the sample identified at least one economic factor as a prerequisite for the relationship to result in marriage. Table 3 also suggests that the prominence of economic concerns may vary by race, with Blacks more likely to cite economic factors than Latinos or Whites (82 % vs. 67 % and 71 % among Whites and Latinos, respectively), but the percentage is high in all groups.

In the remainder of the paper we explore the specific aspects of economics that cohabitators deem important for marriage as well as related themes. Essentially, our goal is to unpack the ways in which cohabitators think money matters for marriage. Five central themes emerged from the data: (a) having enough money; (b) the ability to pay for a “real” wedding; (c) achieving a set of financial goals before marriage; (d) the male partner’s capacity to be an economic provider, and (e) lack of money as a source of stress and relationship conflict.

Money as Capstone in the Cohabitation-Marriage Sequence: “Everything’s There Except Money”

About one third of those many citing any economic factor mentioned money generally as needing to be in place for them to marry (or have married) their cohabiting partner. Leroy, who is 29 years old and recently unemployed, says: “I don’t really know ‘cause the love is there uh...trust is there. Everything’s there except money.” Similarly, Ofilia, a 25-year-old Latina says: “Money, it’s just money. Nothing else.” And Joseph, 31 years old, says: “Basically everything was in place, just basically it gets back to the money.” Patricio, a 20-year-old unemployed Latino who dropped out of high school, puts it perhaps most

straightforwardly: “If I ever got rich I would marry Melissa.” Calvin, who is 24 and unemployed, says: “I want to be financially okay when I, when I’ve decided to take that step.”

Other respondents are somewhat more specific. The idea of marriage appears to be associated with having attained a certain “comfortable” financial status. Holly, a 36-year-old store supervisor whose cohabiting relationship dissolved without marriage, describes how getting married should signify that one is no longer struggling economically:

I: Ok. How then, like what would have had to been in place for you to have gotten married?

R: Money.

I: Ok. Tell me a little bit about what that means.

R: Money means um...stability. I don't want to struggle, if I'm in a partnership, then there's no more struggling, and income-wise we were still both struggling.

The implication is that one doesn't get married if one is struggling financially; marriage both connotes and requires a certain level of economic stability. Holly's comment about financial stability was echoed in some other cohabitators' concerns. Donald, a 30-year-old Black roofer, tries to describe what he means: “we feel when we get financially, you know what I'm saying, stable, then we will be ready.”

Andy, a White 26-year-old computer technician whose relationship recently ended, also talks about wanting to be financially “comfortable,” but expresses it in negative terms, mainly focusing on debt: “I'm still at a financially unstable point because of like school loans. And I don't want to impose that upon anybody else. Like that's one of my major things before I get married, I want to be paid up I don't want anybody buying into my debt, really.”

Thus, empathizing with what he thinks a future partner might feel, Andy will not marry unless he is basically debt-free. This concern with debt was echoed by several others as they thought about what needed to be in place to marry: getting “bills paid down,” “caught up on some bills,” and dealing with student loans all inhibited their sense of being ready to marry.

Heidi, an assistant manager at a shoe store, lives with her boyfriend and her boyfriend's parents. She implies that marriage, but not cohabitation, requires economic and residential independence, which boils down to having enough money:

Right now, we wouldn't be able to afford, you know, to be out on our own To have to pay rent . . . to pay bills I mean, I realize that you're going to have rent and I realize that you're going to have you know, utilities and groceries and furnishings and stuff like that. I don't think he realizes that half the time and he's like, "Hmmm, so let's go!" You know, and . . . I think ahead and . . . I think that we need to have more income coming in so we can be able to do that.

Money and the Symbolic Meaning of the Wedding Ceremony: A “Real” Wedding

For some cohabitators, the issue of enough money is tied directly to the ability to afford a wedding. Overall, one fifth of those mentioning any economic issue as important for marriage mentioned weddings, or more precisely, the cost of weddings, as an impediment to getting married. This is especially noteworthy because the interviewer never raised the issue of weddings, and it emerged without prompting.

Respondents often cite saving to have a “real” wedding as a prerequisite to marriage. Abram, a 27-year-old Latino, said he knew right away that he wanted to marry his girlfriend, but “we never saved up enough money to have the wedding we wanted.”(He also mentioned the cost of a honeymoon as part of what he considers a proper wedding.) In fact, another respondent, Vicente, currently cohabiting with his fiancé, posited that the purpose of cohabitation is actually to pay for a wedding: “I mean cohabitation I think it's alright I mean. You see someone you love and if you want to have a big wedding, you can't afford it, you go live with them until you can afford it.”

Other respondents said they simply couldn't afford a wedding, even if they had plans to marry. A 29-year-old Latina, Petra, who works as an administrative assistant, reported that her boyfriend tells her he "wants to marry me and that he wants a big wedding and, you know, he wants the whole nine yards, but right now we can't really afford it." And, for Ofilia, having a wedding competes monetarily with raising children; she and her boyfriend don't have enough money to do both:

. . . . he gave me a ring, he asked me to marry him a long time ago. We talked about getting married, it's just we don't have anyone to pay for the wedding and I don't want to go downtown. So, it's on us . . . and when we came down to the decision of do we want kids or do we want the marriage and for now we wanted the kids because I really don't think getting married is going to change anything in our relationship after nine years.

Typically, respondents who talked about weddings want to have sufficient financial resources for a relatively large wedding. But for others the impediment is just being able to afford an engagement ring or a modest wedding. Geraldine, a 28-year-old White law clerk reported that her partner was "trying to sell his trumpet" to pay for her ring. Indeed, even very modest weddings may pose a serious obstacle to marriage for working- and middle-class young adults. Ben, a 30 year-old White railroad conductor, said he didn't know where he'd come up with five thousand dollars for a wedding, exclaiming "weddings are expensive!"

Several men and women made a distinction between a "church" wedding and a "downtown" (or "courthouse" or "justice of the peace") wedding; this distinction was quite salient to them. When asked whether she and her partner had considered marriage, Terri, a beautician, says:

I did, I did a lot. He just said he wasn't ready or we don't have the money, you know wait until we get our finances straight. Well, you never can get your finances straight, it don't matter how long and I don't want a big wedding, I already told him that, I want to go downtown and that's it, it's not going to cost that much but for some odd reason he just, I don't think he ever wants to get married to be truthful.

Here, note that Terri has come to the conclusion that her partner's persistent desire to wait until their finances are "straight"—despite her willingness to compromise on a downtown wedding—amounts to a strategy to avoid marriage.

Heidi, too, decides that although she yearns for a church wedding, a downtown wedding would be acceptable:

I've always wanted a church wedding. You know I want to walk down the aisle with my Dad, and you know, I want to dance with my Grandpa (laughs)
. . . . But if it came down to the point where Eric was just like, I really don't want to have a church wedding, let's just go downtown, I, I love him so much, I want to be with him so much, that I probably would do it.

Among other cohabitators, especially some women, the resistance to "going downtown" was formidable. Annie, a 22-year-old home health care aid, explains that she's just waiting for her boyfriend to change his mind because "until he does, we just won't get married. I'm not going downtown I say, you don't want a big wedding, we're not going to get married." Gloria, a 25-year-old Black woman who works for a telephone company says: "We're gonna do it right. So, we wouldn't rush a wedding like -- let's just go get married "justice of peace" We want to have a big wedding. We want to have, you know, both of our families enjoy it." Here, one can see that perceptions of prerequisites for marriage also involve relations to others such as family members. Asked whether he's considering marriage, Leroy answered:

R: Well, it crossed my mind. Um I always said I just couldn't afford it. If I could afford it I probably would be married by nowYou can't get married for free.

I: Ok. But you could go down to the justice of the peace, you could have a simple church wedding, you could, I mean...

R: But that's the poor people way.

Despite the fact that Leroy is nearly poor--having recently lost a job paying him about \$15,000 per year--it is vital to him to have a “real” wedding rather than a “poor people” wedding. Leroy goes on to explain his reactions to his cousin’s recent wedding. Although it was in a church, it was small, simple and inexpensive. There weren’t any bridesmaids, or groomsmen, or flower girls, leading Leroy to say that “it just didn’t seem like a wedding” and it was more like a “get together.” Kerry, a White female homemaker, appears to agree. She reports that her sister-in-law told her “Oh, don’t go downtown, you should have a wedding!”—implying that marriage by a justice of the peace is not considered a “real wedding.” For Annie, these kinds of weddings are somehow “not right.” Others cohabitators also spoke of “just” going downtown, with the implication that this is a minimal, lesser sort of wedding.

James, a 36-year-old carpenter, describes how he and his girlfriend are trying to save up for a house so he suggested that they go “downtown” to marry and then have a “real” wedding in a couple of years when they could afford it:

And her thing was "No, I don't want to do that. I want to go back home, I want to have this big ceremony with my mother by my side." My thing was "we just can't afford it, your mother doesn't have any money. It's not like she's going to pay for anything. I'm going to pay for this and we can't afford it. You know. So, no we can't do it." Then her thing was "Well, no I'm not going down to the court house and getting married." You know, and that was about the extent of our conversation.

Wesley, a 22-year-old Black man who works as a supervisor at a manufacturing plant, was quite specific about the need for a little “financial time” because of his girlfriend’s desire for a “big 30, 40 thousand thing and I’m not quite ready for that...we need to get some more of my student loans paid off and stuff like that before I can even do that.”

It is noteworthy that in all cases the young couples appear to have sole responsibility to pay for the wedding; parents or other relatives are not mentioned as potential resources. These young adults, unlike their more privileged, upper-middle class counterparts, are unable to rely on family members to absorb the cost, or even some of the cost, of a wedding. This is not surprising, given their modest backgrounds, including that over 60% did not grow up with their two biological married parents (not in table).

Money as Part of the Respectability Package: “After X, W, and Z, we’ll get married”

An important theme that emerged in the interviews is the importance of accomplishing a *set* of financially-related goals before marriage. Respondents who mention any one economic factor as a prerequisite for marriage tend to mention more than one. These responses were generally stated as “when we have x, w, and z, we’ll get married.”

LaTonya, a 24-year-old Black customer service supervisor, says of her partner: “So he thinks that he needs to graduate and be making more money and, you know, buy me a house and a really big ring and all that kind of thing before we get married.” Russell, 19 years old and unemployed, says: “For us to get married we’d have to have a lot. Like we’d have to both have good jobs, money, and a place to stay. And all of that. Mostly financially stable.” Fred, a 22-year-old, White UPS worker states: “If I had the money, I would, I'd get married, but all that wedding and stuff and I want to get my own place before—I want to settle down before I get married.” For Fred, financial resources for a wedding and a home are required before marriage. Malcolm, a 25-year-old waiter, wants a car and a good career prior to marriage: “I don’t

have a car . . . I want a nice dependable car, I want a good job as far as career-wise . . . I want to either be back at school or take a path to going back to school or being in school and being successful and on my way to graduating.” Ellen, a White graduate student and part-time Medicaid eligibility worker, says: “I think, have enough money set aside, and maybe even living in our own apartment or a house maybe?”

Candace, a 25 year-old Black woman who is currently on workman’s compensation, provides a more elaborate response. She talks about how she and her partner are interested in marrying, but there are some things they want first.

Um, we have certain things that we want to do before we get married. We both want very good jobs, and we both want a house, we both want reliable transportation. I'm about to start taking cake decorating classes, and so I can have me some good income, and he – he's trying his best you know? He's been looking out for jobs everywhere, and we – we're trying. We just want to have- we gotta have everything we need before we say "Let's get married."

Although Candace and her partner have discussed these issues at some length and generally agree on their goals, lack of money still intervenes. Candace has a G.E.D., and isn’t quite sure how many years of schooling her partner has. Their relatively low levels of schooling and unemployed status suggest that they may have enormous difficulty achieving their goals of good-paying jobs in order to marry.

As suggested by several of the above quotations, home ownership is often part of the desired package. Approximately 22% of those mentioning at least one economic factor say that owning their own home as an important prerequisite for marriage.

The case of Peter, a White 28-year-old salesman who did end up marrying his partner, is illustrative. Reflecting on the timing of the marriage, he says: “Probably the biggest thing of all...was a...just a financial stability before we would jump into something like that. I didn't want to get married and go living in apartment or townhouse. I wanted to save on up to, you know, buy a home, start a family.” These results are consistent with a quantitative analysis showing that housing opportunities influence young adults’ living arrangements. Hughes (2003) finds that people are more likely to be married when potential earnings are high and housing costs are low.

Sandra, a 19-year-old Latina, voices a similar concern. She and her partner live half of the time at her parents’ house and half at his parents’ house. She explained that they are not yet ready for marriage because they don’t have the resources to set up an independent household, which – in her mind – is necessary for marriage:

I feel like we don't have the resources, I mean he lives here, and my mom always says you know, "if you want to get married, you can live here and it wouldn't matter", cause, but I, I wouldn't feel right. I feel like if you get married, you need to go out on your own, and start your own life, and I'm not ready for that right now. And neither is he.

Another factor sometimes mentioned in the set of economic prerequisites for marriage is finishing school. This is consistent with both quantitative (e.g., Manning & Smock, 1995; Thornton, Axinn, & Teachman, 1995) and qualitative research (Sassler, 2004) suggesting that school enrollment inhibits marriage among cohabitators.

However, finishing school is not necessarily viewed as an end in itself, but part of package, tied to attaining economic stability. As Geraldine, a teacher who ended up marrying her partner, says: “I wanted to be graduated from college . . . I wanted to have a job.” Gloria, who also married her partner, has a similar view about the timing of her marriage: “See, I had the degree and I was ready to move to this next step which would be my mate . . . because I've done the schooling and I've secured the job with the security, financial security.” In one case, however, finishing a degree before marriage was an end in itself. Vicente explains that he and his partner are waiting to marry because “college is free when you're a single mom. They give her the grants for free, she can do all that until she graduates or gets married.”

Money and Gendered Expectations: "The guy takes care of the woman and his kids"

Another theme that emerged in our interviews is a perception on the part of some cohabitators that men's economic situations are relatively more important than women's for marriage. This came across in two ways. First, it was more common for women than men to be concerned about their *partner's* jobs. About three times as many women than men reported they wanted a change in some aspect of their partner's employment (e.g., get a job or get a better paying job) in order to marry. Additionally, whereas women might mention wanting to finish their degrees and get their career on track before marriage, both men and women made far more references to men's jobs and men's income stability. This is of particular interest, given that cohabitators express more gender-egalitarian views than those who do not cohabit (e.g., Clarkberg, Stolzenberg, & Waite, 1995).

Second, a significant minority of our respondents directly expressed the expectation that the male should be able to "provide for" or "support" a family. Such views were expressed by one-third of those mentioning at least one economic factor ($n=26$), and about equally by women and men.

For example, Henry, a 33-year-old White information systems manager, reflects: "Had I been . . . in a financial position where I was able to take care of myself and a family, then it might have moved things along quicker." Jamal, a 27-year-old Black man, says: "What would make me ready? Knowing that I could provide . . ." Victor, a 27-year-old White male, states that it is "the male's financially responsible for like, you know, the household, paying the bills."

The following interchange with Hector, a 20-year-old Latino student, clearly reveals gendered expectations. Here he is describing why he and his former cohabiting partner didn't marry:

R: . . . if I do get married I need myself to be able to support [her] as well as me and everybody else that gets brought into this family. That's what I, that's what you know, I ideally what I was brought up to be. The guy takes care of the woman and his kids . . .

I: Is that machismo?

R: Not machismo. That's just how I was brought up. I mean I . . . I could be wrong. I'm probably wrong to most people now because women are taking care of themselves, which is fine.

I: You're more of a traditionalist.

R: Yeah.

I: So you wanted to be able to support her financially?

R: Right.

Sometimes the belief that men are more responsible for the finances in a marriage comes out in subtler ways. Lester, an 18-year-old house painter, says that in order to marry his partner "I would have to be able to take care of myself before I'd be able to take care of a family." This implies his expectation that it would be his responsibility to take care of a family. Perhaps less realistically, Donald, who is 30 years old and currently cohabiting, muses that he would marry his partner "if I was to hit the lottery and could take her somewhere and we wouldn't have to worry about no problems for the rest of our life."

Women also sometimes express views that men have more responsibility for providing in marriage than women. Kerry, a 25-year-old married homemaker, reflects on what had to be in place for her to marry her partner, illustrating the expectation that the male needs to be a provider: "I don't know if he was really thinking about what marriage meant. You know, he was gonna have to take care of us, and have a family now, and be a provider. He was just being kind of immature still . . ." Kerry also says that they were "trying to get him into a career that, you know, was gonna make enough money for us And then worry about getting married . . ." Gloria puts it this way:

I'm just saying that I feel like, ok, I do want my man to make more money than me, I believe he needs to be the breadwinner and I also feel like, as a wife those are my responsibilities to keep the house clean and all this

(Gloria went on to say that the minute she would start helping her husband to earn money, then household chores ought to be split.) Although seeing gender as less relevant to income provision, Candace nonetheless explains her hesitancy to marry her partner because she needs to know whether “he can take care of us” (Candace has four children), if anything happens to her to prevent her from working.

A case in which we did hear a woman talking about needing to be able to “provide” or support a family herself was Geraldine’s. When describing how she wanted to finish school and start a job before marriage she explained, “if anything happened, or if he died or something, or we did end up getting divorced somewhere down the line, that I wouldn’t be destitute.” Thus, her concern with economic independence, seemingly a prerequisite for marriage, was more a precaution in case of her partner’s death or a divorce.

Money and Relationship Quality: “Whenever we’d get in fights, it’d be about money”

Although not typically referenced in the quantitative literature on the economic determinants of marriage or cohabitation, there is a body of research linking forms of economic distress to marital quality and stability (e.g., Clark-Nicolas & Gray-Little, 1991; Conger et al., 1990; Fox & Chancey, 1998; Johnson & Booth, 1990). Although effects are not always large, studies suggest that perceived economic hardship has negative effects on relationship quality and is positively related to thoughts of divorce, that employment uncertainty and low income are associated with psychological distress among husbands and wives, and that husbands’ job insecurity has a significant positive effect on wives’ reports of marital conflict and thoughts of divorce. One study of farm families, for example, suggests that economic hardship is related to thoughts of divorce, with about half of this effect due to depression (Johnson & Booth, 1990). Another, focusing on Black married couples, finds that perceived economic adequacy -- as measured by adequacy of income for food, clothing, medical, care, leisure, and monetary surplus left at month’s end -- is a significant predictor of marital satisfaction (Clark-Nicolas & Gray-Little, 1991).

Our interviews with cohabitators are supportive of these findings, suggesting that financial constraints are sometimes perceived as a source of relationship conflict that affects relationship quality and the sense of a stable future. Over one-quarter of the total sample ($n=31$) told us that money was a problem area when asked about conflict in their relationships. Larry, for example, reports that he had no hopes for the future with his partner at the beginning of their relationship because they argued about “how we’re going to pay for these bills . . .” Aileen, a 32-year-old computer technician, says about her partner:

[He] doesn't work enough, sometimes. He like, you know, he won't go to work for four days, so his paycheck will be half of what it should be. And then he'll want to pay his bills, before he gives, gives me the money that I, I need. And that pisses me off.

Vicente, when asked about the stability of his relationship, says that “just finances, pretty much, is about the only instability in the relationship.” And when asked about the main source of conflict in her relationship, Rose, a married, 27-year-old medical worker, had this to say:

R: Money.

I: Money. Okay. Does that mean like choices in what each other spends it on?

R: Oh no. Just ‘cause we don't have enough . . . to pay all the bills at one time.

The severity of the problem varies of course with economic resources. Thus, although some cohabitators may feel money is a source of tension, they are able to resolve ensuing conflicts. As described by Ellen, a graduate student: “Sometimes when it's dwindling down before we’re gonna get paid, and it's like not really a conflict, it's just like, "What are we gonna do?" And then, like the last fight we had, we fought about money a little bit, we kind of just didn't talk for ten minutes, then we just started talking about it . . . and we worked it out.”

Notably, in the event that financial circumstances improve and stabilize, relationship quality can be impacted in a positive way. Ben, now married to his partner, reports that “I think things stabilized quite a bit too with when I started working for the railroad. It stabilized us a lot more. We were making better money...it wasn't an up and down, it was a constant. It's a stable job, it was a stable company.” In his prior job, “it was a lot of stress. It was a lot of 'Okay, am I gonna be able to make my bills this month?’” Recalling this earlier time, Ben says:

It's hard when you don't have money and you can't get what you want to get and you . . . might not be able to get all the groceries that you want to get, you might not be able to put gas in your car to go somewhere So, I think it's helped us a lot being able to do what we want, when we want, and get the things that we need.

DISUCSSION AND CONCLUSION

Economic and financial problems are much more important to successful marriage than is generally realized. (Folsom, 1941, p. 86)

Quantitative research based on survey data has typically shown that good economic situations are associated with higher chances of marriage among cohabiting couples (see Table 1). However, we have had little research on whether cohabitators themselves perceive economic circumstances as important for marriage. Prior work also does not address the mechanisms underlying the link between economic factors and marriage. That is, *why* do economic characteristics appear to be associated marriage decisions? Drawing on in-depth interviews with 115 young adults who are currently or were recently cohabiting, this paper suggests that, for the majority of cohabitators (72%), economic factors are salient in thinking about when and whether to marry, helping to explain why cohabitation is perceived as costing less than marriage (e.g., Clarkberg, 1999).

We find that cohabitators believe that their economic circumstances matter for marriage in several different ways. First, having “enough” money is a common consideration, alongside the view that marriage signifies that one is no longer struggling economically. Second, we find that lack of money is associated with relationship conflict, suggesting a significant indirect pathway by which financial difficulties inhibit marriage.

Third, although our sample is largely nonpoor, having sufficient money or savings to afford a “real” wedding is also a concern. Going “downtown” to the courthouse is not deemed a real wedding—even among those willing to compromise—and some cohabitators say they will delay marriage until they can afford a church wedding and reception. Noteworthy is that these young couples, generally from modest backgrounds, anticipate paying for their weddings themselves, without help from parents. Fourth, it is often not attaining a single financial goal, but several as a package, that is perceived as necessary for marriage. Cohabitators’ thoughts on this issue often took the form of “after x, y, and z, we’ll get married.” Most commonly, this economic package includes home-ownership, getting out of debt, and financial stability (not living paycheck to paycheck).

Finally, we find that some cohabitators, both male and female, tend to think that the decision to marry hinges on the male partner’s ability to fulfill the breadwinner role – despite the prevailing view that cohabitators are less invested in traditional normative practices than those who do not cohabit. Our study illustrates that some cohabitators are making a direct and conscious connection between willingness to marry and the male partner’s ability to provide. This finding is consistent with quantitative studies that have found that men’s economic situations may matter more for marriage than women’s (e.g., Oppenheimer, 2003; Smock & Manning, 1997; Xie et al., 2003). For example, Oppenheimer (2003) concludes that cohabitation provides a fallback strategy for men whose careers aren’t established. She finds that men working less than full-time and year-round may start a relationship, but, compared to steady workers, they are more likely enter a cohabiting than a marital relationship. Landale and Forste (2001) speculate that cohabitation is an adaptive family strategy that allows for union formation in the

face of economic uncertainty, because it makes few unambiguous demands on the male as breadwinner (1991, p. 603). Our finding is also consistent with prior qualitative research on low-income mothers (Edin, 2000); what our study also shows is that men themselves hold expectations of fulfilling the breadwinner role in order to marry. Another qualitative study of unmarried parents also suggests that marriage is viewed as needing stronger economic underpinnings than cohabitation (Gibson, Edin, & McLanahan, 2003).

Interestingly, the notion of marriage as preferably occurring after economic stability has been achieved contrasts sharply with the experiences of the working-class married couples studied some three decades ago by Lillian Rubin (Rubin, 1976). Rubin describes how financial difficulties pervaded the early years of marriage in her sample. Our results suggest that, today, those years of economic struggle often occur during cohabitation rather than marriage.

Why have perceptions about economic readiness to marry altered since Rubin's study? This question is intricately tied to the issue of the retreat from marriage in general over the past 30 years, a topic that numerous social scientists have and continue to ponder; a recent issue of this journal (November, 2004) is, in fact, devoted to the topic. As emphasized by Cherlin (2004), while marriage remains quite desirable, as all surveys show, its practical importance has decreased. At the same time, marriage has become the most prestigious family form and indicator of achievement, with even the wedding a signal of such achievement. Similarly, Furstenberg argues that marriage is now a "luxury good" (Furstenberg, 1995).

We would agree with this assessment, and would underscore that increases in the acceptability and prevalence of living together unmarried, as well as having children outside of marriage, have most certainly raised the bar as far as marriage itself is concerned. As long as individuals have available to them a living arrangement that has become normative and offers many of the same benefits as marriage (i.e., companionship, financial economies of scale, sexual access, and even procreation), there is no reason why marriage should occur unless expectations, economic and otherwise, are met. The existence of increasingly socially acceptable alternatives to marriage is thus an important part of the story of why marriage seems to "cost more" than cohabitation.

This paper has several limitations. First, our interviews were geared to attaining a wide array of information about cohabitation so that the focus on the prerequisites for marriage comprised only a relatively small part of the interview. Had this issue been our main focus, we would have had more and richer data. In a similar fashion, our interviewer was not instructed to provide specific probes regarding what needs to be in place to marry. Had she asked specifically about money or debt or the cost of weddings, we are convinced that the percentages we report here would be higher.

Second, our findings are based on a nonrepresentative sample of cohabitators who were living in the Toledo, Ohio area. Given this, and the qualitative nature of our study, the results cannot be generalized to a larger population. Nonetheless, an important goal of this study was to deepen our understanding of the connections between economics and marriage and to provide a basis for interpreting quantitative analyses of nationally representative data. That our findings are consistent with those of past quantitative studies and the handful of existing qualitative studies, however, increases their credibility.

A third limitation is that we rely on data from respondents at one point in time. We plan follow-up interviews with respondents who were cohabiting at the time of the interview to gain a better understanding of the dynamics of cohabiting relationships and the forces behind transitions into marriage or dissolution.

Our findings make several important contributions to extant knowledge. First, returning to the quantitative studies displayed in Table 1, our data suggest that these associations between money and marriage are more than correlations. Cohabitators consciously draw on perceptions of their economic position in order to think about whether and when to marry. In this way, our data triangulates already existing quantitative data. The result is a stronger case for a causal relationship between marriage and economic opportunity as well as new information on aspects of economics that are salient to young adults that are generally unmeasured in data used by the studies shown in Table 1 (i.e., home ownership, debt, the cost of a wedding, the achievement of a set of financial goals). It also identifies relationship *processes*

such as stresses and conflict over money that likely partially account for the quantitative association between good economic circumstances and marriage.

Second, qualitative work to date on the economic barriers to marriage has focused on disadvantaged, unmarried parents, primarily mothers. By widening the socioeconomic spectrum to include the working and lower middle classes, our study enlarges the discourse on marriage and its retreat. At least in extant qualitative work about marriage, average young Americans, including those who are childless, have been an understudied population. Our work underscores the ubiquity of financial problems confronting those in our society who are not privileged economically, who may be just a step or two away from poverty, and the linkage between financial struggles and the retreat from marriage.

Third, our study has two key implications for how social scientists study marriage. First, our findings can inform the development of new measures beyond those displayed in Table 1 to investigate how and why economic circumstances influence marriage decisions. For example, our study suggests that gauging perceptions of financial difficulties (e.g., perceived economic adequacy) could enhance our understanding of relationship quality, stability, and the transition to marriage (see Clark-Nicolas & Gray-Little [1991] for examples of such measures). We also believe that questions about the type of wedding expected and sources of funds for weddings may be useful predictors of marriage among cohabitators or couples who plan to marry but are living apart. Finally, further development of questions about the male provider role may help to better explain why men's economic circumstances appear to matter more than women's for marriage.

Finally, family demographers Bumpass and Sweet (2001) have argued that, to be motivated to marry, cohabitators must feel that marriage will change something in their lives. This reasoning is consistent with the arguments of some scholars that marriage itself causes changes in couples' lives that lead to higher incomes or other positive outcomes (Waite, 1995, 2000). Our findings suggest a slightly different take on these matters, at least in terms of economic factors. We find that cohabitators feel that marriage ought to occur once something has *already* changed. In the end, our results suggest that a feeling of readiness to marry hinges not on the hope of a comfortable financial future, but on the sense that it has already been attained.

REFERENCES

- Brown, S. L. (2000). Union transitions among cohabitators: The significance of relationship assessments and expectations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 833-46.
- Bumpass, L., & Lu, H. (2000). Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts. *Population Studies*, *54*, 29-41.
- Bumpass, L., & Sweet, J. A. (2001). Marriage, divorce, and intergenerational relationships. In A. Thornton (Ed.), *The well-being of children and families: Research and data needs*, (pp. 295-313). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Casper, L., & Bianchi, S. (2002). *Continuity and change in the American family*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., & England, P. (2004). Union formation in fragile families. *Demography*, *41*, 237-261.
- Cherlin, A. J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 848-861.
- Clark-Nicolas, P., & Gray-Little, B. (1991). Effect of economic resources on marital quality in African American married couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *53*, 645-655.
- Clarkberg, M. E. (1999). The price of partnering: The role of economic well-being in young adults' first union experiences. *Social Forces*, *77*, 945-968.
- Clarkberg, M. E., Stolzenberg, R. M., & Waite, L. J. (1995). Attitudes, values, and entrance into cohabitational versus marital unions. *Social Forces*, *74*, 609-34.
- Conger, R. D., Elder, G., Lorenz, F., Conger, K., Simons, R., Whitbeck, L., Huck, S., & Melby, J. (1990). Linking economic hardship to marital quality and stability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *52*, 643-656.
- Duvander, A. (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.
- Edin, K. (2000). What do low-income single mothers say about marriage? *Social Problems*, *47*, 112-133.
- Edin, K., & Kefalas, M. J. (forthcoming). *Promises I can keep: Why poor women put motherhood before marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ellwood, D., & Jencks, C. (2001). *The growing difference in family structure: What do we know? Where do we look for answers?* Unpublished paper prepared for the New Inequality Program. New York: Russell Sage.
- Fields, J., & Casper, L. (2001). *America's families and living arrangements: Population characteristics* (Current Population Reports No. P20-537). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Folsom, J. K. (1941). A plan for successful marriages. *Marriage and Family Living*, *3*, 85-86.
- Fox, G. L., & Chancey, D. (1998). Sources of economic distress: Individual and family outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, *19*, 725-749.
- Furstenberg, F. F. (1995). Fathering in the inner city: Paternal participation and public policy. In W. Marsiglio (Ed.), *Fatherhood: Contemporary theory, research, and social policy* (119-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gibson, C., Edin, K., & McLanahan, S. (2003). *High hopes but even higher expectations: The retreat from marriage among low income couples*. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing Working Paper 03-06-FF, Princeton, NJ.
- Hughes, M. E. (2003). Home economics: Metropolitan labor and housing markets and domestic arrangements in young adulthood. *Social Forces*, *81*, 1300-1429.
- Johnson, D., & Booth, A. (1990). Rural economic decline and marital quality: A panel study of farm marriages. *Family Relations*, *39*, 159-165.

- Koball, H. (1998). Have African American men become less committed to marriage? Explaining the 20th century racial cross-over in marriage timing. *Demography*, *35*, 251-258.
- Landale, N. S., & Forste, R. (1991). Patterns of entry into cohabitation and marriage among mainland Puerto Rican women. *Demography*, *28*, 587-607.
- Lichter, D. T., McLaughlin, C. D., Kephart, G., & Landry, D. (1992). Race and the retreat from marriage: A shortage of marriageable men? *American Sociological Review*, *57*, 781-799.
- Lin, A. C. (1998). Bridging positivist and interpretivist approaches to qualitative methods. *Policy Studies Journal*, *26*, 162-180.
- Lloyd, K. M., & South, S. (1996). Contextual Influences on young men's transition to first marriage. *Social Forces*, *74*, 1097-1119.
- Manning, W. (2002). The implications of cohabitation for children's well-being. In A. Booth & A. C. Crouter (Eds.), *Just living together: Implications for children, families, and public policy* (pp. 121-152). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (1995). Why marry? Race and the transition to marriage among cohabitators. *Demography*, *32*, 509-520.
- Mare, R. D., & Winship, C. (1991). Socioeconomic change and the decline of marriage for African Americans and Whites. In C. Jencks & P. E. Peterson (Eds.), *The urban underclass* (pp. 175-202). Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- McLaughlin, D., & Lichter, D. (1997). Poverty and the marital behavior of young women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *59*, 582-594.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Oppenheimer, V. (2000). The continuing importance of men's economic position in marriage formation. In L. Waite, C. Bachrach, M. Hindin, E. Thomson, & A. Thornton (Eds.), *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation* (pp. 283-301). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Oppenheimer, V. (2003). Cohabiting and marriage during young men's career development process. *Demography*, *40*, 127-149.
- Oppenheimer, V., Kalmijn, M., & Lim, N. (1997). Men's career development and marriage timing in a period of rising inequality. *Demography*, *34*, 311-330.
- Raley, R. K. (1996). A shortage of marriageable men? A note on the role of cohabitation in black-white differences in marriage rates. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 973-983.
- Raley, K., & Bumpass L. (2003). The topography of the divorce plateau: Levels and trends in union stability in the United States after 1980. *Demographic Research*, *8*, 245-259.
- Rubin, L. B. (1976). *Worlds of pain: Life in the working-class family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sassler, S. (2004). The process of entering into cohabiting unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 491-505.
- 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.
- Sassler, S., & McNally, J. (2003). Cohabiting couple's economic circumstances and union transitions: A re-examination using multiple imputation techniques. *Social Science Research*, *32*, 553-578.
- Sassler, S., & Schoen, R. (1999). The effects of attitudes and economic activity on marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*, 147-159.
- Smock, P. J., & Manning, W. D. (1997). Cohabiting partners' economic circumstances and marriage. *Demography*, *34*, 331-341.
- Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Gupta, S. (1999). The effect of marriage and divorce on women's economic well-being. *American Sociological Review*, *64*, 794-812.

- Stryker, S. (1972). Symbolic interaction theory: A review and some suggestions for comparative family research. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 3, 17-32.
- Sweeney, M. (2002). Two decades of family change: The shifting economic foundations of marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 67, 132-147.
- Thornton, A., Fricke, T., Axinn, W., & Alwin, D. (2001). Values and beliefs in the lives of children and families. In A. Thornton (Ed.), *The well-being of children and families: Research and data needs* (pp. 215-243). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Thornton, A., Axinn, W., & Teachman, J. (1995). The influence of school enrollment and accumulation on cohabitation and marriage in early adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 762-774.
- Thornton, A., & Young-Demarco, L. (2001). Four decades of trends in attitudes toward family issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63, 1009-1037.
- Waite, L. (1995). Does marriage matter? *Demography*, 32, 483-507.
- Waite, L. (2000). Trends in men's and women's well-being in marriage. In L. Waite, C. Bachrach, M. Hindin, E. Thomson, & A. Thornton (Eds.), *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation* (pp. 368-392). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Weitzman, E. (1999). Analyzing qualitative data with computer software. *Health Services Research*, 34, 1241-1263.
- Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Free Press.
- Wu, Z., & Pollard, M. (2000). Economic circumstances and the stability of nonmarital cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21, 303-328.
- Xie, Y., Raymo, J., Goyette, K., & Thornton, A. (2003). Economic potential and entry into marriage and cohabitation. *Demography*, 40, 351-367.

Table 1. Studies on the Economic Determinants of Marriage**A. Effects of Economic Variables on Marriage/Dissolution among Cohabitators**

<u>Study</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Economic Variables</u>	<u>Marriage</u>	<u>Separation</u>
(1) Brown (2000)	National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH) (cohabiting couples)	Male partner's education	NS	NS
		Male partner's earnings	Positive	NS
		Male partner's employment	NS	NS
		Female partner's education	NS	NS
		Female partner's earnings	NS	NS
(2) Duvander (1999)	Swedish Family Survey 1992 (cohabiting women)	Male partner's education	Positive	N.A.
		Female partner's education	NS	NS
		Female partner's earnings	NS	NS
		Female partner's employment	NS	NS
		Female partner's education	NS	NS
(3) Manning and Smock (1995)	NSFH (cohabiting men and women)	Full-time employment	NS	Negative
(4) Oppenheimer (2003)	National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (cohabiting men)	FT, FY employment-men	Positive	NS
		Education-men	Positive	NS
		Earnings-white men	NS	Negative
		Earnings-black men	NS	NS
(5) Sassler and McNally (2003)	NSFH with imputed data (cohabiting couples)	Male partner's earnings	Negative	Negative
		Female partner's earnings	NS	NS
		Education	NS	NS
(6) Smock and Manning (1997)	NSFH (cohabiting couples)	Female partner's earnings	NS	NS
		Female partner's education	NS	NS
		Male partner's earnings	Positive	NS
		Male partner's education	Positive	NS
(7) Wu and Pollard (2002)	Survey of Labor and Income Dynamics (Canada, 1993-94) (cohabiting men and women)	Professional occupation-men	Positive	NS
		Professional occupation-women	NS	NS
		Semi-prof., full-time-men	Positive	NS
		Semi-prof., full-time-women	NS	Positive
		Education-men	Positive	NS
		Education- women	NS	NS
		Personal earnings-women	NS	Positive
Personal earnings-men	NS	Positive		

B. Effects of Economic Variables on Marriage (or Marriage Versus Cohabitation) among Singles

<u>Study</u>	<u>Data</u>	<u>Economic Variables</u>	<u>Marriage</u>	<u>Cohabitation</u>
(8) Carlson, McLanahan & England (2004)	Fragile Families	Father's earnings ^a	Positive	NS
	(unmarried parents)	Father's education	NS	Negative
		Mother's Earnings	NS	NS
		Mother's Education	Positive	NS
(9) Clarkberg (1999)	National Longitudinal Study Class of 1972 (single men and women)	High relative income-men ^b	Positive	Positive
		High relative income-women	Positive	Positive
		Earnings-men	Positive	Positive
		Earnings-women	Positive	Positive
		Education-men	Positive	NS
		Education-women	Positive	NS
(10) Koball (1998)	NSFH (men)	Full time employment -men	Positive	N.A.
(11) Landale and Forste (1991)	New York Fertility, Employment & Migration Survey (women)	Employed-women	Positive	NS
		Education-women	NS	Negative
(12) Lichter et al. (1992)	NLSY (women)	Education-women	Positive	N.A.
		Earnings-women	Positive	
		Employment-women	Positive	
(13) Lloyd and South (1996)	NSLY (men)	Earnings-men	Positive	N.A.
		Home ownership-men	Positive	
(14) Oppenheimer (1997)	NLSY (men)	Education-men	Positive	N.A.
		Full time employment-men	Positive	
(15) Oppenheimer (2003)	NLSY (men)	Work Experience-men ^c	Positive	NS
		Earnings-men	Positive	Positive
		Career Maturity-men	Positive	Positive
(16) Raley (1996)	NSFH (women)	Employed part time-women	Positive	NS
		Education-women	Positive	Positive

(17) Sassler and Goldscheider (2004)	NSFH (men)	Education-men Employment-men	Positive Positive	NS NS
(18) Sassler and Schoen (1999)	NSFH1 and 2 (men & women)	Employed full time-men Employed full time-women Education-men Education-women	Positive NS Positive NS	N.A.
(19) Sweeney (2002)	NLSY ² (men & women)	Education-women Earnings-women Employed-women Earnings-men Education-men women Employed-men	Positive Positive NS Positive Positive Positive	N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A.
(20) Thornton, Axinn and Teachman (1995)	Intergenerational Panel Study of Parents and Children (men & women)	Education-men Education-women	Positive Positive	Negative Negative
(21) Xie et al. (2003)	1980-92 High School & Beyond (men & women)	Earnings-men Earnings-women Education-men Education-women	Positive NS Positive NS	NS NS NS Negative

Positive or Negative means coefficient statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. NS = not statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

^a Results from Model 2, Table 3

^b Effects stronger for marriage than cohabitation

^c Effects vary for different age groups; this paper reports results for 19-21, 22-25, and 26-34. They also vary by race with the positive effect of work experience on marriage limited to white men.

Table 2. Distribution of Sample According to Race, Gender, Education, Income and Employment Status

	White Male	White Female	Black Male	Black Female	Latino	Latina	Total %
Percent	19.1	25.2	13.9	14.8	13.0	13.9	100.0
<u>Educational Attainment</u>							
Less than High School	4.5	3.4	18.8	0.0	33.3	25.0	12.2
High School or G.E.D.	22.7	10.3	31.3	41.2	40.0	18.8	25.2
Technical or Some College	50.0	48.3	43.8	41.2	20.0	56.3	44.3
College Graduate	22.7	37.9	6.3	17.6	6.7	0.0	18.3
<u>Personal Income</u>							
Less than \$20,000	22.2	50.0	56.3	64.7	69.2	92.9	57.3
\$20,000-\$40,000	50.0	50.0	31.3	35.3	30.8	7.1	35.4
More than \$40,000	27.8	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3
<u>Employment Status</u>							
Employed	95.5	93.1	81.3	88.2	53.3	62.5	81.7
Not Employed	4.5	6.9	18.7	11.8	46.6	37.5	18.2
N	22	29	16	17	15	16	115

Table 3. Distribution of Sample by Perceived Prerequisites for Marriage					
	N	Only Economic	Only Relationship	Relationship & Economic	No Response
Total Sample	115	22.6	23.5	49.6	4.3
Gender					
Male	53	20.8	24.5	47.2	7.5
Female	62	24.2	22.6	51.6	1.6
Race/Ethnicity					
White	51	25.5	29.4	41.2	3.9
African American	33	18.2	18.2	63.6	0.0
Latinos/Latinas	31	22.6	19.4	48.4	9.7