

Attitudes toward Marriage in the Philippines

Lindy Williams
Department of Development Sociology
Warren Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
lbw2@cornell.edu

Midea Kabamalan
Department of Sociology
University of Hawaii at Manoa
& East-West Center
Honolulu, HI 96848-1711

Nimfa Ogena
Population Institute
Palma Hall
University of the Philippines
Quezon City, The Philippine

Introduction:

In a recent symposium on marriage, Smock (2004: 966-967) identified two prominent themes articulated by the contributors: “(a) that marriage has ‘retreated’; and (b) that the retreat is due to a complex and interrelated set of social forces.” These same causal forces (e.g., changing gender roles within and outside marriage, low fertility norms, norms tolerating alternatives to marriage, including allowance for childbearing outside of marriage, norms tolerating divorce when marriages prove unsatisfactory) also may be reinforced by the retreat. While many of the papers in the symposium focused on North American and European contexts, declines in marriage and fertility worldwide are among the few generalizable patterns in family change recently identified by Adams (2004).

Although a similar retreat from marriage has been identified in a number of contexts in Asia (Jones, 1997; Jones, 2005; Leete, 1994), the region as a whole is characterized by considerable diversity in marriage patterns (Jones, 2004). East Asian men’s and women’s marriage patterns mirror fairly closely those in Europe, for example, both in timing and in nature of historical change, yet South Asian women and men have typically married earlier than individuals from elsewhere in Asia. Southeast Asian patterns have tended to fall somewhere in between those of the other two regions (Smith and Shiu-Meng Ng, 1982).

In this paper we examine data on formal and informal unions in the Philippines. According to Smith and Shiu-Meng Ng (1982: 250), over the first three quarters of the twentieth century, the Philippines pattern shifted “from the middle of the South-east Asian cluster to a point bordering on the East Asian pattern.” Furthermore, the available data “place the nineteenth-century Philippines clearly outside the Southeast Asian pattern of very low celibacy” (Smith and Shiu-Meng Ng, 1982: 250). While non-marriage in the Philippines has been relatively more common historically than is true in much of the rest of Southeast Asia, other countries are now catching up (Jones, 2004). For reasons that will become clear in this paper, however, we do not expect that the Philippines experience will be fully generalizable to her neighbors. We examine survey data on attitudes toward marriage and cohabitation among a sample of 15-27 year olds, and we do an exploratory analysis of teens’ and young adults’ experiences with both

types of unions. In addition, we examine transcripts from focus group data to expand our understanding of attitude differences across generations.

A shift toward cohabitation?

Early marriage and childbearing are now less regular occurrences in Southeast Asia than they once were (Rele and Alam, 1993; Jones, 2004). Within the region, age at first marriage has increased over the years in a range of contexts including predominantly Muslim countries such as Indonesia and Malaysia, and primarily Buddhist and Catholic countries such as Thailand and the Philippines respectively (Alam and Leete, 1993; Berfield, 1997; Singh and Samara, 1996). What this implies for relationships in the period of time before marriage is not yet certain, however. For example, cohabitation has taken the place of marriage for some couples in Europe and the United States, as marriage and cohabitation exhibit many of the same characteristics: “shared home, economic support, sexual intimacy, and not infrequently, children” (Kiernan, 2004:985). According to Seltzer (2004:922), in the United States and Great Britain, “cohabitation before first marriage is now the behavioral norm,” with three quarters of British marital unions and over half of U.S. marital unions beginning as cohabitations (Bumpass and Lu, 2000; Haskey, 2001). Increases in cohabitation have been observed across race and ethnic lines and across socioeconomic categories, with cohabiting relationships now frequently including children (Cherlin, 2004). Nonetheless, in the United States, cohabitation remains more common among couples with less education and fewer financial assets than among their more well-off counterparts.

The extent to which such opposite sex coresidence is considered acceptable when the couple does not marry shows marked variation globally though; and it is not clear whether it will gain widespread acceptance in Southeast Asian contexts in the near term. According to Jones (2004:35), increases in non-marital cohabitation are offsetting decreases in marital unions in many Western contexts, and “non-married non-cohabiting but sexually intimate relationships are to some extent filling the gap” in Southern Europe and Japan, yet “elsewhere in Southeast and East Asia, neither of these trends appears to be very strong” at present. At the same time, Kabamalan (2004) has recently documented a slight increase in

cohabiting unions among young Filipinos between 1994 and 2002, and indicated that media portrayals of cohabiting couples may now be challenging more conservative positions against the practice.

In this paper, we expand the recent work of Kabamalan (2004) and examine attitudes and behavior regarding cohabiting and non-cohabiting unions among teens and young adults in the Philippines. According to Seltzer (2004), attitudes toward less conventional behaviors such as cohabitation and divorce may shift in favor of those behaviors once one has experienced the behavior. In addition, as younger people develop a tolerance for certain behaviors, the door becomes open to future widespread adoption of those behaviors. We are fortunate to have data on marriage and cohabitation attitudes and experiences among a national sample of 15-27 year olds, who are likely to be the ones to establish the next set of norms regarding the formalization of unions in that predominantly Catholic country.

To preface the discussion that follows, we would like to clarify that when we use the term “marriage” or “married” in the context of the Philippines, that indicates that a wedding ceremony (regardless of type, i.e. church or civil) formalized the union in question. In contrast, respondents who were classified as “cohabiting” had been living together like a married couple, but without a wedding ceremony. We use the term “union” to refer to both formal marriages and cohabiting arrangements. At times, the terms “formal” or “legal” are used to describe the “marriage” for emphasis.

Data

The data used in the statistical analyses in this paper are from the 2002 Young Adult Fertility and Sexuality Study (YAFS). The YAFS is the third of a series of cross-sectional surveys focusing on youth conducted by the Demographic Research and Development Foundation and the University of the Philippines Population Institute. The survey includes among others, the topic of marriage behavior and attitudes. It is national in scope and covers both males and females, ages 15 to 27. A total of 19,728 youth were interviewed.

Sampling was done with the intention of drawing a nationally representative sample of youth ages 15 to 27 years old, with each of the 16 regions within the Philippines treated as a domain. In each domain, the *barangays* (villages) were stratified into three categories, with population size as the stratification variable. The number of sample *barangays* was then allocated proportionally, and sample *barangays* were selected using simple random sampling. Each sample *barangay* was divided into enumeration areas (EA) and one EA was selected using probability proportional to size. In each sample EA, a household listing was then done and households with no eligible youth respondent (that is, with no household member age between 15 and 27 years old) were dropped from the list. Sample households were then selected using systematic sampling and all youth within each sample household were enumerated (see Berja and Kabamalan, 2004).¹

To augment the statistical data, we also analyze data from 4 focus group interviews that were conducted in Metro Manila. We focus on the urban middle class because they are supposed to be on the leading edge of the shift toward later (and even foregone) marriage in the Philippines. The focus groups were intended to get a sense of the different issues that are currently motivating people to marry early, postpone marrying, or avoid marriage altogether. We are able to compare responses from men's groups and women's groups. Two sets of guidelines were constructed, one for younger participants (18-24 years of age) and one set for older participants (40-50 years of age). For this paper, we are presenting preliminary data from the younger sample only. Eventually we will augment the analysis with data from older participants, as they have had a richer history and present much more detailed accounts of marriage and cohabitation experiences. See Table A below for information about the focus group study design.

Focus groups guidelines were developed in English and translated into Tagalog and pre-tested. Issues covered in the guidelines developed for the young groups include perceptions of marriage and non-marital alternatives, dating and friendship, age at marriage, characteristics of an ideal spouse, expectations within marriage, perceptions of divorce and remarriage, and problems that could occur within marriage.

¹ Although all youth were eligible for the survey (regardless of their religion), Muslim youth are not included in this study because they were not asked questions about their cohabitation experience and their views about cohabitation.

For the older groups these same questions were asked, as were questions about perceived changes in family formation over the previous generation. The focus groups therefore provide information that will eventually allow us to examine change by comparing attitudes and opinions of participants from two cohorts, and to examine perceptions of change as expressed by the older groups of participants.

Table A. Number and Composition of Focus Groups

<u>Respondent Characteristics</u>		
<u>Marital Status and Sex</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Groups</u>
Ever-married women	40-50	2
Never-married women	18-24	2
Ever-married men	40-50	2
Never-married men	18-29	2
Total		8

The variables

The union status variable was created from several questions in the YAFS. It includes (1) those never in union, (2) those who had been formally married but who had not cohabited previously, (3) those who had cohabited and who had not been married, and (4) those who had been formally married, but who had also cohabited before marriage. It is fairly straightforward to determine those who have never been in union, or the “singles.” To identify the union status of other respondents who had ever been in some kind of union, answers from several questions were required. Those who said they had ever been in a union were asked: “At present, are you formally married, living-in, widowed, separated, or divorced?” Obviously, a “living-in” response indicates cohabitation. Those who responded “formally married” were also asked about cohabitation prior to the formal marriage. Respondents who answered that they were, “widowed, separated, or divorced,” or those who had been in a union more than once, were asked a similar set of questions about their first union. In this analysis, we focus on the first union experience of

the youth. Because the sample is comprised of quite young respondents, the first union is very often their only union.

In addition, all youth, regardless of union status, were asked a number of questions about attitudes toward marriage, cohabitation, and related activities such as gender roles within unions, sex before formal marriage, extra-marital affairs, separation and remarriage. For the following questions respondents were asked whether they strongly agreed, agreed, neither agreed nor disagreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statements:

- a. It is much better for everyone if the man is the breadwinner and the woman takes care of the home and family.
- b. If both the husband and the wife work full-time, they should share in household tasks equally.
- c. It is a wife's duty to have sexual intercourse with her husband whenever he wants it.
- d. It is alright for unmarried people to live together even if they have no plans to marry.
- e. It is alright for a woman to get pregnant even if she is not married to the father of the child.
- f. It is alright for a woman to get married/live together with someone before she finishes her studies.
- g. In general, married people are happier than unmarried ones.
- h. In general, married couples are happier than living-in couples.
- i. It is alright for men to have extramarital affairs.
- j. It is alright for women to have extramarital affairs.
- k. A couple with an unhappy marriage should separate.
- l. It is alright for a separated/divorced person to remarry.

These attitudinal questions were examined in a factor analysis to determine which of these questions are structurally related to each other. Results (not shown here) identify a total of five factors and explain 65 percent of the variance. Using 0.50 factor loading as the cut-off point for inclusion in a factor (see Blaikie, 2003), results indicate a clustering of factors toward similar situations or behaviors.

Attitudes about gender roles (a, b, and c) cluster together on one of the five factors and form the basis for an index.² The index was created by first, reversing the codes for attitude b to make it consistent with the other two, then adding the scores on the three variables, and recoding the resulting variable into quintiles.

² Other factors identified are as follows. Attitudes d, e, and f, all relating to cohabitation, are correlated to the first factor. Attitudes i and j, addressing extramarital affairs, are correlated to the second factor. Happiness of married couples compared with other groups (g and h) cluster together on the third factor. Attitudes about separation and remarriage (k and l) are related to the fourth factor. For factors included in the regressions, mean values were calculated.

Other attitudinal questions include simple approval or disapproval of:

1. Single women dating married men
2. Single women dating separated/divorced men
3. Single men dating married women
4. Single men dating separated/divorced women.
5. A woman having sex before marriage
6. A man having sex before marriage

The youth were also asked of the:

7. General importance of virginity until marriage
8. Importance of virginity in the youth's choice of spouse.
9. Whether they would support a bill to legalize divorce in the Philippines.
10. Ideal ages at marriage (separately for both men and women).

Some socio-demographic variables include age and sex of respondent, "who raised the youth through age 15" (which compares life with two biological parents to other arrangements), religiosity (measured by frequency of going to church services), education in years, and main activity. For youth who had never been in union, the last two variables (educational attainment and main activity) were measured at the time of the survey. If the respondent had ever been in a union, those variables were measured both at the time of the survey and at the time of the union.

Results

In Table 1 the sample is divided into three broad age groups. As is shown in the table, there are 9,968 15 to 19 year olds, 6,509 20 to 24 year olds, and 2,654 25 to 27 year olds in the full sample. Men comprise just under half of the sample (46.4 percent) and women comprise the other 53.6 percent. As is clear from Table 1, the vast majority of respondents were never in union at the time of the interview. About 15 percent had been married, with just over half of those having cohabited for some time before marriage. In addition, 7.3 percent of respondents had been in a cohabiting relationship, but had not yet entered a formal marriage arrangement.

Not surprisingly, older respondents were more likely than younger ones to have ever been formally married (about half of 25 to 27 year olds and close to a quarter of 20 to 24 year olds (22 percent),

compared to 1.4 percent among the teen sample). In addition, women in the sample were much more likely than men to have been married (21.5 percent versus 7.6 percent) or to have cohabited (20.5 percent versus 8.5 percent). By age 20-24, 31.2 percent of women had been married, compared to 10.8 percent of men. Similarly, 31.2 percent of women and 13.9 percent of men had ever cohabited.

Table 2 shows respondents' views of the ideal age at marriage for men and for women and the results help explain the data shown in Table 1. As a rule, women are expected to marry earlier than men. Over ten percent of respondents (11.4 percent) felt that women should marry before they are 20 years old, while only 2.2 percent felt that men should marry that early. Roughly forty-two percent indicated that women should marry in their early twenties, while just under a third (31.2 percent) felt similarly about men's optimal marriage age. Finally, while about ten percent felt that men should marry at age 30 or above, only 1.5 percent thought women should wait that long. Not surprisingly, stated preferences for later marriage were more common in the never in union sub-sample than in any other group.

Interestingly, those who had been raised by two biological parents, rather than in some other family configuration were more likely to be in the never-in-union group than in any other. Results are shown in Table 3. Those who had either been raised by a single parent or in some other family type were considerably more likely than those raised by both biological parents to have cohabited only (11.4 percent compared to 6.5 percent), or to have ever cohabited (21.4 percent compared to 13.6 percent). In addition, cohabitation experience appears to be associated with less regular attendance at religious services. Lower percentages of those who attend services more than once a week have cohabited only (or ever) than is true of those who attend less frequently.

In Table 4, we narrow our focus to those who had ever been in some kind of union, leaving aside those who had not. The sample is roughly evenly divided among those who have been married only (33.3 percent), those who have cohabited only (32.8 percent), and those who cohabited and then married their partner (33.9 percent). In this table, we look at educational attainment and primary activity at the time the union began. The data indicate that those with the least education were most apt to have cohabited only (about 42 percent), while those who had completed college were the least likely to have done so (just

under one in five in that group). Those who had completed high school were intermediate to the other two groups. The data on activity status indicate that unpaid family workers were more likely than those in other subgroups to have married only, and particularly unlikely (compared to other groups to have cohabited and then married). In addition, unemployed respondents were particularly likely to have cohabited only, without formalizing their union. Other differences according to activity status are less striking.

In Table 5a, we present attitudinal data for the different union status subgroups. The first three variables in the table focus on gender roles within marriage. Interestingly, while a decided majority of all subgroups felt that it is “much better for everyone if the male is the bread-winner and the woman takes care of the home and family”, an even more striking majority of all subgroups either agreed or strongly agreed that if both partners are working full-time, they should share equally in household tasks. Fewer respondents agreed or strongly agreed that it was a woman’s duty to have sex every time her husband desired it (just under a quarter of the full sample).

Much more variation is observed across union subgroups in their acceptance of cohabitation prior to marriage. Not surprisingly, acceptance of cohabitation is greatest among those who had been in a cohabiting union that had not (yet) transitioned to marriage, and least among those who had been in a marital union, but had not cohabited. A similar pattern was observed regarding respondents’ acceptance of non-marital pregnancy. When asked if it was okay for a woman to marry or cohabit while she was still in school, widest acceptance is observed among those who had ever cohabited, with the lowest acceptance among those who had not yet been in union.

By and large, respondents viewed married people as happier than others, particularly those in cohabiting unions. Lowest agreement with these two comparisons, again not surprisingly, was found among those who had cohabited only, but over half of them agreed or strongly agreed that married people are happier than cohabiters. There was very low tolerance for extramarital affairs, either for men or for women, although percentages agreeing or strongly agreeing that of extramarital affairs are okay for

women are particularly low, never reaching three percent of any subgroup. Highest acceptance of these behaviors was found among the never-in-union subsample.

Finally, there is still mixed acceptance of the idea that one should separate if the marriage is not working out. Again, highest acceptance of this was found among cohabiters. Higher percentages agreed that it should be alright to remarry if one had separated or divorced, but the only group among whom percentages agreeing or strong agreeing exceeded 50 percent was the cohabiters.

Table 5b and 5c examine these attitudes according to the sex and age of respondents respectively. Not surprisingly, men tended to have more conservative views of gender roles within marriage and more liberal views of cohabitation, non-marital pregnancy, and extra-marital affairs. They tend to be more apt to believe that marriage affords greater happiness than other living arrangements, and more likely to feel that it is alright for a person to remarry if s/he has been divorced or separated. Men and women are about equally likely to feel that it is alright to separate if a marriage is not going well, however, with women being slightly more accepting of separation than men.

Younger respondents are most apt to feel that the man should be the primary breadwinner, while older respondents are more apt to agree that women should provide sex on demand. The 20 to 24 year olds are most apt to express tolerant attitudes toward cohabitation, non-marital pregnancy, and extra-marital affairs. Older respondents are more apt to tolerate marital dissolution.

Table 6 address similar behaviors but is derived from different questions during the interview (i.e., they were not asked in the same battery of questions and not asked in the same format). Again, tolerance of divorce is greatest among those who had cohabited only. In this case the attitude is meant to tap legalization of divorce and may make the behavior somewhat more distant and less personal than the general question on union dissolution. Expectations that women in general should be virgins and that one's own spouse should be a virgin are highest among those who had never been in union. Again, we are reminded of Seltzer's (2004) insight that acceptance of a behavior may increase if one becomes exposed to the behavior.

We turn now to Table 7, in which we present results of a logistic regression predicting whether or not respondents in this relatively young sample have ever cohabited. The ever-cohabit category includes those who have cohabited and then married, and those who have just cohabited. Results are largely consistent with what we have showed thus far. Women are very much more likely to have ever cohabited than are men (3.8 times), and older respondents are increasingly more likely to have cohabited than younger ones.

As is true in a variety of other contexts, socioeconomic variables suggest that cohabitation may be more common among lower SES couples; those who are in the paid labor force are less likely to have cohabited than are those working as unpaid family labor, and individuals who have completed more schooling are less likely to have cohabited than those with the least formal education. Interestingly, while students are more likely to have cohabited, those who are unemployed/not in the labor force are less likely to have done so. We expect that this group may be the least likely to have married as well, as recent work in Thailand has showed that men out of the labor force are especially likely to be never-married into their early forties. On the other hand, women who are unemployed may be housewives and those who went directly into a marital union without cohabiting at any point. Future analyses will be run separately for men and women to further examine this result.

Our family background variable suggests that those raised by two biological parents will be less likely to have ever cohabited than are people raised in other family forms. This is what the largely U.S. and European based literature would suggest. In addition, those who attend religious services more frequently were less likely to have cohabited than were those who attended less often. Again, these results suggest that where reinforcement of traditional norms may deter Filipino youth from entering cohabiting unions.

Finally, net of all other factors, those who held more conservative attitudes about gender roles were somewhat more likely to have cohabited than those holding more liberal views, while those holding more liberal views about cohabitation and divorce were more likely to have cohabited than were their more

traditional counterparts. Net of all other factors, respondents were somewhat less likely to view married people as generally more happy than others.

Focus group data

The group interviews reveal some insights not available through YAFS. First, in nearly all groups there was consensus that eventually, formal marriage is more desirable than simple cohabitation, at least for women. The possibility of a non-marital pregnancy was central to much of the discussion.

Woman 1: Even if it is now what they say is the “Generation X”, having a formal marriage ceremony is still important. Furthermore, I also observe that there are early marriages which are not approved, so the wedding is delayed and they go for the live-in relationship. The wedding follows later. For those who get pregnant in such relationship there is something lacking – the wedding. That is still important.

Woman 2: Isn't it that if parents are not legally married the child can't bear the father's name? And that's pitiful on the part of the child.

Women in this group noted that men do not face as much pressure to formalize a union.

Woman 1: Depends on the men. Some men are obliged to wed the girl because he got her pregnant. Some have other reasons. Even if he has an obligation to the woman (got her pregnant) he may still leave.

Woman 2: It is still important, but not as important as how women value it. It's like something forced on men.

Woman 1: Naturally it's the women. They view it differently and we are the losers. Women are the ones in favor of legal marriage. Men just want sex, but resist the idea of legal marriage.

This same view was articulated in the other groups as well. While the second group of women seemed certain that marriage was important, particularly for mothers with children, this group was a little bit easier on men:

Woman 1, group 2: And also, the reason why they wanted to be married is that they will not be on the losing side. If he will leave you [and you are not married], you will be left. If you are married, though, he has an obligation to the child. He has to support the child because you are the legal wife, and you have all the legal documents.

Woman 2: If the man really wants the woman, he will insist on a marriage by all means.

Consistent with at least some of what the women's groups were concluding, men's groups were more split on whether or not a formal marriage was essential for them, but most agreed it was important for women. In some instances the particular need for a formal marriage was not articulated, as many of the features of a union that could also characterize an informal one were viewed favorably. For others, the distinction between union type was clearer. When asked whether legal marriage is important these days, one group of men generally agreed that marriage is eventually desirable. In the second group a lively discussion ensued in the first group. Some excerpts are as follows:

Man 1[D]: For me it is not that important.

Man 2[R]: Maybe it's important for us to have a partner.

Man 3[J]: For me it is also important because as it is said, the reason we are here is that each of us has a destined partner. It is also important so that we can test ourselves through trials. And to prove that you can live on your own.

Man 1[D]: I don't believe in formalizing marriage or getting wed. I do believe in living together because it will test if we are really for each other.

Man 4[R]: I also agree with him. A marriage is only for legalization, but personally it is not that important.

Man 2[R]: I value formalizing marriage or getting wed because we should not only let the law of men prevail, but the law of God as well. It is important because that's what the Lord says. Marriage in the Bible implies a blessing from God. And that makes it important.

Man 1 [D]: With my female friends, they worry so much about their future. They look for men on whom they can rely. So it's more important on their part.

Man 3[J]: Formal marriage is not yet important for me. For marriage should not be done in haste. It is hard to get out from it once you're in that situation. It's like hot rice you can't afford to spit out. It will only cause you despair if you opt into it in haste. It's much better if you first take the time to know the girl you wish to marry. If you think you both get along well, maybe it's the right time for marriage wherein you are now very sure of yourself.

Man 5 [G]: For me it's not too important. Better if it's live-in for the moment and then find your soulmate, the right woman for you.

Man 1 [D]: It is very important for women because this will serve as a legal ground if she decides to claim for support if ever they separate ways. But for men it's not too important.

On the one hand, marriage was seen as important eventually for both groups of women, one group of men, and for a number of participants in the remaining group. On the other hand, formal marriage was

often postponed because of dire financial circumstances. When asked why one would not get married the first response of the first group of young women was poverty. In addition, if parents do not approve of a match, couples often cohabit in the hopes that parents will come around. The second group of women noted that unemployment was an important issue and added that seeing the struggles of their parents and siblings (both financial and other) made them cautious about getting married too soon. Both men and women saw lack of responsibility as an additional barrier to marriage, and men saw financial circumstances as essential.

Man 1: It is important [to get married] if you have money. Okay. But if you are financially in need, I think it's not the right time to get married....

When asked why men sometimes prefer not to marry these days:

Man 2: Of course because of financial problems.

Man 3: Basically, financial problem is the number one reason.

Man 2: We're having difficult times nowadays and you still wish to add one more mouth to feed?

Overall, the focus group data suggest that even among the urban middle class, marriage is still seen as desirable for women. Most of the people in the groups interviewed still hold fairly conservative views of marriage, particularly as it relates to childbearing. In addition, data not discussed here make it clear that expected gender division of labor within the household remains quite traditional, with many men wishing to be the breadwinners, while their wives tend to the household and children. Cohabitation, it seems, is thought of by most to be tolerable in the short run, particularly for men, but not desirable in the long run, particularly for women.

Conclusions

The literature suggests that marriage is in retreat throughout much of the world. Some shifts toward non-marriage have been identified in Southeast Asia, and these have been particularly striking in the large cities of the region (Jones, 2004). Jones (2004) presents census data that actually show a slight decline

after 1980 in the percentages unmarried among 45-49 year old women in the Philippines. Our data do not provide much evidence for a normative shift in that direction of large scale permanent non-marriage at this point, or of a replacement for formal legal marriage with cohabitation, even among young middle class men and women who were interviewed in Metro Manila. While the focus group data are not at all representative of the broader population, they provide some insights into current attitudes held by some young singles in the capital city. In addition, the YAFS data indicate that only 18.5 percent of the sample believes that it is alright to cohabit without plans to marry, and only 15.2 percent of the sample believes that it is alright to get pregnant if you are not yet married. [MORE TO COME].

References

- Adams, Bert N. 2004. "Families and Family Studies in International Perspective," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66(5), 1076-1088.
- Alam, Iqbal and Richard Leete, 1993. "Fertility in India and Indonesia," Pp. 148-172 in R. Leete and I. Alam (eds.), *The Revolution in Asian Fertility*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berfield, Susan, 1997. "Why So Many Women Won't Settle for Marriage," *Asiaweek* (June 27): 30-37.
- Berja, Claire L., and Kabamalan, M. Midea. M. 2004. 2002 Young adult fertility and sexuality survey: technical notes. In C. M. Raymundo & G. T. Cruz (eds.), *Youth Sex and Risk Behaviors* (pp. 166-175). Quezon City: Demographic Research and Development Foundation, Inc. and University of the Philippines Population Institute.
- Blaikie, Norman. 2003. *Analyzing quantitative data: from description to explanation*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Bumpass, L.L. and H. H. Lu. 2000. "Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the United States," *Population Studies-a Journal of Demography* 54:29-41.
- Cherlin, A. J. 2004. "The Deinstitutionalization of American marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66(4):848-861.
- Haskey, J. 2001. "Cohabitation in Great Britain: Past, present and future trends-and attitudes," *Population Trends*, 103:4-25.
- Jones, Gavin W. 2004. "Not 'When to Marry' but 'Whether to Marry': The Changing Context of Marriage Decisions in East and Southeast Asia," in G.W. Jones and K. Ramdas (eds.) *Untying the Knot: Ideal and Reality in Asian Marriage*. Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore: Singapore, pp. 3-56.
- Jones, Gavin W. 1997. "The demise of universal marriage in East and South-East Asia," in G.W. Jones, R.M. Douglas, J.C. Caldwell, and R. M. D'Souza (eds). *The Continuing Demographic Transition*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Jones, Gavin W. 2005. "The 'Flight from Marriage' in Southeast Asia," *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 36(1):93-119.
- Kabamalan, Midea M. 2004. New path to marriage: the significance of increasing cohabitation in the Philippines. *Philippine Population Review*, 3(1), 111-127.
- Kiernan, Kathleen. 2004. "Redrawing the Boundaries of Marriage," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66(4), 980-987.
- Leete, Richard. 1994. "The Continuing Flight from Marriage and Parenthood Among the Overseas Chinese in East and Southeast Asia: Dimensions and Implications," *Population and Development Review* 20(4): 811-829.
- Rele, J.R. and Iqbal Alam, 1993. "Fertility Transition in Asia: The Statistical Evidence," Pp. 15-38 in R. Leete and I. Alam (eds.), *The Revolution in Asian Fertility*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Seltzer, J. A. 2004. "Cohabitation in the United States and Britain: Demography, kinship, and the future." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66:921-928.

Singh, Susheela and Renee Samara, 1996. Early marriage among women in developing countries, *Family Planning Perspectives*, 22(4), pp. 148-157&175.

Smith and Shiu-Meng Ng, 1982. "The Components of Population Change in Nineteenth-century Southeast Asia: Village Data from the Philippines," *Population Studies* 36(2): 237-255.

Smock, Pamela J. 2004. "The Wax and Wane of Marriage: Prospects for Marriage in the 21st Century," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 66(4): 966-973.

Westley, Sidney B. and Andrew Mason, 1998. "Women are Key Players in the Economies of East and Southeast Asia," *Asia-Pacific Population and Policy*, 44, Honolulu: East-West Center.

Table 1. Status of first union by sex and age group

	<i>Never in Union</i>	<i>Married Only</i>	<i>Live-In Only</i>	<i>Cohabit, then Marry</i>	<i>Total</i>
Sex					
Men	87.6	3.8	4.7	3.8	8,884
Women	68.9	10.6	9.6	10.9	10,249
Age Group					
<i>15-19</i>	95.5	0.7	3.1	0.7	9,968
Men	98.7	0.2	1.0	0.1	4,876
Women	92.5	1.2	5.1	1.2	5,092
<i>20-24</i>	66.5	10.2	11.5	11.8	6,509
Men	80.8	5.3	8.4	5.5	2,948
Women	54.6	14.2	14.2	17.0	3,561
<i>25-27</i>	37.6	26.3	12.9	23.2	2,654
Men	55.6	16.8	11.4	16.2	1,058
Women	25.6	32.6	13.9	27.9	1,596
Total	77.6	7.5	7.3	7.6	19,133

Table 2. Ideal age at marriage by first union status

Ideal age at marriage	<i>Never in Union</i>	<i>Married Only</i>	<i>Live-In Only</i>	<i>Cohabit, then marry</i>	<i>Total</i>
For Men:					
Under 20 years of age	2.2	1.8	2.9	1.8	2.2
20-24	29.9	31.8	41.3	34.1	31.2
25-29	57.3	57.2	48.1	55.1	56.4
30 or older	10.6	9.2	7.7	9.0	10.2
Total	14,764	1,424	1,400	1,447	19,035
For Women:					
Under 20 years of age	10.2	14.2	19.0	13.6	11.4
20-24	41.1	44.9	48.2	46.3	42.3
25 -29	46.9	40.5	32.2	39.5	44.8
30 or older	1.8	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.5
Total	14,766	1,420	1,399	1,444	19,029

Table 3. Status of first union by selected background characteristics

Selected Characteristics	Never in Union	Married Only	Live-In Only	Cohabit, then Marry	Total
<i>Raised by</i>					
Both parents	78.9	7.5	6.5	7.1	15,919
One parent and/or other(s)	71.2	7.4	11.4	10.0	3,211
<i>Religiosity</i>					
Attends > once/week	81.1	7.2	5.3	6.3	1,326
Attends once/week	79.4	7.8	5.4	7.4	7,079
Attends 1-3 times/month	74.6	8.0	8.4	9.0	4,197
Attends rarely/never	76.9	6.8	9.2	7.1	6,489

Table 4. Status of first union by selected background characteristics

Selected Characteristics	Married Only	Live-In Only	Cohabit, then Marry	Total
Education				
Elementary	31.2	41.6	27.2	794
High School	28.7	36.9	34.4	2,262
College +	43.9	18.5	37.7	1,149
Total	33.3	32.7	34.0	4,205
Main Activity				
None/unemployed	33.9	28.1	38.0	1,783
Student	32.3	37.0	30.7	462
Working – paid	32.7	36.0	31.3	1,933
Unpaid family work	39.3	35.5	25.2	107
Total	33.3	32.8	33.9	4,285

Table 5a. Status of first union and current attitudes: Percent who agree or strongly agree

Attitudes	Never in Union	Married Only	Live-In Only	Cohabit, then Marry	Total
Man should be bread-winner	79.1	76.2	80.0	74.2	78.6
If both work, should share housework	87.2	85.2	84.2	84.0	86.6
Wife's duty – sex on demand	21.6	27.4	27.8	29.3	23.1
Okay to cohabit w/out plans to marry	18.7	8.6	29.2	16.2	18.5
Okay to get pregnant if not married	14.3	9.6	30.7	15.1	15.2
Okay for woman to marry/cohabit while still in school	20.5	21.5	28.2	25.8	21.6
Married are happier than unmarried	52.2	56.3	48.4	56.1	52.5
Married are happier than cohabiters	66.0	70.7	53.7	68.6	65.7
Extramarital affair okay for a woman	2.3	1.2	1.4	1.0	2.1
Extramarital affair okay for a man	5.2	2.4	3.1	3.5	4.7
Okay to separate if unhappy	34.7	34.0	44.7	39.6	35.8
Okay to remarry after separation/ divorce	49.5	38.8	52.7	44.1	48.5

Table 5b. Current attitudes by sex of respondent: Percent who agree or strongly agree

Attitudes	Women	Men	Total
Man should be bread-winner	74.0	83.8	78.5
If both work, should share housework	87.9	85.0	86.6
Wife's duty – sex on demand	21.5	24.9	23.1
Okay to cohabit w/out plans to marry	11.4	26.7	18.5
Okay to get pregnant if not married	13.0	17.9	15.3
Okay for woman to cohabit while still in school	17.9	25.7	21.6
Married are happier than unmarried	48.7	56.8	52.5
Married are happier than cohabiters	64.1	67.4	65.6
Extramarital affair okay for a woman	1.2	3.1	2.1
Extramarital affair okay for a man	2.2	7.7	4.7
Okay to separate if unhappy	36.1	35.4	35.8
Okay to remarry after separation	45.5	51.9	48.5

Table 5c. Current attitudes by age of respondent: Percent who agree or strongly agree

Attitudes	15-19	20-24	25-27	Total
Man should be bread-winner	81.2	76.3	74.1	78.5
If both work, share housework –NS	86.6	86.3	87.0	86.6
Wife's duty – sex on demand	21.0	24.3	27.8	23.1
Okay to cohabit w/out plans to marry	16.9	20.5	19.7	18.5
Okay to get pregnant if not married	12.8	18.3	15.2	17.1
Okay for woman to cohabit while still in school	18.8	24.9	23.7	21.6
Married are happier than unmarried	52.4	51.8	54.5	52.5
Married are happier than cohabiters	66.2	64.6	66.0	65.6
Extramarital affair okay, women	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.1
Extramarital affair okay, men	4.5	5.1	4.5	4.7
Okay to separate if unhappy	33.0	38.7	39.3	35.8
Okay to remarry after separation	47.1	50.2	49.3	48.5

NS: Chi-square value is not significant.

Table 6. Status of first union and current attitudes: Percent who approve of behavior or agree with attitude

Behavior/Attitudes	Never in Union	Married Only	Live-In Only	Cohabit, then Marry	Total
Divorce should be legal	36.8	32.2	43.9	36.7	36.9
Very important that a woman should be a virgin until married - general	61.3	59.3	45.3	50.2	59.2
Very important that spouse should be a virgin	60.6	57.2	40.8	48.5	57.9

Table 7. Logistic regression coefficients for ever-cohabit

	B	Exp(B)
<i>Female</i>	1.339***	3.815
<i>Age</i>	.278***	1.321
<i>Raised by both parents</i>	-.513***	.599
<i>Religiosity</i>		
Attends > once/week	-.162	.850
Attends once/week	---	---
Attends 1-3 times/month	.264***	1.302
Attends rarely/never	.255***	1.290
<i>Education</i>		
Elementary	---	---
High School	-.291***	.748
College +	-1.286***	.276
<i>Main Activity</i>		
None/unemployed	-.825***	.438
Student	.186***	1.204
Working – paid	-.573***	.564
Unpaid family work	---	---
<i>Attitudes</i>		
Conservative gender roles in marriage	.049**	1.050
Married people are happier	-.059*	.942
Cohabitation is okay	.327***	1.387
Divorce should be legal	.084***	1.087
<i>Constant</i>	-8.257***	.000