

3-2007

Determinants of Attitudes toward Having Children outside Marriage

Amir Erfani

University of Western Ontario, aerfani@uwo.ca

Roderic Beaujot

University of Western Ontario, rbeaujot@uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers>

Recommended Citation

Erfani, Amir and Beaujot, Roderic (2007) "Determinants of Attitudes toward Having Children outside Marriage," *PSC Discussion Papers Series*: Vol. 21 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.

Available at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/pscpapers/vol21/iss1/1>

**Determinants of Attitudes toward
Having Children outside Marriage**

**by
Amir Erfani
and
Roderic Beaujot**

Discussion Paper no. 07-01

March 2007

On the web in PDF format: <http://sociology.uwo.ca/popstudies/dp/dp07-01.pdf>

contact:
aerfani@uwo.ca
rbeaujot@uwo.ca

Paper presented at Canadian Population Society meetings 2006.

**Population Studies Centre
University of Western Ontario
London CANADA N6A 5C2**

Determinants of Attitudes toward Having Children outside Marriage

Abstract

In the context of low fertility and a high proportion of persons who are not living in marital unions, it is important to study the attitudes toward having children outside of marriage. Based on a sample from Oxford and Middlesex counties in Ontario, Canada, we find that there are more positive attitudes toward having children outside of marriage for persons who have a more liberal orientation to gender division of labour and to cohabitation, those who are less religious, have smaller ideal family size, and where the first relationship was a cohabiting union. While the relation was not significant, there were also more positive attitudes toward non-marital childbearing for respondents whose parents experienced cohabitation or marital dissolution. The effect of having full-time employment differed by gender: women who had full-time employment were more likely to favour non-marital childbearing, but the opposite holds for men.

1. Introduction

The prevalence of non-marital childbearing in Canada has increased from 9.0 percent of births in 1971 to 34.7 percent in 2003 (Beaujot and Kerr, 2004: 212; Statistic Canada, 2005: 17). The situation varies widely across the country, with rates as high as 56.8 percent in Quebec compared to 25.6 percent in Ontario. The growth in non-marital births in Canada, like other Western developed countries, is part of a series of family changes that have affected family formation in particular. For instance, by age 15, children born to

married mothers can expect to live 1.31 years with a single mother, compared to 4.03 years for children born to cohabiting mothers, and 9.20 years for those born to lone mothers (Heuveline et al., 2003).

The increase in non-marital births is clearly associated with the declining trend of marriage and the progression of common-law unions (Le Bourdais and Lapierre-Adamcyk, 2004: 935). In the early 1970s, marriage was the typical way of starting the first union for 85 percent of couples in Canada outside of Quebec and for 80 percent of those in Quebec, while in the early 1990s this applied to 50 percent of couples outside of Quebec and 20 percent in Quebec (Dumas and Bélanger, 1997: 135). Among children born in 1971-73, over 85 percent had parents who had not previously cohabitated. In this birth cohort, only 6 to 7 percent of children were born outside a union, namely to a single mother, and 4 to 5 percent of births occurred to parents who married after first cohabiting. Although cohabitation began to emerge during the 1970s as a prelude to marriage, by 1983-84 the proportion of children born to parents who had married after first cohabiting had increased to a quarter of births. In this period of the early 1980s, the proportion of births to couples within cohabiting unions remained relatively low (7 percent) outside Quebec but it had already increased to 17 percent in Quebec. At this time, cohabitation was becoming socially accepted as a *prelude to* marriage outside of Quebec, but also as an *alternative* to marriage in Quebec. These trends have progressed further; by 1997-98, 46 percent of births in Quebec and 15 percent outside of Quebec were occurring in cohabiting unions (Le Bourdais and Lapierre-Adamcyk, 2004: 935-36).

While there are previous examinations of childbearing outside marriage, especially in the United States (Musick, 2002; Seltzer, 2000; Upchurch, Lillard, and Panis. 2002; Schoen and Tufis, 2003; Wu, Bumpass and Musick 2000), but also in Canada (Wu, 1996; Ram, 2002), these have examined the determinants of non-marital childbearing *behaviour*, rather than the *attitudes* toward childbearing outside marriage. The study of attitudes is important, both as a prelude to behaviour, and to anticipate further changes.

2. Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

Attitudes have been theorized as a function of an individual's affect or feelings, cognition or thoughts and beliefs, and behaviour or intention (Myers, 1999: 130; Bohner and Wänke, 2002: 5). When we question someone's attitudes, we typically refer to feelings and beliefs related to a person. A person's attitudes toward an object, or their evaluative reactions, are exhibited in beliefs, feelings, or inclinations to act (Myers, 1999: 130). It can be proposed that people's attitudes toward something will be shaped or changed through economic and social factors, including the exposure to new experiences or events (Bohner and Wänke, 2002: 70). That is, one can expect that attitudes toward having children outside of marriage would be shaped by individuals' family-related beliefs and values, and by their socio-economic situation. In developing hypotheses on the determinants of these attitudes, we find it useful to take advantage of concepts from the theory of second demographic transition, economic theories of fertility, and theories of

social learning and cognitive dissonance (Lesthaeghe, 1995; Van de Kaa 1987; Becker, 1981; Oppenheimer, 1994; Willis, 1999; Bandura 1977; Festinger, 1957).

Second demographic transition and liberalization of family values

The second demographic transition has been used as a framework through which to interpret the drastic changes in family and family-related behaviours: increasing divorce, cohabitation, decreasing fertility and rising non-marital childbearing. These family changes have especially been linked to individualism as the base for pluralist views on alternate forms of family behaviour, as individuals give priority to their “well-being and self-expression” (Van de Kaa 2001: 294).

Recent demographic research has documented significant changes in the underlying values and norms associated with family behaviour, including union formation, union dissolution, and childbearing (Lesthaeghe and Meekers 1986; Lesthaeghe and Surkyn 1988; Lesthaeghe, 1995; Surkyn and Lesthaeghe, 2002; Lapierre-Adamcyk and Lussier, 2003; Thornton 2001; Roussel 1989). The substantial shift from traditional to liberal familial values signifies a “reorientation of ideals” in recent decades (Lesthaeghe and Meekers 1986; Lesthaeghe and Surkyn 1988). *Traditional* familial values, which are reflected in familism and are rooted in religious teachings, emphasize commitment to the family as a unit and they consider the “heterosexual nuclear family” as the only legitimate form of union. In contrast, *modern* liberal familial values, which are based on individualism, place less value on marriage and the family unit, and takes a pluralist

orientation to alternate forms of family and childbearing behaviour (e.g., cohabitation, single parent family, same-sex unions, divorce, and non-marital childbearing). For instance, Nevitte (1996) finds that Canadians express values of permissiveness and tolerance on family questions, and they place a high value on egalitarianism in both husband/wife and parent/child relationships.

The examination of trends in family attitudes and values during the last four decades in the United States, for instance, reveals substantial long-term trends toward approval of *gender equality in families*. It also shows that there have been significant and ongoing long-term trends of *tolerance toward* alternative forms of personal and family behaviours as reflected in increased acceptance of *cohabitation*, divorce, and premarital sex (Thornton and Young-DeMarco, 2001). That is, we would expect that attitudes toward non-marital childbearing would be associated with orientations toward other familial values and norms as reflected in the acceptance of cohabitation, the support for gender equality in family work, degree of religiosity, and ideal number of children:

Hypothesis 1: Compared to persons with traditional family values, persons holding more liberal values are more likely to hold positive attitudes toward non-marital childbearing.

Previous studies have linked religiosity to propensities for marriage, cohabitation and divorce (Thornton, Axinn and Hill, 1992; Thornton, 1985). Church attendance has been found to be significantly related with non-marital childbearing *behaviour* (Plotnick,

1992). However, the relationship between religiosity and attitudes toward non-marital childbearing has not been examined. Previous studies have also found that the orientation to the gender division of labour in families influences childbearing behaviour. For instance, more egalitarian attitudes toward women's family roles are related to a higher likelihood of premarital pregnancies (Plotnick, 1992). We expect that individuals with more egalitarian orientation to gender division of labour in families are more likely to hold positive attitudes to childbearing outside marriage. Similarly, persons with more positive orientations toward cohabitation and those who believe in a low ideal number of children would represent individuals with liberal views on family values and positive attitudes toward childbearing outside marriage.

Social learning

The attitudes toward non-marital childbearing could also be acquired from parents through an active learning process, where children observe and imitate their attitudes and behaviour. Social learning theory proposes that people learn how to behave through observing and imitating the social behaviours and attitudes of others with whom they interact within families and sub-cultures. Bandura (1977: 22) suggests that “most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action.”

From this perspective, children who have grown up in a cohabiting, separated or step family structures, would hold more positive attitudes toward alternative family arrangements and family-related behaviours such as non-marital births. The American experiences have shown that parental positive attitudes toward cohabitation increase the likelihood of children's cohabitation, and children of divorce and remarriage hold more positive attitudes toward premarital sex, cohabitation, and divorce, and have more negative attitudes toward marriage and childbearing (Axinn and Thornton, 1993 and 1996). In addition, spending time in a single-parent family during childhood increases childbearing outside marriage (Musick, 2002). Those who have grown up in nontraditional family arrangements have also more liberal attitudes toward non-marital fertility (Trent and South, 1992). Thus:

Hypothesis 2: Individuals whose parents cohabited or divorced are expected to have more positive attitudes toward having children outside marriage.

Cognitive Consistency

Attitudes are also shaped in a process of cognitive consistency through which people try to express the attitudes that are consistent with their past actions, and that reduce possible “dissonance.” Through this process, people endeavor to convince themselves and observers that their experiences are legitimate. The theory of cognitive dissonance proposes that, in everyday life, people often find themselves in situations where their behaviour does not totally correspond to their attitudes, but it is instead in accordance

with the requirements of their roles or the social context (Festinger, 1957). Thus, persons who have children in cohabiting unions may experience some degree of “post-decisional dissonance” wherein their evaluation of alternatives is inconsistent with their behaviour (Bohner and Wänke, 2002: 170, 178). One way of reducing this dissonance is to magnify the acceptability of having children in a cohabiting union.

There is ample empirical evidence showing effects of past family experiences on attitudes toward living arrangements and fertility. Those who have experienced cohabitation hold more positive attitudes toward cohabitation and divorce, have lower intention for having children, and have lower fertility and higher contraceptive prevalence (Ram, 2002; Cunningham and Thornton, 2005; Axinn and Barber, 1997). Thus:

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who begin their first relationship as a cohabitating union are expected to hold more positive attitudes to non-marital childbearing.

Women’s employment

Women’s employment fosters approval of non-marital childbearing and liberalizes attitudes toward family formation (Trent and South, 1992). Economists have theorized this generalization by proposing that marriage and childbearing decisions should be seen as rational behaviours. The classical theories of marriage and fertility proposed by Becker (1981), for instance, suggest that fertility decision is a rationale choice, and childbearing mostly occurs within marriage, which is considered as a “long-term commitment between

a man and a woman” based on a “specialized” or “complementary” gender division of work. Oppenheimer (1994) proposes a “collaborative” model of marriage in which the family is based on the spousal relationship and in gender equality in the division of work. In particular, unions based on complementary roles would be less oriented to bearing and rearing children outside marriage.

In his article entitled “A theory of out-of-wedlock childbearing,” Willis (1999) also uses an economic model to explain “the interaction between marital decisions and fertility decisions.” Contrary to Becker who treated fertility as a “household decision,” made jointly by both spouses as a “unitary decision maker,” Willis (1999: 36-37) considered women and men within union as “separate decision makers.” His model suggests that increases in women’s income, together with the stagnation and decline in men’s earnings, would tend to increase the rate of out-of-wedlock births. He proposes in particular that “out-of-wedlock childbearing will be most prevalent when females are in excess supply, when they have sufficient income to support a family on their own, and when the gains to marriage are small because male incomes are low” (p. 60). Similarly, women’s orientation to employment and the availability of public child care have been linked to the weakening of the economic incentives for women to get married at childbirth (Konietzka and Kreyenfeld, 2002). Therefore:

Hypothesis 4: Women who are engaged in a full-time work are expected to hold more positive attitudes toward non-marital childbearing.

Controls for socio-demographic status

Research indicates that attitudes toward family formation are affected by age, gender, marital status, and education (Trent and South, 1992; Cunningham and Thornton, 2005; Musick, 2002). Since older people hold more traditional values, including the disapproval of atypical forms of family formation, we expect age to be correlated negatively with attitudes toward having children outside marriage (Thornton, 1995). Men and married persons have more traditional and negative attitudes than women and unmarried persons (Erfani and Beaujot, 2005; Trent and South, 1992; Thornton 1985). The evidence is mixed on the association between education and the acceptance of non-marital childbearing (Thornton, 1995: 210), but higher education is generally related with more liberal attitudes to family and gender role behaviours (Trent and South, 1992; Thornton and Freedman, 1982; Cherlin and Walters, 1981).

3. Data and Methods

The data used here are taken from a 2000 survey of orientations to marriage, relationships and childbearing that was taken in London, Ontario, and the surrounding region.

Households were selected from enumeration areas that had been stratified by income level and location (city, town, rural areas). The household response rate was 48.3 percent, and in these households 76.6 percent of eligible respondents completed the survey, for a total sample of 966 persons aged 18 and over. Missing data on the dependent and explanatory variables leave 894 respondents¹ for the present analysis. These respondents

¹This Includes 165 cases whose missing data on dependent variable and the explanatory attitudinal variables were computed by LISREL using a matching method. Based on the matching procedure, “the

had completed a self-administrative questionnaire consisting of items designed to measure the attitudes toward marriage and partnership, bearing and rearing children, division of work within family, and programs and policies pertaining to family and childrearing.

Ordinary least squares regression models are used to test our integrated theoretical model and hypotheses. The dependent variable, *attitudes toward having children outside marriage* is measured by a summated rating scale based on six relevant items. Factor analysis indicated that all six items loaded on one strong factor². The reliability measure of Cronbach Alpha (= 0.834) and the statistics produced by factor analysis (eigenvalue = 3.371, KMO = 0.782) indicate respectively a strong reliability and validity for the extracted latent factor of attitudes toward having children outside marriage.

The explanatory variables relevant to the four hypotheses are grouped into four corresponding categories: family values, learning process, cognitive consistency, and women's employment. Familial values are measured through the following items:

value to be substituted for the missing value for a case is obtained from another case that has a similar response pattern over a set of matching variables". The comparison of the descriptive results and the regression models based on imputed and non-imputed data did not show significant differences.

² The six items of the scale (with factor loading) are as follows: "It is acceptable for a divorced person to live with his or her children and a new partner without being married to that person" (0.645); "Government should initiate giving the right for same sex couples to adopt [children]" (0.700); "A single woman should never choose to have a child" (0.852); "A single man should never choose to have a child" (0.843); "A child needs a home with both a father and a mother to grow up happily" (0.738); "When two people decide to have children, they should first get married" (0.695). All six items were measured by four-point Likert scales. To harmonize the direction of attitudes, the last four items were scored from "strongly agree" (1 point) to "strongly disagree" (4 points), and the first two items were scored from "strongly agree" (4 points) to "strongly disagree" (1 point). The standardized distribution of the weighted, summated rating scale, produced by factor analysis, ranges from -2.07 to +2.07.

orientation toward the gender division of work within family, orientation to cohabitation, ideal number of children and religiosity. The learning process is taped by one item regarding whether respondents have ever experienced a parental cohabitation or marital dissolution. Cognitive consistency was based on respondent's union history, where we determined whether the first relationship with a partner had began as cohabitation. The extent of women's involvement in labor force was based on a dummy variable with a score of 1 for those who worked in a full-time job and 0 for those who did not.

4. Results

Table 1 presents the mean values of attitudes toward having children outside of marriage, across the categories of all variables used in this study. As expected, respondents with traditional orientations to familial values have shown more negative attitudes to childbearing outside marriage. Of particular interest is the attitude toward having children outside of marriage by orientation to gender division of work in families, showing more positive attitudes among persons who disagree with the traditional gender division of labour. As expected, there are more positive attitudes toward having children outside of marriage for persons who are less religious, persons who hold positive attitudes to cohabitation, and those for whom the ideal family size was under three children.

--- Table 1 about here ---

Consistent with our expectation on learning process, the results show that the 20 percent of respondents whose parents have cohabited or separated are more in favour of non-marital childbearing. Moreover, the 15 percent of respondents who began their first

relationship with a partner in cohabitation have strong positive attitudes toward having children outside of marriage. In terms of labour force involvement, the most positive attitudes are found among the 53 percent of respondents who are engaged in a full-time job, with the most negative attitudes among persons who are retired. In the next section, we will show separate models based on women and men's labour force involvement. The gender differences are small, but women have more positive attitudes. As expected, older respondents have more negative attitudes. Those individuals who were living with a partner or were single at the time of the survey hold more positive views on having children outside marriage. By education, the general pattern is that of more positive attitudes with higher education, especially post-secondary schooling.

Results of regression analyses are shown in Tables 2 and 3. In addition to the overall regression model (Table 2), we include separate models for women and men in order to differentiate the impact of employment status.

Family values. The significant net effects of the four indicators of family values, namely orientations to gender division of work and to cohabitation, religiosity, and ideal number of children, support the first hypothesis that individuals who are more liberal in their family values are more likely hold positive attitudes to non-marital childbearing, compared with those who hold more traditional views. The net effects of these four indicators of family values are larger than that of the other explanatory variables. The orientation to the gender division of work stands out as the most significant variable. As

expected, those who are more positively orientated toward cohabitation are more positive on childbearing outside of marriage, as are persons who are less religious and who have smaller ideal family sizes.

--- Tables 2 and 3 about here ---

The net effects of orientations to gender division of labour and to cohabitation differ considerably by gender (Table 3). While the impact of orientation to gender division of labour is stronger among women, the net effect of orientation to cohabitation is larger among men.

Cognitive consistency. After familial values, the experience of cohabitation in the first relation with a partner has the strongest significant effect on attitudes to non-marital childbearing. Respondents who began their first relationship with a partner in a cohabitating union rather than in a marriage tend to hold positive attitudes to childbearing outside marriage. The results by gender also show that the effect of experiencing cohabitation in the first relationship is considerably higher for men than for women. Therefore, our third hypothesis is supported by these results.

Learning process. Interestingly, learning process through parental cohabitation or marital dissolution does not have a significant effect on attitudes toward having childbearing outside marriage. However, the direction of the effect is consistent with the second hypothesis that respondents whose parents have ever experienced cohabitation or marital

dissolution hold more positive attitudes to non-marital childbearing. Part of the reason for non-significant effect of parental cohabitation could be due to lack of information about the timing of parental cohabitation or marital dissolution in the data used in this study.

Women's employment. Although the effects are not strong, the results shown in Table 3 support the fourth hypothesis: women's employment status has significant effect on their attitudes toward non-marital childbearing. As expected, women who are involved in a full-time job hold more positive attitudes towards having children outside marriage than those who do not. In contrast, an inverse relation between employment status and attitudes to non-marital childbearing was found for men, though the relation is not significant.

Socio-demographic control variables. The significant effect of marital status indicates that married respondents are more likely to hold negative attitudes toward childbearing outside marriage. This effect is much stronger among women, and is not significant in men's sample. The results by gender support the expectation that women are more likely to hold positive attitudes to having children outside marriage. Moreover, age is negatively related to attitudes toward non-marital childbearing. Finally, there is a significant but weak relation between education and attitudes to non-marital childbearing, with more positive attitudes at higher levels of education.

5. Summary and discussion

The increasing trend of non-marital births in Canada, which began in 1970s, has since accelerated. This study advances our knowledge on the factors that influence the attitudes toward non-marital childbearing. The results show that orientation to familial values, experience of cohabitation at the first relationship with a partner, women's employment, and demographic characteristics all have significant influences on attitudes toward childbearing outside marriage.

The strongest effects on these attitudes are orientations to familial values: more liberal orientations are associated with more positive attitudes to non-marital childbearing. Of the familial values, orientation to gender division of work has the strongest net impact, and this relationship is much stronger for women. Orientation to cohabitation, religiosity and ideal number of children, which measure the other familial values, all have significant effects on the attitudes. The influence of orientation to cohabitation is stronger for men.

After familial values, experience of cohabitation in the first relationship with a partner showed a very strong association with attitudes toward non-marital childbearing.

However, contrary to our expectation, parental cohabitation or marital dissolution did not have significant impact on attitudes toward non-marital childbearing, though the direction of effect was consistent with our hypothesis.

The impact of employment status on these attitudes was not significant for the whole sample. However, the results in the women's model showed that women's employment in a full-time job is significantly associated with more positive attitudes towards childbearing outside marriage.

While the gender differences had not been specifically hypothesized, these generally correspond with the underlying theoretical views. In particular, it is the women who hold full-time jobs who will be more positively oriented to having children outside of marriage, because this childbearing is more difficult for other women. Also, the orientation toward the division of family work is most relevant to women, with those preferring less specialization having more favourable attitudes. Also, it is the women who are not married who have more positive attitudes toward childbearing outside of marriage. For men, it is their own experience of cohabitation that orients them to have a more positive attitude. Men appear to opt for alternatives that have more likelihood of continued interaction with their children.

These results also suggest that there will be a continuing trend toward more positive attitudes toward childbearing outside of marriage. That is, besides the more positive attitudes of the younger generations, there are relative increases in the categories of the population who have more positive attitudes: non-married persons, people who have experienced cohabitation and women working full-time. As proposed by the second demographic transition, the family values are moving in a liberal direction which is

accepting of alternate forms of family living. In addition, the attitudes favorable to having children outside of marriage are increasing as a function of the economic context, especially women's increased incomes, along with attitudes favoring a more collaborative approach to the division of family work.

6. References

- Axinn, William G. & Jennifer S. Barber. 1997. "Living arrangements and family formation attitudes in early adulthood", *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59: (3) 595-611.
- Axinn, William G. & Arland Thornton. 1996. "The influence of parents' marital dissolutions on children's attitudes toward family formation", *Demography* 33: (1) 66-81.
- Axinn, William G. & Arland Thornton. 1993. "Mothers, children, and cohabitation: The intergenerational effects of attitudes and behavior", *American Sociological Review* 58 (2) 233-246.
- Bandura, Albert. 1977. *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Beaujot, Roderic & Don Kerr. 2004. *Population Change in Canada*. Oxford University Press.
- Becker, Gary S. 1981. *A treatise on the family*. Harvard University Press.
- Bohner, Gerd and Michaela Wänke. 2002. *Attitudes and attitude change*, Psychology Press, Taylor and Francis.
- Cherlin, Andrew & Pamela Barnhouse Walters. 1981. "Trends in United States men's and women's sex-role attitudes: 1972 to 1978", *American Sociological Review* 46: (4) 453-460.
- Cunningham, Mick & Arland Thornton. 2005. "The Influence of union transitions on White adults' attitudes toward cohabitation", *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: (3) 710-720.

- Dumas, J. & A. Be'langer. 1997. Report on the demographic situation in Canada 1996 (cat. 91-209E). Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Erfani, Amir & Roderic Beaujot. 2005. "Familial Orientation and the Rationales of Childbearing Behaviour" Discussion Paper 05-07. Population Studies Center. University of Western Ontario.
- Festinger, L. 1957. *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Heuveline, Patrick, Jeffrey M. Timberlake and Frank F. Furstenberg, JR. 2003. "Shifting childbearing to single mothers: Results from 17 Western countries," *Population and Development Review* 29(1): 47-71.
- Konietzka, Dirk & Michaela Kreyenfeld. 2002. "Women's Employment and Non-Marital Childbearing: A Comparison between East and West Germany in the 1990s," *Population* (English) 57: (2) 331-357.
- Lapierre-Adamcyk, Evelyne and Marie-Hélène Lussier. 2003. De la forte fécondité à la fécondité désirée. Pp. 66-109 in V. Piché and Céline Le Bourdais (editors), *La démographie québécoise : enjeux du XXIe siècle*. Montréal : Presses de l'Université de Montréal.
- Le Bourdas, Céline & Évelyne Lapierre-Adamcyk. 2004. "Changes in conjugal life in Canada: Is cohabitation progressively replacing marriage?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 929-942.
- Lesthaeghe, Ron. 1995. "The second demographic transition in Western countries: An interpretation," in K. O. Mason and A. M. Jensen (eds.) *Gender and Family*

- Change in Industrialized Countries*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 17-62.
- Lesthaeghe, Ron, and Dominique Meekers. 1986. "Value changes and the dimensions of familism in the European community." *European Journal of Population* 2(3/4):225-68.
- Lesthaeghe, Ron, and Johan Surkyn. 1988. "Cultural dynamics and economic theories of fertility change." *Population and Development Review* 14 (1): 1-45.
- Musick, Kelly. 2002. "Planned and unplanned childbearing among unmarried women", *Journal of Marriage and Family* 64: (4) 915-929.
- Myers, David G. 1999. *Social psychology*. Sixth edition, McGraw-Hill College.
- Nevitte, Neil. 1996. *The decline of difference*. Peterborough: Broadview.
- Oppenheimer, Valerie K. 1994. "Women's rising employment and the future of the family in industrial societies." *Population and Development Review* 20:293-342.
- Plotnick, Robert D. 1992. "The effects of attitudes on teenage premarital pregnancy and its resolution", *American Sociological Review*, 57: (6) 800-811.
- Ram, Bali. 2002. "Children in common-law unions: The Canadian experience", paper presented at the XV World Congress of Sociology, Brisbane, Australia.
- Roussel, Louis. 1989. *La famille incertaine*. Paris: Editions Odile Jacob.
- Schoen, Robert & Paula Tufis. 2003. "Precursors of nonmarital fertility in the United States", *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 65: 1030-1040.
- Seltzer, Judith A. 2000. "Families formed outside of marriage", *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62: 1247-1268.

- Surkyn, J. and R. Lesthaeghe. 2002. "Values orientations and the Second Demographic Transition (SDT) in northern, western and southern Europe - An update", IPD Working Paper, Interface Demography, VU Brussels.
- Statistics Canada. 2005. *Births 2003*. cat. no. 84F0210-XIE. Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Thornton, Arland. 2001. "The development paradigm, reading history sideways, and family change". *Demography* 38: 449-465.
- Thornton, Arland. 1995. *Attitudes, values, and norms related to nonmarital fertility* (Report to Congress on out-of-wedlock childbearing, Publication No. PHS 95-1257, pp. 201–215). Hyattsville, MD: U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services.
- Thornton, Arland. 1985. "Changing attitudes toward separation and divorce: Causes and consequences", *The American Journal of Sociology* 90: (4) 856-872.
- Thornton, Arland & Linda Young-DeMarco. 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: (4) 1009-1037
- Thornton, Arland & William G. Axinn & Daniel H. Hill. 1992. "Reciprocal effects of religiosity, cohabitation, and marriage", *The American Journal of Sociology* 98: (3) 628-651.
- Thornton, Arland & Deborah Freedman. 1982. "Changing attitudes toward marriage and single life" *Family Planning Perspectives* 14 (6): 297–303.

- Trent, Katherine & Scott J. South. 1992. "Sociodemographic status, parental background, childhood family structure, and attitudes toward family formation", *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54: (2) 427-439.
- Upchurch, Dawn M., Lee A. Lillard, & Constantijn W.A. Panis. 2002. "Nonmarital childbearing: Influences of education, marriage, and fertility", *Demography*, 39 (2): 311-329.
- Van de Kaa, Dirk. J. 2001. "Postmodern fertility preferences: From changing value orientation to new behavior", in Rodolfo A. Bulatao and John B. Casterline (eds.) *Global Fertility Transition. A supplement to Population Development Review* 27: 290-331.
- Van de Kaa, Dirk. J. 1987. "Europe's second demographic transition," *Population Bulletin* 42: 1-59.
- Willis R. J. 1999. "A theory of out-of-wedlock childbearing," *Journal of Political Economy* 107: S33-64.
- Wu, Zheng. 1996. "Childbearing in cohabitational relationship," *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58: 281-292.
- Wu, Lawrence L., Larry L. Bumpass, & Kelly Musick. 2000. "Historical and life course trajectories of nonmarital childbearing", Working Paper No. 99-23: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Table 1. Mean distributions of attitudes toward having children outside marriage, across the categories of independent variables, London and Surroundings, 2000

Variables	n	Mean	Eta²
Liberalization of Family Values			
<i>Orientation to Cohabitation</i> (Living together involves no long term commitment?)			0.121
Yes (negative orientation)	145	- 0.810	
No (positive orientation)	749	0.131	
<i>Orientation to gender division of work in family</i> (It is better if husband works outside home, and wife stays home)			0.242
Agree	142	- 0.818	
Tend to agree	223	- 0.396	
Tend to disagree	309	0.188	
Disagree	220	0.577	
<i>Ideal number of children</i>			0.066
0	6	1.030	
1	13	0.152	
2	581	0.112	
3	228	-0.200	
4	50	-0.590	
5 ⁺	16	-1.081	
<i>Religiosity</i> (How often do you attend religious services?)			0.126
More than once a week	28	-0.969	
Once a week	150	-0.595	
Twice a month	50	-0.077	
Monthly	24	-0.328	
Occasionally	165	-0.040	
Special occasions	265	0.186	
Never	212	0.312	
Leaning Process			
Ever experienced parental cohabitation or marital dissolution?			0.021
Yes	168	0.278	
No	726	-0.091	
Cognitive Consistency			
Ever experienced cohabitation in the first relationship with a partner?			0.075
Yes	126	0.649	
No	768	-0.132	
(Cont'd)			

Table 1. Mean distributions of attitudes toward having children outside marriage, across the categories of independent variables, London and Surroundings, 2000 (Cont'd)

Variables	n	Mean	Eta²
Economic Factors			
<i>Employment Status</i>			0.072
Working full-time	473	0.146	
Working part-time	145	0.060	
Unemployed	43	0.047	
Student	22	0.027	
Homemaker and Volunteer	81	- 0.290	
Retired	101	- 0.645	
Other	29	- 0.388	
Controls			
<i>Gender</i>			0.006
Women	535	0.041	
Men	359	-0.116	
<i>Age</i>			0.136
18-24	98	0.384	
25-34	178	0.373	
35-44	235	0.051	
45-54	172	-0.082	
55-64	120	-0.360	
65 ⁺	91	-0.831	
<i>Marital Status</i>			0.084
Single	151	0.374	
Married	576	-0.203	
Living with partner	74	0.587	
Separated/Divorce	67	0.112	
Widowed	26	-0.392	
<i>Education</i>			0.038
Some primary school	21	-0.357	
Primary school	11	-0.554	
Some high school	100	-0.205	
High school graduation	151	-0.220	
Technical training	55	-0.320	
Some college	86	0.005	
College	150	0.091	
Some university	77	0.252	
University degree	118	0.177	
Professional or graduate degree	125	0.089	

Note: 1. Sample size is 894.

2. The values of Eta² denote the proportion of explained variation of attitudes toward non-marital childbearing by explanatory variables presented in the above table.

Source: Survey of Orientation to Marriage, Relationship and Childbearing, London, Ontario, 2000

Table 2. Multiple regression analysis of attitudes toward having children outside marriage, London and Surroundings, 2000

Covariates	b	SE	Beta
Liberalization of Family Values			
Orientation to Cohabitation (<i>0 = positive; 1 = negative</i>)	-.409	.073	-.189***
Orientation to gender division of work in family	.331	.029	.341***
Ideal number of children	-.082	.038	-.060*
Religiosity	.083	.016	.156***
Leaning Process			
Ever experienced parental cohabitation or marital dissolution (<i>0 = no; 1 = yes</i>)	.100	.069	.039
Cognitive Consistency			
Ever experienced cohabitation in first relationship (<i>0 = no; 1 = yes</i>)	.351	.080	.123***
Economic Factor			
Employment Status (<i>0 = other; 1 = full-time employed</i>)	.065	.057	.032
Controls			
Gender (<i>0 = men; 1 = women</i>)	.150	.056	.074**
Marital Status (<i>0 = other; 1 = married</i>)	-.213	.059	-.102***
Age	-.005	.002	-.079**
Education	.022	.011	.056*
(Constant)	-1.027	.218	
F = 56.858***, Multiple R = 0.644, R ² = 0.415			

* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Note: The categories of variables are as indicated in Table 1, except for employment and marital status where we created two dummy variables, and age is a continues, ungrouped variable.

Source: see source in Table 1.

Table 3. Multiple regression analysis of attitudes toward having children outside marriage by gender, London and Surroundings, 2000

Covariates	Women			Men		
	b	SE	Beta	b	SE	Beta
Liberalization of Family Values						
Orientation to Cohabitation (0 = positive; 1 = negative)	-.417	.093	-.152***	-.630	.119	-.240***
Orientation to gender division of work	.375	.037	.380***	.274	.049	.280***
Ideal number of children	-.092	.050	-.065 [©]	-.070	.060	-.054
Religiosity	.076	.019	.147***	.091	.027	.165***
Learning Process						
Ever experienced parental cohabitation or marital dissolution (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.084	.089	.032	.130	.107	.054
Cognitive Consistency						
Ever experienced cohabitation in first relationship (0 = no; 1 = yes)	.407	.107	.132***	.368	.122	.142**
Economic Factor						
Employment Status (0 = other; 1 = full-time employed)	.140	.070	.069*	-.123	.102	-.057
Controls						
Marital Status (0 = other; 1 = married)	-.333	.071	-.162***	.075	.108	.036
Age	-.003	.002	-.051	-.011	.003	-.169**
Education	.015	.014	.036	.027	.017	.071
(Constant)	-.940	.264		-.770	.353	

Women (n = 535): F = 42.657***, Multiple R = 0.670, R² = 0.449

Men (n = 359): F = 22.076***, Multiple R = 0.623, R² = 0.388

[©] p < 0.1, * p ≤ 0.05, ** p ≤ 0.01, *** p ≤ 0.001

Note: see note in Table 2.

Source: see source in Table 1.