

Determinants of Non-Formation of Partnership: A French-Japanese Comparison.

Jean Louis RALLU (INED), Hiroshi KOJIMA (NIPSS)

Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques,
133 Bd Davout, 75980 Paris Cedex 20.
National Institute of Population and Social Security Research,
Ministry of Health and Welfare,
1-2-3 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100, Japon.

INTRODUCTION

Recent changes in living arrangements at young adult ages : longer coresidence with parents and increase in one-person households, have been seen as a threat to family formation leading to low levels of fertility and rapid aging in developed countries. Causes of non-formation of partnership need to be analysed to understand recent trends in union formation. We previously studied the trends in fertility in France and Japan (Kojima, Rallu, 1998) and realized the necessity to compare nuptiality patterns at the individual level in the two countries with very different types of union formation and different advancements in the process of non-formation of unions.

DATA AND METHODS

This study has used the data from the French FFS (1994) and of the 10th Japanese NFS (National Fertility Survey – sample size around 8000) conducted by the Institute of Population Problems (currently, the National Institute of Population and Social Security Research) in 1992. The analysis has been limited to respondents aged 21-34 in both surveys, i.e. lower age limit in FFS data and because most marriages

occur before mid-thirties and there might be misreporting of marital status due to the stigma attached to singlehood in late 30s for Japanese women. A 4-category partnership status variable has been constructed 1) « has no partner », 2) « has an intimate friend » ('relation amoureuse stable' (France) or 'has friend(s) of the opposite sex' (Japan), 3) « cohabitant » (France) or « has a lover/fiancé » (Japan), and 4) « currently married ». In France, cohabitants include 6% persons who declared to live « in couple » but are not residing together and persons having a friend include 2% persons who declared a date of beginning of current union as 'couple life'. Cohabitants can be included in both « single » and « married » persons in the Japanese data because 1% of single males and females reported to be in cohabitation and because the married couples include those married consensually, which are small numbers. We do not mean to say that partnership categories are always comparable between the two countries. Even the meaning of being married might be different between France with a high prevalence of cohabitation and Japan with a low prevalence. However, each categorization of partnership status seems appropriate for each country. Independent variables : education, labour force status-occupation and residence have been made as similar as possible in French and Japanese data (Table 1).

The multinomial logit (logistic regression) and proportional hazards (Cox regression) models have been applied to French and Japanese data sets. For ease of computation and interpretation, only categorical variables in dummy coding have been used for independent variables. We have also conducted multinomial logit analysis for living arrangements in which « living alone », « living with parents before union » and « living with a partner (in cohabitation or marriage) » are distinguished because living with parents is hypothesized to compete with living with a partner in some cases.

In the proportional hazards analysis of first union formation, we have analyzed the timing (age) of first cohabitation or first marriage without cohabitation for France and first marriage for Japan. For France we have also analyzed the determinants of first marriage either with or without previous cohabitation. For the proportional hazards analysis of Japanese data only never-married and first-married subjects are used because the information on the timing of first marriage is not available for other kind of marital status.

RESULTS

Partnership status at the time of survey (Figure 1) shows that Japanese are less frequently alone (no partner) than French at all ages and for both sexes. They are also less frequently with a friend, except for males aged 30-34. Married persons are more frequent in Japan than in France. However, total persons in union (married or cohabitants) are more frequent in France, except at ages 30-34. Japanese with a lover or a fiancé actually represent the category where cohabitation is beginning. If social norms were different, cohabitation would certainly be much more important and the proportions married would be lower in Japan. It is noticeable that the proportions « having no partner » among this category plus « having a friend » are rather similar in both countries, except for females aged 25-29 where Japanese are more often without partner and among males aged 30-34 where French are more often alone.

(1) Multinomial Logit Analysis of Partnership Status

Table 2 shows the results of multinomial logit analysis for determinants of partnership status. Each column presents the effects of independent variables on the odds of « having no partner », « having a stable partner without cohabitation » and

« being cohabitant » relative to « being married ». Among French men, age as a whole has a negative effect on « having no partner », « having a stable partner without cohabitation » and « cohabitant » in relation to « being married » and the effect becomes larger as they get older. This means that unmarried men including cohabitants are increasingly more likely to get married as they age, which is as expected. Coresidence with parents before union has a significant and negative effect only on « having no partner » relative to « being married », which may mean that living with parents before union encourages French men to have a marriage partner but not an unmarried partner with or without cohabitation. This may suggest that living with parents competes only with living with an unmarried partner.

Among educational levels over 2-year university education does not have any significant effect on partnership status among French men, but 2-year university education has a significant and positive effect on « having a stable partner without cohabitation » presumably because those with 2-year education have chances to meet a partner at university but possibly because they have financial difficulty to cohabit or marry - actually most of them were still students. French men with technical college education or with the lowest education are generally more likely to be married possibly because of their orientation towards traditional family life.

Among occupational groups (note that LF status-occupation is the situation at time of survey in French data and therefore subject to the reverse causation), the self-employed French men are more likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation and less likely to cohabit. Perhaps, this reflects their traditional life style of proceeding to a stable relationship and then to marriage without going through cohabitation. French men in professional and managerial occupations are less likely to have no partner in relation to being married. In other words, they are more likely to be married relative to

having no partner possibly because of their attractiveness as marriage partners. French men in part-time employment are more likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation. Unemployed French men are more likely to have no partner and to have a stable partner without cohabitation, which may reflect their difficulty to have a partner and to cohabit or marry if they have one, probably due to their lack of financial resources, which also applies to men in part time employment. Regional variables do not have any significant effects on partnership status among French men.

Although the results are not presented in the form of table here, a model using LF status (stable, unstable employment and unemployed) before first union : either cohabitation or marriage, shows rather similar results as the model presented above, but men in unstable employment or unemployed are more likely to have no partner or a stable partner without cohabitation (effects are above 1.0 and significant at 1 p.1000 and 1 percent levels respectively for unstable employment and unemployed) ; they are also more likely cohabitant (effect of 0.7 significant at 5 percent level). This means that they are less likely to being married. In the latter model, men with highest education are less likely to have no partner and those living in Paris are more likely to be cohabitant, with significant effects at levels of respectively 10 percent and 5 percent. We have also conducted the multinomial logit analysis of living arrangements. The results show that self-employed and unemployed French men are highly likely to live with parents in relation to living with a (unmarried or married) partner. Therefore, these French men are considered to be more likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation because they face competition for living with a partner from living with parents.

For French women (Table 2, col. 4,5,6), as among French men, age as a whole has negative effects on all non-married status in relation to « being married » and the effects become larger as they get older. This also means that unmarried women

including cohabitants are increasingly more likely to get married as they age. Coresidence with parents has negative effects on all the three unmarried partnership status, which means that French women living with parents are more likely to marry in relation to staying unmarried whatever the partnership status may be. This may suggest the existence of parental control over the partnership formation of French women living with parents.

Among educational levels, over 2-year university education has weakly significant and positive effects on « having a stable partner without cohabitation » and « cohabitant ». Perhaps, some of the relationship and /or cohabitation with the partner continue from their school days. French women with technical college education are less likely to have a stable partner in relation to being married. These women may quickly proceed to marriage once they find a suitable partner. It may be the same for French women in blue-collar occupation because they are also less likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation. Although the table is not presented here, French women in blue-collar occupation are less likely to live with parents relative to living with a (unmarried or married) partner. This may also suggest that these French women face less competition for living with a married partner from living with parents.

French women in part-time employment are weakly less likely to be cohabitant in relation to being married, which reflects the opposite causal relationship between work and marriage (i.e., married women are more likely to work part-time than cohabitant women). Similarly, the strong negative effect of French women's unemployment on cohabitation mainly reflects the opposite causal relationship (i.e., married women are more likely to be unemployed due to children, change of residence, etc.). – When LF status before union is used, part time employment has similar effects as for males, but unemployment still retains a slightly negative effect (-0.4 significant at

5 percent level) on cohabitation, meaning that unemployed women tend to marry more than employed ones. - Regional variables do not have any significant effects among French women, either.

The seventh to twelfth columns of Table 2 show the results for Japanese men and women. As among French men, age as a whole has negative effects on each unmarried partnership status relative to « being married » and the effect becomes larger as they age. Coresidence with parents before marriage has a positive effect on « having no partner » and a negative effect on « having a lover or a fiancée ». This suggests that Japanese men living with parents are less likely to form an intimate partnership except marriage.

Like French men with the lowest education, Japanese men with junior highschool (lowest) education are less likely to be unmarried as a whole or, alternatively, more likely to be married. They are particularly less likely to have friends of the opposite sex, which may suggest that they have less chances to meet single women, less skills to communicate with single women or lower desirability as a casual partner for single women and that they tend to immediately go into marriage once they meet a suitable woman presumably through introduction because of their orientation towards traditional family life. On the other hand, Japanese men having graduated from technical schools after senior highschool are more likely to be unmarried as a whole. This may suggest that they need more time to build up their professional career before going into marriage with an unmarried partner which they tend to have. Junior (2-year) college education does not have any significant effects possibly because of small number of cases among Japanese men. Japanese men with (4-year) university education are more likely to be unmarried as a whole like technical school graduates partly for the same reasons. This may be also caused by their less traditional family attitude and less

parental pressure for marriage which are related to the fact that they are highly likely to live alone relative to living with a married partner, as found in the analysis of living arrangements.

Among occupational groups (occupation before marriage for married persons and current occupation for unmarried persons) the self-employed Japanese men are more likely to have friends of the opposite sex in relation to being married. This may be related to their higher probability to be unmarried and to live with parents relative to living with a married partner, which is found in the analysis of living arrangements. Japanese men in professional and managerial occupations and blue-collar occupations as well as those in part-time employment or without employment are more likely to be unmarried as a whole and less likely to be married. Japanese men in professional and managerial occupations are more likely to live alone and they may have less traditional family attitude and less parental pressure for marriage. On the other hand, Japanese men in blue-collar occupation may have less chances to meet single women. Japanese men in part-time employment or without employment are highly unlikely to be married probably because of their lack of financial resources to marry, which is similar to the situation of French men.

Among regional variables living in Tokyo (currently for the unmarried and premaritally for the married) has no significant effect on the unmarried partnership status among Japanese men. But living in other urban areas has negative effect on being unmarried as a whole, which may suggest the existence of marriage squeeze in rural area.

For Japanese women (Table 2, col. 10,11,12), as among men as well as French women, age as a whole has increasingly negative effects on each unmarried partnership status relative to « being married ». As among French women, coresidence with parents

before marriage also has a negative effect on each unmarried partnership status relative to « being married » although its negative effect on « having no partner » is barely non-significant. This encouragement of marriage as a whole suggests that Japanese women living with parents face more parental pressure to marry.

Like French and Japanese men with the lowest education, Japanese women with junior highschool education are less likely to be unmarried as a whole or, alternatively, more likely to be married although its negative effect on « having no partner » is not significant and they may tend to immediately go into marriage once they meet a suitable men presumably through introduction because of their orientation towards traditional family life. On the other hand, Japanese women having graduated from technical schools, (2-year) junior college and 4-year university are more likely to be unmarried as a whole, which is similar to Japanese men with 4-year university or technical college education. This may suggest that they need more time to build up their professional career before going into marriage. This may be also caused by their less traditional family attitude and less parental pressure for marriage which are related to the fact that they are more likely to live alone relative to living with a married partner, as found in the analysis of living arrangements.

Among occupational groups the self-employed Japanese women are more likely to have no partner and to have a lover or a fiancé relative to being married. This may be related to their higher probability to live with parents before marriage relative to living with a married partner, as regards living arrangements. Japanese women in blue-collar occupation are less likely to have a lover or a fiancé perhaps because they may have less chances to meet single men. Japanese women in part-time employment or without employment are unlikely to be married probably because of their lack of financial

resources to marry, which is similar to the situation of French and Japanese men, as well as French women in part time employment.

Among regional variables living in Tokyo has positive effect on having no partner and having a lover or a fiancé relative to being married, which suggests that they are less likely to be married as a whole. Among Japanese women as among Japanese men, living in other urban areas than Tokyo has negative effect on being unmarried as a whole, suggesting the existence of marriage squeeze in rural area.

(2) Proportional Hazards Analysis of Age at First Union Formation

The first column of Table 3 presents the results of proportional hazards analysis for determinants of age at first cohabitation or first marriage without cohabitation among French men, the second column shows the results for determinants of age at first marriage either with or without previous cohabitation and the third column presents the results for first marriage without previous cohabitation. Coresidence with parents before union has a weakly positive effect on the hazards to have a first union, which suggests that living with parents encourages French men to start either cohabitation or marriage. But the second column showing a non-significant effect of coresidence on first marriage and the third column showing a weakly positive effect suggest that coresidence with parents encourages first marriage without cohabitation.

French men with the lowest education have significantly higher hazards to have a first union, presumably a first cohabitation followed or not by marriage as suggested by the non-significant effects in the third column ; in other words, they are less likely to go into direct marriage. French men in professional and managerial occupations also have significantly higher hazards to have a first union, but it is presumably a first cohabitation without marriage as suggested by the non-significant effects in the second

and the third columns. – A model using LF status before union shows that men in part time or without employment are less likely to have a first marriage (after or without cohabitation), and the latter are even less likely to be cohabitant or married. - French men living in urban areas other than Paris have higher hazards to have a first union, perhaps first cohabitation without marriage rather than first marriage.

As for women (Table 3, col. 4,5,6), coresidence with parents before union has highly positive effect on the hazards of first union and a positive effect on first marriage as a whole, particularly first marriage without previous cohabitation, which suggests that living with parents encourages French women to marry without cohabitation. These results are similar to those for French men perhaps because French young adults are subject to higher parental pressure to marry without going through cohabitation when they live with parents.

French women with the lowest education have significantly higher hazards to have a first union, particularly a first marriage without cohabitation as suggested by the sixth column. The sixth column also shows that French women with technical college education have somewhat higher hazards to have a first marriage without cohabitation. On the other hand, women with the highest education have somewhat lower hazards to have a first marriage as shown by the fifth column, which may reflect the opposite orientation or their investment of time and efforts to build up their career before marriage. The fifth column also shows that unemployed French women have higher hazards to have a first marriage, which actually reflect the causation in the opposite direction from marriage to work. - When using LF status before union, women in part time employment are less likely to marry, like for men, however, unemployed women are more likely to be cohabitant or married (0.13 significant at 5 percent level), but not

significantly for being married with or without previous cohabitation. - The regional variables do not have any significant effects among French women.

In contrast to the French results, coresidence with parents before marriage does not have any significant effect on the hazards to have a first marriage among Japanese men and women (Table 3, col. 7,8). However, the previous analysis of the same data set with a larger model by Kojima (1994 :100) shows that it has a positive effect on the hazards to have a first marriage among Japanese women aged 18-34. Therefore, the similar effect of coresidence may appear at least among Japanese women in a more elaborate model.

Japanese men and women with the lowest education have higher hazards to have a first marriage while those with post-secondary education (technical schools and 2-year and 4-year college) have lower hazards, except for men with 2-year college education without statistical significance. Therefore, education as a whole has a negative effect on union formation among both men and women in Japan, which is somewhat different from the results for France.

Japanese men with all the occupational categories have significant and lower hazards to have a first marriage (for different reasons for higher and lower occupations), which means that those in clerical and sales occupation (reference category) have higher hazards because of their greater chances to meet single women or higher desirability as a prospective marriage partner. Among Japanese women only those in self-employment and those in part-time employment or unemployment have lower hazards to have a first marriage. Living in Tokyo does not have a significant effect among Japanese men but a significant and negative effect on the hazards to have a first marriage among Japanese women, suggesting the difficulty for unmarried women to marry in Tokyo. On the other hand, living in urban areas other than Tokyo has positive effects on hazards to have a

first marriage among both men and women, again suggesting marriage squeeze in rural areas.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The results presented above exhibited the differences and the similarities between the two countries. Although the effect of coresidence with parents as a family demographic variable has been less often analyzed for the West, it has turned out to encourage marriage for French women ; for Japanese women, proportional hazards analysis does not show significant effect of coresidence with parents on marriage in this study but other models have shown such effect (Kojima 1994). The effects of education also seem to be similar in the sense that higher one tends to encourage less « traditional » partnership behavior. Similarly, persons in professional and managerial occupation tend to have more « modern » partnership behaviors while the self-employed young adults in the two countries tend to have more « traditional » ones. Unstable employment and unemployment seem to restrict partnership behavior in the two countries. Regional variable do not always have clear effects on partnership behaviors, but they seem to constrain them in some cases possibly through marriage squeeze.

In both countries, marriage is in competition with other forms of union with or without cohabitation. In Japan, proportions of women aged 25-29 having a partner but not cohabiting (Iwasawa, 2000) have steadily increased from 7% in 1982 to 11 % in 1987 and 17% in 1992. At ages 30-34, increase is from 2% in 1982 to 5% in 1992. Moreover, proportions of women aged 30-34 without an intimate friend also increased from 9% in 1982 to 15% in 1992. In France, proportions of women having a friend and not cohabiting are not negligible with 13% at ages 25-29 and 6% at 30-34, but trends are

unknown. Whenever proportions of non cohabiting couples are still low with 6% of cohabitants or less than 1% of females aged 20-49 (Toulemon 1996), 12% of first unions started that way for women born 1960-1964 and 1965-1969, but it has increased to 17% for cohorts 1970-1974 (for men figures are resp. 17% and 21%).

However, it may not be just ideology or culture that differentiate the partnership behaviors within and between the two countries (Iwasawa, 2000), but it may be structural constraints (Ekert-Jaffé et Solaz, 1998). Demographic and financial constraints seem to exert strong structural effects on the partnership behavior of both « traditional » and « modern » young adults in the two countries and the seemingly different partnership behaviors may be different representations of their limited choice or adaptive strategy under somewhat different constraints.

REFERENCES

Ekert-Jaffé O., and A. Solaz, 1998, « Unemployment and Formation of the Family in France », paper presented at 16^{ème} Journées de Microéconomie Appliquée, Lyon, 3 et 4 juin 1998.

Iwasawa M., 2000, « The Transformation of Partnership of Japanese Women in the 1990s : Increased Reluctance towards Traditional Marriages and the Prevalence of Non-Cohabiting Couples », Paper prepared for the 2000 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Los Angeles, March 23-25 2000.

Kojima H., 1994, « Analysis of Marriage », Institute of Population Problems (ed.), *Attitudes toward Marriage and the Family among the Unmarried Japanese Youth : Report of the Tenth Japanese National Fertility Survey in 1992*, Volume II. Tokyo : Institute of Population Problems, pp.95-102 (in Japanese).

Kojima H. and J.-L. Rallu, 1998, « Fertility in Japan and France », *Population : An English Selection*, 10, pp. 319-348.

Toulemon L., 1996, La cohabitation hors mariage s'installe dans la durée, *Population*, 51-3, pp. 675-716.

Villeneuve-Gokalp C., 1997, Vivre en couple chacun chez soi, *Population*, 52-5, pp. 1059-1082.

ABSTRACT

Besides cohabitation, new forms of union without common residence : friends, lover, fiancé, not cohabiting couples, are (re)appearing as revealed by FFS. These types of union are more common in Japan than in countries with high cohabitation. However, France also has sizeable numbers of unions without cohabitation. Determinants of these various types of unions and of the non formation of unions are social and cultural (coresidence with parents) as well as related to socio-economic status (education, LF participation, occupation) of men and women on the marriage market. Thus, trends in economic situation, specially unemployment and precariousness, have important effects on union formation.

Table 1 : Definition and frequency distribution of independent variables used in multinomial logit analysis and proportional hazards. France and Japan

		France		Japan	
		Males	Females	Males	Females
Union st.	Alone	34.3	24.1	25.9	15.9
	Having friend	14.4	14.0	11.0	8.3
	Cohab./Lover-f.	21.6	22.1	17.6	16.9
	Married	29.7	39.8	45.4	58.9
Age	21-22	12.1	12.4	15.2	14.2
	23-24	16.1	17.0	13.8	14.3
	25-26	15.0	12.9	12.3	13.3
	27-28	13.2	14.9	13.9	14.8
	29-30	15.5	14.9	14.2	13.7
	31-32	13.7	13.1	15.4	14.6
	33-34	14.4	14.8	15.2	15.1
	Coresidence w. parents *	60.8	62.3	60.8	76.8
Education	Univ. > 2 years	10.3	10.8	(1) 39.2	12.8
	Univ. 1-2 years	2.9	2.7	(2) 4.3	23.6
	Tech. soc. dipl.	8.6	11.8	(3) 9.0	12.6
	Bac. gen./tech.	18.8	21.7	(4) 41.6	46.7
	<= 2ary 1 st cycle	59.5	53.1	5.9	4.3
LF st – occ.	Agri. craft. trades	3.6	0.8	(5) 5.9	1.6
	Manag., prof.	5.7	4.6	26.9	20.3
	Clerical, serv. w.	16.4	30.4	37.6	59.7
	Production w.	30.7	5.6	18.3	5.8
	Part time	12.9	16.6	(6) 11.3	12.6
	Not LF	30.7	42.2		
Residence	Rural	3.6	2.8	4.8	4.6
	Urban	73.5	76.7	84.4	83.9
	Paris/Tokyo	22.8	20.5	10.8	11.5

* at time of survey or until union if any.

(1) university 4 years, (2) junior college, (3) technical sch., (4) junior high sch., (5) self empl., (6) unstable employment.

Due to small numbers 'part-time' and 'not working/not LF' have been included in the same 'unstable employment' group for Japan.

Table 2 : Coefficients of multinomial logit analysis of determinants of partnership status relative to being married, France and Japan.

	French males				French females				Japanese males				Japanese females				
	No partner	Stable friend	Cohabitant		no partner	stable friend	Cohabitant		No partner	Friend(s)	Friend(s)	Friend(s)	No partner	Friend(s)	Friend(s)	Friend(s)	
Intercept	3.525 ***	1.737 #	1.007		2.058 **	1.908 *	1.364 #		2.011 ***	1.218 ***	2.136 ***	1.222 ***	1.108 ***	2.091 ***			
Age 23-24	-0.092	0.012	0.797		-0.536	-1.340 **	-0.752 #		-1.066 ***	-1.476 ***	-1.066 ***	-1.115 ***	-1.252 ***	-1.081 ***			
25-26	-2.250 ***	-2.422 ***	-1.004		-2.148 ***	-2.421 ***	-1.395 **		-1.675 ***	-1.977 ***	-1.801 ***	-2.078 ***	-2.475 ***	-2.211 ***			
27-28	-2.251 ***	-2.859 ***	-1.196 #		-2.977 ***	-3.373 ***	-2.307 ***		-2.633 ***	-3.180 ***	-2.837 ***	-2.799 ***	-3.100 ***	-3.436 ***			
29-30	-3.280 ***	-4.623 ***	-1.563 *		-2.793 ***	-3.152 ***	-2.469 ***		-3.185 ***	-3.842 ***	-3.749 ***	-3.186 ***	-3.786 ***	-4.200 ***			
31-32	-3.119 ***	-4.723 ***	-1.780 **		-2.912 ***	-3.824 ***	-2.505 ***		-3.690 ***	-4.335 ***	-4.624 ***	-3.569 ***	-4.099 ***	-4.675 ***			
33-34	-3.945 ***	-4.857 ***	-2.481 ***		-3.197 ***	-5.165 ***	-3.203 ***		-3.912 ***	-4.688 ***	-5.139 ***	-3.804 ***	-5.285 ***	-4.979 ***			
Coresid. w. parents*	-0.385 *	0.022	-0.197		-0.988 ***	-0.747 ***	-0.512 **		0.208 **	0.134	-0.166 *	-0.179	-0.387 **	-0.537 ***			
Educ. univ > 2 y.	-0.373	0.324	-0.433		0.386	0.671 #	0.598 #		(1) 0.495 ***	0.995 ***	0.920 ***	1.053 ***	1.047 ***	0.951 ***			
Univ 1-2 y.	0.804	1.964 *	0.088		0.875	-0.510	-0.302		(2) -0.013	0.411	0.019	0.605 ***	0.837 ***	0.470 ***			
tech. soc. dipl.	-1.051 **	-0.711	-0.901 *		-0.263	-0.764 #	-0.318		(3) 0.499 **	0.827 ***	0.874 ***	0.717 ***	0.716 ***	0.491 ***			
<= 2ary 1cyc	-0.617 *	-1.240 ***	-0.372		0.339	-0.090	0.312		(4) -0.405 *	-1.305 ***	-0.673 **	-0.185	-0.986 *	-1.004 ***			
LF. Agri. Craft. tr.	0.065	1.570 *	-1.268 #		-0.328	-0.398	-0.447 #		(5) 0.230	0.618 **	0.339	0.950 **	0.540	0.688 #			
Manag. Prof.	-0.942 #	0.370	0.290		-0.105	-0.537	-0.587		0.301 **	0.230 #	0.256 *	0.043	0.005	0.005			
Production w.	-0.237	0.451	-0.244		-0.700 #	-1.260 *	-0.542		0.695 ***	0.643 ***	0.366 *	0.134	-0.405	-0.432 *			
Part time	0.175	1.018 *	0.144		-0.328	-0.398	-0.447 #		(6) 1.919 ***	1.586 ***	1.046 ***	1.000 ***	0.739 ***	0.528 ***			
Not LF	1.043 ***	1.224 **	0.419		-0.309	-0.450 #	-0.900 ***										
Resid. Urban	-0.343	0.453	0.605		0.317	0.739	0.752		-0.775 ***	-0.556 ***	-0.821 ***	-0.594 ***	-0.639 ***	-0.615 ***			
Paris/Tokyo	0.068	0.255	0.772		0.228	0.572	0.667		0.048	0.095	-0.083	0.305 *	0.261	0.299 *			

* at time of survey or until union if any

Ref : age 21-22 ; not coresiding with parents ; general-techn. Bac/senior high school ; clerical and service workers ; rural.

(1) university 4 years, (2) junior college, (3) technical school, (4) junior high school, (5) self employed, (6) unstable employment. CATMOD procedure of SAS package.

Table 3 : Coefficients of proportional hazards analysis of determinants of being cohabitant or married, France and Japan

	France						Japan	
	Males			Females			Males	Females
	Cohabitant + marriages	All 1st marriages	Direct 1 st marriages	Cohabitant + marriages	all 1st marriages	Direct 1 st marriages	1st marriages	1st marriage
Coresid. w. parents*	0.1567 #	0.0207	0.5014 #	0.5191 ***	0.4255 ***	1.3326 ***	-0.066	0.0474
Educ. Univ > 2 y.	-0.01	0.0496	0.7396	-0.215	-0.488 #	-0.015	(1) -0.465 ***	-0.655 ***
Univ 1-2 y.	0.2072	-0.346	-14.3	-0.245	-0.14	-0.209	(2) -0.068	-0.375 ***
Tech., soc. dipl.	0.2213	0.2355	0.6616	0.0816	0.3319 #	0.6246 #	(3) -0.414 ***	-0.363 ***
<= 2ary 1 st cycle	0.4481 ***	0.6366 **	0.4033	0.2558 **	0.2219 #	0.5349 *	(4) 0.3135 ***	0.2639 **
LF Agri., craft., tr.	-0.013	0.3551	0.4479				(5) -0.254 **	-0.352 *
Manag., prof.	0.5707 **	0.1809	-0.395	-0.023	0.0049	-0.295	-0.169 **	-0.048
Production w.	0.0042	-0.34 #	0.4018	-0.116	0.0447	0.221	-0.368 ***	0.0926
Part time	0.1427	-0.142	0.2608	-0.05	0.2108	0.2653	(6) -1.149 ***	-0.493 ***
Not LF	-0.145	-0.796 ***	-0.528	0.0249	0.2345 *	0.2745		
Resid. Urban	0.56 *	0.2549	0.1602	0.003	-0.337	0.6003	0.3831 ***	0.1732 ***
Paris/Tokyo	0.3233	-0.147	-0.186	-0.021	-0.21	0.7926	0.0175	-0.189 **

* at time of survey or until union if any

Ref : not coresiding with parents ; general-techn. Bac/senior high school ; clerical and service workers ; rural.

(1) university 4 years, (2) junior college, (3) technical school, (4) junior high school, (5) self employed, (6) unstable employment.
PHREG procedure of SAS package.

Figure 1 : Marital status of females and males aged 21-34, France 1994 and Japan 1992

