

Determinants of Non-Formation of Partnership:

A French-Japanese Comparison¹

Jean Louis RALLU (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques, Paris) and

Hiroshi KOJIMA (National Institute of Population and Social Security Research,

Tokyo)

ABSTRACT

Besides cohabitation, new forms of partnership without common residence, including friends, lover, fiancé(e), non-cohabiting couples, are (re)appearing as revealed by the French FFS. These types of partnership are more common in Japan than in societies with a high prevalence of cohabitation. However, France also has a sizeable number of unions without cohabitation. Determinants of these various types of partnership and of the non-formation of partnership are socio-cultural (coresidence with parents) as well as related to socio-economic status (education, labor force participation, and occupation) of young men and women on the marriage market. Thus, the trends in economic situation, especially unemployment and precariousness, have important effects on partnership formation.

¹ This is a revised version of our paper prepared for the poster session at the FFS Flagship Conference, May 29-31, 2000, Brussels. We would like to thank anonymous referees *for Jinko Mondai Kenkyu* for their helpful comments and Japan Ministry of Health and Welfare Scientific Grant for financial assistance. However, we are responsible for all the remaining errors and shortcomings.

INTRODUCTION

Recent changes in living arrangements at young adult ages, including longer coresidence with parents (e.g., Kojima 1990a, Suzuki 1999) and an increase in one-person households (e.g., Bozon et Villeneuve-Gokalp 1994, Lesthaeghe & Moors 1996), have been seen as a threat to family formation leading to low levels of fertility and rapid aging in developed societies. It is partly because the decision about family formation (marriage and/or childbearing) is also the decision about living arrangement (living with a spouse and/or living with a child). The factors of non-formation of partnership need to be examined to understand recent trends in union formation. We previously studied the trends in fertility in France and Japan (Kojima & Rallu 1997, 1998) and found that similarities and differences in fertility are at least partly caused by those in nuptiality between Japan and France where cohabitation has been much more prevalent. Then, we realized the necessity to compare nuptiality patterns at the individual level in the two societies with very different types of union formation and different developments in the process of non-formation of unions. This is an extension of our previous work but a preliminary study which explores the effects of only a few common factors on partnership (union) formation or non-formation in France and Japan, drawing on micro data sets from the two societies. Even though one of the authors previously reviewed the literature and constructed an analytical framework for union formation (Kojima 1990b), this study does not explicitly draw on it because of the limitation in the number and comparability of variables as well as its preliminary nature.

DATA AND METHODS

This study has used the data from the French FFS (Family and Fertility Survey with a sample size of above 2000) conducted by the Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques (INSEE) in 1994 and the data from the 10th Japanese NFS (National Fertility Survey with a sample size of 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 for both surveys because the FFS had the lower age limit of 21 for French respondents and because most marriages occur before mid-thirties and there might be misreporting of marital status in the late 30s for Japanese women due to the stigma attached to celibacy. A 4-category partnership status variable has been constructed: 1) “having no partner” (or “alone”), 2) “having an intimate friend” (‘relation amoureuse stable’ for France or ‘having friend(s) of the opposite sex’ for Japan), 3) “cohabiting” (‘cohabitant’ for France or ‘having a lover/fiancé(e)’ for Japan), and 4) “currently married.” In France, cohabitators include 6% of respondents who declared to live “in couple” but were not residing together and single persons having a friend include 2% of respondents who declared a starting date of current union as ‘couple life.’ Cohabitators 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 of small percentages. We do not mean to say that partnership categories are always comparable between the two societies. 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. Thus, we analyze the determinants of partnership formation or non-formation based on this categorization. Independent variables used in this study are only four basic ones, including education, labor force status/occupation and urban-rural residence, which have been made as similar as possible in French and Japanese data (Table 1).

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 analyses for 3-category living arrangements: “living alone,” “living with parents before union” and “living with a partner (in cohabitation or marriage)” 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 union (cohabitation or first marriage) for France and that of 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

likely to be alone (with no partner) than French at all ages and for both sexes. They are also less likely to have a friend, except for males aged 30-34. The proportion married is higher in Japan than in France. However, the total proportion in union (married or cohabiting) is higher in France, except at ages 30-34. Japanese with a lover or a fiancé(e) may actually represent the category where cohabitation is beginning. If social norms and economic conditions were different, cohabitation would certainly be much more prevalent and the proportion married would be lower in Japan. It is noticeable that the percentage “having no partner” among the total of this category plus the percentage “having a friend” are similar in both societies, except for females aged 25-29 where Japanese are more often without a partner and among males aged 30-34 where French are more often without a partner.

(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 cohabiting” relative to “being married.” In this and the following tables asterisks and number marks mean the significance level: *** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; and # $p < .10$. Among French men, age as a whole has a negative effect on “having no partner,” “having a stable partner without cohabitation” and “being cohabiting” in relation to “being married” and the effect becomes larger as they get older. This means that unmarried men including cohabitators 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, men with the highest education (more than 2 years in university) are less likely to have no partner. Those with 1-2-year university education are more likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation presumably because those with 1-2-year university 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.

Men in unstable employment or unemployment are more likely to have no partner or a stable partner without cohabitation. They are also more likely to be cohabiting, 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. Men living in Paris are slightly more likely to be cohabiting².

² Data on occupation are only available at the time of survey in the FFS. Although the results may be subject to reverse causation, the logit analysis of this data set reveals interesting aspects: self-employed French men are more likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation and less likely to cohabit. 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

We have also conducted the multinomial logit analysis of living arrangements, although the table is not presented here. The results show that 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 more likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation presumably because they face competition for living with a partner from living with parents.

For French women (Table 2, col. 4-6), 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 cohabitators 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 effect of parental control over the partnership formation of French women living with parents.

Among educational levels, the highest education (more than 2 years in university) has weakly significant and positive effects on “having a stable partner without cohabitation” and “cohabiting.” 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

are less likely to have no partner in relation to being married, possibly because of their attractiveness as marriage partners.

partner³.

French women in part-time employment are more likely to have no partner or a partner without cohabitation, or also to be cohabiting. This means that they are less likely to be married, like for men. But, unlike men, unemployed women are less likely to be cohabiting, meaning that they tend to marry more often than employed ones, which may reflect the reverse causation. Regional variables do not have any significant effects among French women.

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.

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 high-school (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

³ It may be the same for French women in blue-collar occupation (at the time of survey) because they are also less likely to have a stable partner without cohabitation.

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 toward traditional family life. On the other hand, Japanese men having graduated from technical schools after senior high-school 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 attitude toward family life 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) 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 attitude toward family life and less parental pressure for marriage. On the other hand, Japanese men in blue-collar occupation may have less chances to meet single women and lack financial resources to marry. 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 a negative effect on being unmarried as a whole, which may suggest the possible effects of marriage squeeze in rural areas.

For Japanese women (Table 2, col. 10-12), as among Japanese 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 high-school 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 man presumably through introduction because of their orientation toward 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 attitude toward family life 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 a 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 a negative effect on being unmarried as a whole, suggesting the possible effects of marriage squeeze in rural areas.

(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 union (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. The hazards of first marriage decline from cohorts born in the first half of the 1960s and the decline is steeper in recent cohorts, but the hazards of first union (cohabitation or marriage) do not show significant change for French males. Coresidence with parents before union has a weakly positive effect on the hazards to have a first union, which would suggest that living with parents encourages French men to start either cohabitation or marriage. But the third column showing a stronger positive effect suggests 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 second and third columns. In other words, they

are less likely to go into “direct marriage⁴.” Men in part-time employment or unemployment are less likely to have a first marriage, and unemployed men are even less likely to be cohabiting or married due to lack of financial resources. French men living in urban areas other than Paris have higher hazards to have a first union, perhaps a first cohabitation without marriage rather than a first marriage.

For women (Table 3, col. 4-6), like for men, the hazards of first marriage decline step by step and more and more steeply from cohorts 1960-1964 to cohorts 1970-1973, but unlike for men, there is also a significant decline in unions (cohabitation or marriage) in younger cohorts. Coresidence with parents before union has a highly positive effect on the hazards of first union, particularly on first marriage without previous 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 followed or not by a marriage, like for men. 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. French women in part-time employment are less likely to marry, like for men, however, unemployed women are more likely to be cohabiting or married. The regional variables do not have any

⁴ French men in professional and managerial occupations (at the time of survey) 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.

significant effects among French women.

It is not a surprise that the hazards of first marriage decline with cohort in Japan, but, unlike in France, the decline is not steeper in recent cohorts for males, although similar trends are found for Japanese and French women alike. In contrast to the French results, coresidence with parents before marriage does not have any significant effects 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 positive effect of coresidence may appear at least among Japanese women in a more elaborate model additionally controlling for father's education, mother's employment status, sib size, inheritor status, geographical areas, although the change in age limits can be also responsible for the significance level.

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 colleges) 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 similar with the results for French women as regards unions, but not on "direct marriage" for which there is no significant effect in France.

Japanese men with all the (non-reference) 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 occupations

(reference category) have higher hazards because of their greater chances to meet single women. 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 or non-desirability 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.

The role of sexual division of labor on decline in marriage in Japan has drawn much attention in recent years from demographers and sociologists (Iwasawa 2000, Segalen 2000). Decline in marriage in Japan is often attributed to a necessary choice between family life and career. Japanese women would delay their marriage because it is traditionally followed by a birth in short intervals and mothers are traditionally encouraged to stay home to care for children. Logistic regression analysis of partnership status shows that ‘denial of sexual division of labor’ has a significant and negative effect on marriage for females (Iwasawa 2000), but the author does not carry out the same analysis for males and variables relating to economic cost of marriage or children are not included in the analysis.

The comparison of labor force participation rates of married Japanese and French women (Table 4) shows that the former are more often in full-time employment before marriage than the latter. But, between marriage and the survey, many Japanese women enter self-employment (including agriculture) following

marriage, and many also shift to part-time work or even quit work. The proportions leaving full-time employment and shifting to unstable employment are much lower in France than in Japan. In France, the main reason of work interruptions, beyond company layoffs, is linked to births. It is probably the same for Japanese women, but short marriage-first birth intervals would make it difficult to carry out a precise comparison. Finally, Japanese and French women have similar labor force participation rates, but the former are more often in part-time employment. Thus, the empowerment of Japanese women enables a large majority of them to work outside home, at a level comparable with an European society such as France where the female labor force participation rate is among the highest in Europe. While Japanese traditions give an important role to women in their choices for household expenditures, Japanese women show one of the lowest participation in decision-making positions at the occupational level in Asia. Accusing sexual division of labor or gender roles, is certainly not a solution to the marriage bust in Japan as well as in any other societies. It might be better to consider that cohabitation would be able to stabilize union formation. But, as regards stabilizing fertility, births to cohabitators and working mothers should be also accepted.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The results presented above exhibited the differences and the similarities between the two societies. 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 effects of coresidence with parents on marriage in this study but other models have shown such an effect (Kojima 1994). The effects of education also seem to be similar in the sense that higher one tends to encourage less “traditional” partnership behaviors. Similarly, young adults in professional and managerial occupation tend to have more “modern” partnership behaviors while the self-employed in the two societies tend to have more “traditional” ones. Unstable employment and unemployment seem to restrict partnership behavior in the two societies. Regional variables do not always have clear effects on partnership behaviors, but they seem to constrain them in some cases possibly through marriage squeeze.

In both societies, marriage is in competition with other forms of union with or without cohabitation. In Japan, the proportion of women aged 25-29 having a partner but not cohabiting (Iwasawa, 2000) steadily increased from 7% in 1982 to 11 % in 1987 and 17% in 1992. At ages 30-34, the proportion increased from 2% in 1982 to 5% in 1992. Moreover, the proportion of women aged 30-34 without an intimate friend also increased from 9% in 1982 to 15% in 1992. In France, the proportion of women having a friend and not cohabiting are not negligible with 13% at ages 25-29 and 6% at 30-34, but their trends are unknown. While the proportion of non-cohabiting couples is still low with 6% of cohabitators or less than 1% of women aged 20-49 (Toulemon 1996), 12% of first unions started that way for women born in 1960-1964 and 1965-1969, but it has increased to 17% for cohorts 1970-1974 (for men figures are respectively 17% and 21%).

However, it may be not only ideology or culture that differentiate the

partnership behaviors within and between the two societies (Iwasawa 2000), but it may be also structural constraints (Ekert-Jaffé et Solaz 1998). Demographic and financial constraints seem to exert strong structural effects on the partnership behaviors of both “traditional” and “modern” young adults in the two societies and the seemingly different partnership behaviors may be different representations of their limited choices or adaptive strategies under somewhat different constraints.

REFERENCES

Bozon, M, et C. Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1994, “Les enjeux des relations entre générations à la fin de l’adolescence,” *Population*, 49-6, pp.1527-1555.

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 presented for the 2000 Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Los Angeles, March 23-25 2000 (*NIPSSR Working Paper Series (E)*, No.9).

Kojima, H., 1990a, “Coresidence of young adults with their parents in Japan: do sib size and birth order matter?,” *Jinkogaku Kenkyu [J. of Population Studies]*, 13.

Kojima, H., 1990b. “Trends toward Later Marriage: Increase in Single Persons,” *Japanese Journal of Family Sociology*, 2, pp.10-23 (in Japanese).

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., et J.-L. Rallu, 1997, “La fécondité au Japon et en France,” *Population*, 52-5, pp.1143-1172.

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

Lesthaeghe, R., and G. Moors, 1996, “Living Arrangements, Socio-economic Position, and Values among Young Adults: a pattern description for France, West Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands, 1990,” D. Coleman (ed.), *Europe's population in the 1990s*, New York, Oxford University Press, pp.163-221.

Segalen M., 2000, *Sociologie de la famille*, 5^{ème} édition, Paris, A. Colin.

Suzuki, T., 1999. Projection of Households in Japan with a Dynamic Macro-Simulation Model, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

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.

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./L over-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
	Coreidence 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)	Lover/fiancé	No partner	Friend(s)	Lover/fiancé	No partner	Friend(s)	Lover/fiancé
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 ***			
L.F. 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

