

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Reexamining the "Greedy Institution" of Marriage: Marital Status and Social Worlds

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5z75k6dg>

Author

Lui, Jonathan

Publication Date

2015

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
IRVINE

Reexamining the “Greedy Institution” of Marriage:
Marital Status and Social Worlds

DISSERTATION

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILISOPHY

in Sociology

by

Jonathan Lui

Dissertation Committee:
Professor Judith Treas, Chair
Professor Matt L. Huffman
Assistant Professor Kristin E. Turney

2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
CURRICULUM VITAE	v
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: The Social Worlds of Cohabitors and Marrieds	15
CHAPTER 2: The Leisure Time Use of Cohabitors and Marrieds	40
CHAPTER 3: The Social Worlds of Divorced and Never-Marrieds	72
CHAPTER 4: Summary and Conclusions	95
REFERENCES	112
APPENDIX A: Variable Coding	134
APPENDIX B: Method	142
APPENDIX C: The Children of Divorced and Never-Married Persons	144

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=76,335)	28
Table 1.2	OLS Coefficients for Cohabitation (in Minutes Total) by Co-Presence Type (N=76,327)	30
Table 1.3	OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327)	33
Table 2.1	Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=76,327)	55
Table 2.2	OLS Coefficients for Cohabitation (in Minutes Leisure) by Group Size (N=76,327)	58
Table 2.3	OLS Coefficients for Cohabitation (in Minutes Leisure) by Co-Presence Type (N=76,327)	60
Table 2.4	OLS Models of Leisure Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327)	63
Table 3.1	Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=47,145)	84
Table 3.2	OLS Coefficients (in Minutes Total) for Divorced by Group Size (N=47,145)	86
Table 3.3	OLS Coefficients (in Minutes Total) for Divorced by Co-Presence Type (N=47,145)	88
Table 3.4	OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=47,145)	90
Table 4.1	Hypothesis for Cohabiting Compared to Married Individuals for Total and Leisure Time Co-Presence	99
Table 4.2	Hypothesis for Divorced Compared to Never-Married Individuals for Total Time Co-Presence	104
Table A3.1	Children in the Households of Divorced and Never-Married Respondents (N=47,145)	144
Table A3.2.	OLS Coefficients for Divorced (in Minutes) by Children Co-Presence Type (N=47,145)	144

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My dissertation committee chair, Judith Treas, assisted me immensely in the development and structuring of this dissertation, promptly reviewed and returned drafts, provided moral support and encouragement during the tireless days in the office, and motivated me to send out a chapter for publication and a conference presentation. This dissertation would not be possible without her guidance.

My committee members, Matt Huffman and Kristen Turney, played an important role in helping me with my analyses and directing me to the proper solutions. Thank you for your patience and advice. They were greatly appreciated.

Director of graduate affairs, John Sommerhauser, was always there to listen and address any concerns I had throughout this academic journey. Your assurance made it easier for me to focus on my education and life after the program.

Belinda Robnett-Olsen and Su Yang gave me the opportunity to be involved in some amazing projects. You both broadened my understanding of how to approach research outside my discipline of sociology.

I cannot express enough gratitude to Nick Noviello, lecturer in the Department of Social Science, who I had the pleasure of being a teaching assistant for throughout the entirety of this program. Thank you for allowing me to grow and become the teacher I want to be. Learning from you and your experience teaching statistics along with being given countless opportunities to guest lecture were extremely beneficial to my development as an educator. Most of all, thank you for your friendship.

I am grateful for the years of generous financial support I received from the University of California, Irvine, including the Associate Dean's fellowship during the 2013 spring quarter.

To my undergraduate statistics study group during the 2015 spring quarter, thank you for showing up each Wednesday night and going along with my crazy idea of having a casual community-based learning environment. It was an absolute honor to be able to share my brand of statistics to each and every one of you and receiving your input. Thank you for giving me an experience that I will never forget.

The completion of this project could not be made possible without the support of my friends and family. To all my friends, but especially, Quan Nguyen and his wife, Johanne Tsui, thank you for the midweek dinners, social outings, and keeping me in touch with the outside world. I would like to offer my sincerest appreciation to my older brother, Lawrence, his wife, Maile, and two children, Emma and Oliver, for entertaining me in San Diego. To my youngest brother, Kenneth, thank you for listening to all my successes and failures, sharing your home-cooked meals, and reminding me that we're just some kids from Westminster.

Finally, thank you to my parents, Gee and Siu, for trusting my decisions, pushing me to be my best, and being supportive of the path I took.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Jonathan Lui

- 2005 B.A. in Social Science, University of California, Irvine
- 2006 M.A. in Demographic and Social Analysis, University of California, Irvine
- 2008-15 Teaching Assistant, Introduction to Social Science Statistics, University of California, Irvine
- 2011 Research Assistant, Demographic Center Grant, University of California, Irvine
- 2012 Research Assistant, Outlook on Life Project, University of California, Irvine
- 2015 Ph.D. in Sociology, University of California, Irvine

FIELD OF STUDY

Marriage and Family

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Reexamining the “Greedy Institution” of Marriage: Marital Status and Social Worlds

By

Jonathan Lui

Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology

University of California, Irvine, 2015

Professor Judith Treas, Chair

Modern marriage has been characterized as a “greedy institution” where couples disengage from their social networks and community to devote their undivided attention to each other. I compare the co-presence patterns, that is, who people surround themselves with and how much time is spent with them, of cohabiters and married individuals to determine whether marriage is a uniquely “greedy institution” or whether co-residential romantic relationships lead to similar social worlds. I also compare divorcees and never-married individuals to determine whether experiencing marital dissolution influences the time that is allocated to others. Pooling data from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS) from 2003 to 2013, this study finds little differences in how cohabiters and married persons manage their relationships outside of their own union. Although cohabitation may be no less “greedy” of social ties than marriage, cohabiting couples spend more time alone together than marital couples. Divorcees and persons who have yet to marry also have similar social worlds. Household composition and demographic characteristics play a large role in the differences in time allocation. The findings suggest that marriage is no “greedier” than informal co-residential unions, and social networks appear to recover post-marriage.

INTRODUCTION

The idea that people disengage from their social groups when they enter romantic relationships has been around since at least the early 1980s in the social psychology literature on “dyadic withdrawal” (Johnson & Leslie, 1982; Milardo, 1982; Parks, Stan, & Eggert, 1983). According to the idea of “dyadic withdrawal”, people begin to pull away from their own social networks as intimacy with their partner increases. More recently, Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006) rebranded this notion and claimed that modern marriage is a “greedy institution” that isolates and demands the undivided attention and commitment of its members, thus removing couples from kin and community networks. At the same time, cohabitation, singlehood, and divorce are on the rise. While developments in singlehood, especially cohabitation, are not completely understood, they indicate that the lives of many adults are not governed by the social constraints said to be associated with marriage. Framed as indicating that marriage is losing its normative grip, becoming less institutionalized, cohabitation raises questions as to whether dyadic withdrawal is still an apt characterization of married life.

To understand the nature of various marital statuses or partnership arrangements, researchers have studied the permanency of unions and statuses (Goodwin, Mosher, & Chandra, 2010); the values of those who find themselves, say married, cohabiting (Kamp Dush & Amato, 2005), or single (DePaulo, 2006). This study considers how both legal marital statuses and types of partnerships differ on time use. In particular, this study focuses on social time –time spent with others –because it offers insights on social worlds. The research question is how being married or cohabiting or being divorced or never-married is reflected in who one spends time with and how much time is spent with partner and others. Not only does this question speak to the intimate nature of different legal and residential arrangements, but it also addresses how

these arrangements may shape social worlds, likely with consequences for social capital and well-being.

This dissertation will explore the extent to which marriage influences the social world of individuals. The pathway to marriage, as well as its meaning, has undergone some dramatic changes since the early 20th century. They include, a delay in the age of first marriage (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012), a rise in never-married middle-aged adults (Kreider & Ellis, 2011), high divorce rates (Copen, Daniels, Vespa, & Mosher, 2012), and a large proportion of adults living with an unmarried partner (Wang & Parker, 2014). These trends may be a result of changes in what couples expect from marriage. Burgess and Locke (1945) described a transition from marriage as an institution to a companionate marriage, whereby spouses were each other's friends and lovers. Whereas marriage in the previous era functioned primarily as a means of procreation, an economic arrangement, and a way of joining families, this change to companionate marriage introduced a sentimental element to marriage. An important criteria for people looking to marry became the emotional satisfaction derived from a partner, rather than whether they could fulfill their marital roles well. With an increased focus on companionship in marriage, partners prioritize their marital relationship over extended family and friends (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006; Putnam, 2000), serving as each other's main source of support (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Brashears, 2006). It is unclear whether the heteronormative behavior between partners in marriage holds up for cohabiters, or whether the loss of a partner through divorce is more detrimental to one's social world than never having been married.

The following chapters will systematically examine the "greedy institution" of marriage thesis (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006). In chapters 1 and 2, I compare the social worlds of cohabiting and married individuals. Chapter 1 compares the overall time use of cohabiters and married

people. Who time is spent with during the day and whether time is spent alone paint a larger picture of a person's social world. This analysis acknowledges that time allocation may be voluntary (e.g., leisure or recreation) or obligatory (e.g., sharing housework, work-related activities, caring for children), and type of activity may draw people towards certain types of people and away from others. Voluntary activities are presumably those that more closely reflect preference for association. To hone in on this distinction of voluntary versus obligatory time, Chapter 2 compares the leisure time use of cohabiters and married people. Leisure activities have been defined in a variety of ways. Some studies have used broad definitions, such as activities that do not have market substitutes (Gronau, 1977) or the time not spent in paid work, doing domestic tasks, or personal care (Voorpostel, van der Lippe, & Gershuny, 2010). Other studies subjectively classify leisure as activities pursued for enjoyment (Robinson & Godbey, 1997; Solberg & Wong, 1991) For this analysis, I define leisure activities as those that involve socializing, relaxing, sports, exercise, and recreation. Being more voluntary, leisure patterns of time use are expected to be especially revealing of any married versus cohabiter difference in dyadic withdrawal or other patterns of social engagement. Chapter 3 takes a different approach towards exploring the impact of marriage by comparing the social worlds of divorced and never-married persons. If marriage is a "greedy institution" are the social networks of divorced persons what we might expect if marriage permanently constricts their social world? Or, are divorcees able to reconstitute their social networks after their marriage ends in keeping with their single status? By comparing the time divorcees versus never-married people allocate to themselves, their family, and friends, we gain a better understanding of the social consequences of marriage and marital dissolution.

Social Worlds

Social worlds have been measured in terms of intimates with whom one discusses important matters (Barrett, 1999; McPherson et al., 2006) or frequency of contact with others (Pinquart, 2003; Kalmijn & Bernasco, 2001). However, another unexploited approach to social worlds is to measure it from a temporal co-presence standpoint, that is, in terms of people with whom time is spent (e.g., partner, family, non-family) and how much time during an average day is spent with each type of relationship. I focus on relationships apart from children, because time with children often involve their care, which may diminish the value of time with others. Time with children is often spent attending, supervising, and facilitating children's activities (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003).

The availability of others influence personal well-being (Antonucci, 2001), because social relationships are sources of instrumental and socio-emotional support (Demir & Weitekamp, 2007). Spending time with others allows for socialization and access to social capital (e.g., trust, reciprocity, and information) that these relationships offer (Putnam, 2000). Social relationships are found to stave-off loneliness in old age (Cornwell, Laumann, & Schumm, 2008). The variety of relationships that makeup one's social world are all important. Family members are an important part of a person's social capital and social support network (Attias-Donfut, 2000; Bengston, 2001), and close friends also provide tangible and practical social support (Taylor, 2010). Families and intergenerational bonds provide economic support and transmit behavior and values (Attias-Donfut, 2000). Because friendship ties are heterogeneous, they can offer a wide array of support that rival that of family relationships (Doherty & Feeney, 2004). Even interactions with strangers have been found to be important as

they can support one's identity in day-to-day life (Fingerman, 2009). These relationships generate social capital from which individuals can invest in or draw on when needed.

How time is spent, whether it is obligatory or discretionary, is just as important as who time is spent with. Modern life has been described as more hectic, squeezing out leisure as a daily occurrence (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001; Garhammer, 2004). Nevertheless, spending time in leisure activities has been found to be psychologically and physically beneficial (Caldwell, 2005; Trost, Owen, Bauman, Sallis, & Brown, 2002; Warburton, Nicol, & Bredin, 2006; Trenberth & Dewe, 2002). Participating in a diverse set of leisure activities is also known to be associated with a number of desirable outcomes, such as lowered delinquency and positive social behavior (Winther 1989), reduced boredom, and increased life satisfaction (Iso-Ahola & Weissinger, 1990; Weissinger, Caldwell, & Bandalos 1992). Not only does leisure contribute to social capital, but it also adds to one's own cultural capital, that is, cultural knowledge that can be used as a social resource (Bourdieu, 1986).

Arguably, the spouse is the most important relationship for those who are married. Marital partners serve as each other's primary source of emotional and material support (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006), which suggests that marital partners devote a great deal of time to each other. Given the deeper level of intimacy in marriage (Giddens, 1992), not to mention the economic perquisites for those who enter marriage (Cherlin, 2004), the growing popularity of cohabitation as a living arrangement with lower expectations for closeness and financial security may come as little surprise. Cohabitation is fast becoming the first co-residential union formed by young American adults (Goodwin et al., 2010). Since 2000, nearly three-quarters of women who formed a union cohabited prior to marrying (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2011). The prevalence of cohabitation may be due to the fact that it allows people the opportunity to "try" marriage if

they are uncertain about their financial future, partner, or readiness for a formal commitment (Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001). Although research has found spending time together to be the most strongly endorsed reason couples cohabit (Rhoades, Stanley, & Markman, 2009; Surra & Hughes, 1997), a comparison between cohabiting and married couples' time together will tell us whether cohabiting partners play as prominent a role in one's social world as marital partners do.

Despite becoming a normative event in the life course, cohabitation is not clearly defined nor is it well understood (Cherlin, 2004; Manning & Smock, 2005). An area that deserves particular attention is whether cohabitation affects the social world of people in the same manner as Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006) argue marriage does to married people. What delineates marriage from cohabitation is the fact that marriage is institutionalized, whereas cohabitation is an informal arrangement. There is not only a legal structure that gives rights and responsibilities to those who are married, but there are also normative expectations from family, friends, and the broader society that dictate their appropriate role behaviors (Cherlin, 2004). For example, at least some contact with a spouse's family is a widespread expectation. Being more reliant on each other, however, married people may spend less time with others than do those without spousal support. Cohabitation, on the other hand, is "incompletely institutionalized". Cohabitors face fewer social sanctions and fewer obstacles to entering and consequences to exiting cohabiting unions. Cohabitors are described as individualistic and valuing personal autonomy more so than married people (Baxter, 2005). This suggests that cohabitors may be less tied to each other in various ways, including socially.

It has also been argued that the relative ease in forming cohabiting unions joins couples who have "looser bonds" (Schoen & Weinick, 1993). Cohabitation can draw couples together

who are less than ideal matches, because cohabitation involves less emotional and financial commitment than marriage. Although, cohabitation is understood as a more tentative, experimental, and explorative union than marriage (Seltzer, 2000), the uncertainty of cohabitation is evident in the literature on how cohabiting partners organize their households. Compared to married couples, cohabiters contribute more equally to the household income (Brines & Joyner, 1999), uphold more egalitarian divisions of housework (Baxter, 2005), and are more likely to keep separate purses (Hiekel, Liefbroer, & Poortman, 2014). Although cohabiting households might be organized differently than married households, some couples use cohabitation as a “trial marriage” (Brien, Lillard, & Stern, 2006). Couples live together before walking down the aisle as a means of moderating the inherent risk of committing to a marital relationship with the wrong partner. By maintaining a level of independence –including social independence –from their partner, cohabiters incur fewer costs and obstacles in dissolving their relationship should it not work out. Another way in which cohabiters can avoid interdependency is by drawing social boundaries that exclude their partner and not merging their social worlds.

Although some couples opt to cohabit as a risk management strategy before marriage, divorce is still a common occurrence. Divorce rates in the United States are the highest in the world (Kreider & Ellis, 2011). About two-fifths to half of all marriages are expected to end in separation or divorce (Stevenson & Wolfers, 2007). These odds have led people to delay or forgo marriage. The median age at first marriage has been steadily increasing each year, reaching 26.5 for women and 28.7 for men in 2011 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2012). Singlehood has also been on the rise over the past decades in the western world and will likely continue to do so (Fields & Casper, 2001). As of 2010, approximately 28% of Americans have never been married, a nearly 100% increase from half a century before (Cohn, Passel, Wang, & Livingston, 2011).

These trends have led to a growing number of adults spending a greater part of their lives single, either never having married or divorced (DePaulo & Morris, 2005).

Ostensibly, divorced and never-married people should be similar socially. Without a legal partner to rely on, they may turn to family or friends for emotional or instrumental support. However, divorced and never-married people are separated by the experience of marriage, and its dissolution –and the change in lifestyle and social relationships that may come along with it. If the socially isolating effect of marriage on social relationships holds true, differences in the social relationships of divorcees and never-married persons should exist.

Previous studies on the social relationships of married people lend some support to the differences we expect to find. Because people devote less time to maintaining relationships with family and friends while married (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006), they may be returning to smaller and weaker social networks when they divorce. Research on the socially integrative nature of marriage (DePaulo, 2006; Kalmijn, 2003) are also suggestive of the disruption that divorce causes on social networks. Spouses are highly connected with each other socially (Kalmijn, 2003), because marriage is presumed to be a permanent arrangement that encourages couples to merge their social circles. If marital partners become more acquainted with in-laws and their partner's friends, then divorce should negatively affect contacts with relatives as well as mutual friends of the former spouse (Terhell, Broese, van Groenou, & van Tilburg, 2004). These findings suggest that divorcees may have fewer others to spend time with than never-married persons. Studies drawing a direct comparison found that never-married people have stronger intergenerational ties (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008) and more friendship ties (Connidis, 2001) than the previously married. However, divorce may have a positive effect on social ties. Albeck and Kaydar (2002) found that divorced persons take advantage of their social freedom and devote

more time and attention to growing their social network than they did when they were married, which suggests similar or potentially more time with others than the never-married.

As mentioned above, social world here is defined in terms of who one spends time with. Although time is renewed each day, it is a limited resource that poses a constraint on activities and on who those activities are shared with (Joyce & Stewart, 1999). Although having time to oneself may be beneficial in its own right, allocating time to others strengthens social relationships. Arguments in the following chapters stem from what we know about companionate marriages. Marital partners rely more on each other both materially and emotionally than in the past, often serving as each other's confidant (McPherson et al., 2006). This has resulted in married couples having less time for family and friends (Putnam, 2000). However, it is uncertain whether companionate marriage equates to spending more time together than other sorts of unions, that is, whether marriage is a uniquely "greedy institution" or whether co-residential romantic relationships have a similar influence. I analyze who cohabiters and married people spend their time with, and whether they include their partner in interactions with others, to illuminate differences in how relationships affect the way people make these social investments. I also look at those without partners –the divorced and never-married –to determine whether similarities in singlehood extend to social relationships or whether experiencing the end of a close partner relationship influences how people socialize.

Data and Analysis

Appropriate data are pooled from the 2003-2013 American Time Use Survey (ATUS). Certain key demographic variables linked from the U.S. Census Current Population Study (CPS) are updated in the ATUS. The ATUS is the only large, representative U.S. time use survey that measures a full range of non-market activities, the types of activities respondents do on a diary

day, time spent on these activities, and who was present during them. The data are appropriate for the following studies, because they allow for the creation of an exhaustive typology of relationships that comprise a social world as well as measuring the time devoted to these relationships. The following chapters contrast the time allocated to these relationships on the basis of marital status. If marital unions are “greedy” and cohabiting unions have “looser bonds”, what do differences and similarities in social patterns tell us about the two unions? How do the formerly-married navigate their social lives compared to the never-married who have not experienced divorce?

Chapter 1 is guided by the thesis of the “greedy institution” of marriage (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006), which suggests that marriage is a time-consuming endeavor that leaves less time for other relationships. The “looser bonds” of cohabitation perspective that suggests weaker ties between cohabiting partners also helps inform our hypotheses. Taken together, they depict two different social worlds –one more partner-oriented than the other. However, the results are contrary to what I expected. Although I hypothesize that cohabiters will spend less time with their partner on an average day than married individuals do, I find the opposite to be true. While marital partners are not redirecting all of their time solely to each other, and cohabiting partners are more tied to each other than previously thought, I turn to relationships outside these unions.

Because marriage has been characterized as a “greedy institution”, I hypothesize that cohabiters will spend more time than married people alone (separate from the partner) with family members as well as with non-family persons. In case their relationship ends, cohabiters also have incentives to maintain their social ties as an insurance against becoming to socially dependent on their partner. However, I find cohabiters spending more time with non-family

persons, but not family members. If marriage is “greedy”, it undermines relations with unrelated persons not kin.

I also expect cohabiting and married couples to differ in who they spend their time with. Because family ties are involuntary and permanent, I assume that spending time as a cohabiting couple with family constitutes a greater relationship investment than time spent with non-family persons. Cohabitors may not only be reluctant to socialize with their family members or partner’s family members, but family members may also be hesitant in accepting a cohabiting partner, given the higher risks the couple will break-up (Waite, 2000). It is less of a relationship investment to spend time with friends and acquaintances, which cohabiting couples may have shared prior to cohabitation, because those ties are voluntary. Cohabiting couples can also find others who are accepting of the uncertainty of their relationship (Blieszner & Roberto, 2004). Therefore, I hypothesize that cohabitors, compared to married people, will spend less time with their partner and family members together, but more time with their partner and non-family persons. Although I find support for both hypotheses, the differences are modest.

Chapter 2 compares the leisure time use of cohabitors and married people. Previous studies have broadly defined what constitutes leisure activities. I adopt a simplified definition of leisure, encompassing both active and passive leisure that reflect personal choice, activities that involve socializing, relaxing, sports, exercise, and recreation. This analysis on leisure time is distinct from the consideration of overall time use, because leisure, and who it is spent with, is typically voluntary. Thus, leisure may be a stronger indicator of the preferences of cohabitors and married people, “greediness” of marriage, and whether distinctly bounded social worlds extend to cohabitation.

The previous chapter examining overall time suggest institutional differences between marriage and cohabitation lead to differences in time use. The greater interdependency and commitment between marital partners compared to cohabiting partners suggest similar hypotheses for leisure. Spending free time with a partner, as opposed to obligatory time together, is shown to be beneficial to the relationship. Sharing new experiences together helps keep the relationship fresh (Reissman, Aron, & Gergen, 1993). Leisure together is also considered a union-specific investment that helps maintain bonds by opening up lines of communication between partners (Orthner, 1975; Claxton & Perry-Jenkins, 2008). These findings suggest that married couples will spend more time together, given what we know about the importance of marital unions. However, I find that cohabiting couples spend more leisure time alone together than married couples do.

Because leisure is more enjoyable when it is shared with others (Young & Lim, 2014), I compare the free time spent with family and non-family persons, with and without the partner present. If marital relationships are more demanding of time compared to cohabiting relationships, then it should be at the expense of leisure time with others. Although leisure, being more voluntary, offers a better test of the hypotheses, the results are similar to the previous chapter on overall time use. Though I hypothesize that cohabiters will spend more leisure time alone with family and non-family persons, I only find support for the latter. There is no significant difference in the time spent with related persons, which further suggests that marriage, if “greedy”, only excludes non-kin relationships. On the other hand, definitive lines are drawn in social worlds when the partner is included in time with others. I find support for the hypothesis that cohabiting partners are not brought into family networks to the same extent as

married partners. I also find support for the hypothesis that cohabiting couples socialize more with non-family persons.

Chapter 3 takes a different approach towards exploring the “greediness” of marriage by comparing the social worlds of divorced and never-married persons. Compared to divorcees, never-married people did not have marriage to break their social continuity, that is, they did not have a period when they were pulled away from their social network due to marriage. By contrast, the never-married are apt to continue to strengthen and expand their social networks. Following this line of reasoning yields several hypotheses regarding differences in who divorced and never-married people might spend their time with. Because marriage is associated with a contracted social group, I hypothesize that divorcees spend more time alone than never-married people do. However, I find divorcees spend less time alone. Because family relationships and friendships are qualitatively different, time spent in these relationships are analyzed separately. Presumably, family bonds are stronger, more resilient, and require less upkeep than friendship bonds. I hypothesize that divorcees spend more time with family members, but less time with non-family persons, than never-married people do. However, I find no significant difference. I also analyze time with both family and non-family persons together and speculate that divorcees will spend less time in this arrangement. Again, I find no significant difference.

Although marital history as captured by the marital status of the divorced and never-married does not appear to influence social world, socio-demographic differences that distinguish divorcees and never-married persons do. Age, in particular, is known to be associated with social network size (Carstensen, 2006) and frequency of contact (Cornwell, 2011a). Divorcees are generally older (Ono, 2005), and older persons have fewer people to spend their time with. Moreover, older persons spend less time with others than their younger counterparts

do. There are also certain aspects of being young that facilitate time with others. The living situation of younger and older persons differ. Because younger persons are less established, they are likely to be living with more family or non-family persons. Sharing a household with others presents greater opportunities to spend time with others. Divorcees are also more likely to have children than never-married persons. Because children are time-demanding, parents may find less time for other relationships.

The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the “greedy institution” of marriage by contrasting the social worlds of cohabiters with married individuals and divorcees with never-married individuals. Comparisons between cohabiters’ and married people’s overall and leisure time co-presence, suggest whether marriage has a unique effect in isolating marital couples or whether co-residential unions confer similar constraints on social worlds. The social worlds of cohabiters and married persons are more similar than they are different. Both unions can be considered “greedy”. However, cohabiting couples spend more time alone together than married couples do, a finding that is contrary to the “looser bonds” perspective of cohabitation (Schoen & Weinick, 1993). In the third chapter, I take an indirect look at the “greedy institution” of marriage by comparing co-presence for people not in relationships –those who are never-married versus those who were previously married, that is, divorcees. Experiencing marriage (and its presumed “greediness”) and transitioning back to singlehood, divorcees offer a different angle on the “greedy institution” perspective. Despite undergoing this transition, I find the social world of divorcees to be similar to those who never married. Overall, age, which is associated with marital status, is a determining factor in how individuals allocate their time to others.

CHAPTER 1

The Social Worlds of Cohabitors and Marrieds

INTRODUCTION

Cohabitation, like marriage, involves sharing a residence and personal resources, enjoying the gratification of an intimate relationship, and, in some cases, bearing and rearing children (Waite & Gallagher, 2000). However, researchers have sought to understand what really distinguishes the two union types. One question that remains is whether cohabitation serves as a “trial marriage” (that is, part of the spouse selection process) or as an alternative to marriage itself (Manning & Smock, 2002). Admittedly, there are notable differences between those who cohabit and those who marry (see Kroeger & Smock, 2014), but cohabitation’s growing prevalence and acceptance has led some to argue that cohabitation may be less selective of particular types of couples than in the past (Reinhold, 2010). Increasingly, studies suggest that the two unions arrange themselves similarly in terms of day-to-day lives, only differing in their legal rights and future plans (Manning & Smock, 2005).

Despite the high level of academic interest in cohabitation, little attention is given to the social world of cohabiters –that is, to the people who surround them. Social relationships are especially important to explore, given their influence on well-being (Antonucci, 2001). When compared to married persons, co-presence can help to position cohabiters on the relationship spectrum between single and married. Because time is a scarce resource, how it is shared is a telling indicator of the differences and similarities between unmarried and married unions. Drawing on nationally representative data from the American Time Use Survey, this study asks the following questions: 1) As captured by co-presence of other persons, how do the social worlds of cohabiters and marrieds differ? 2) To what extent do differences reflect differences in

the circumstances of –and perhaps selection into –the two union types? 3) How do the differences shed light on differences in the nature and function of the two union statuses?

With its novel focus on the time allocated to various social relationships, this study makes a unique contribution to the understanding of the similarities and differences between contemporary cohabitation and marriage. Building on a nuanced typology of co-presence –one distinguishing time with the partner, family, and non-kin –this analysis of time invested in social ties provides new evidence on the nature of cohabitation and marriage. These social relationships offer a new approach to evaluate whether marriages are “greedily” consuming of partners’ social time, whether cohabiters use cohabitation as “trial marriages” to gauge marital suitability, whether cohabiting couples marshal their social relationships to hedge against their higher risks of break-up. Thus, comparing cohabitation and marriage with time use data on social time allows us to identify the social boundaries of informal and formal unions.

BACKGROUND

Despite its growing popularity in the United States, cohabitation is a complex phenomenon still considered relatively new territory in terms of union formation. Researchers have compared cohabitation to marriage on a number of dimensions, such as sexual frequency (Yabiku & Gager, 2009), contraceptive use (Sweeney, 2010), division of housework (Brines & Joyner, 1999), money management (Hiekel et al., 2014), child well-being (Seltzer, 2004), relationship quality (Kamp Dush & Amato 2005), and stability (Brien, et al., 2006). The role of cohabitation is still poorly understood because cohabitations are often short-lived (Goodwin et al., 2010) and serve different purposes depending on race (Guzzo, 2009), marital status (Brown, 2000), and life course stage (Rindfuss & VandenHeuvel, 1990).

Cohabiting and marital relationships are qualitatively different. This may be due to the relative ease of forming and ending cohabiting arrangements. The decision to cohabit may not even be a deliberate one, as some couples “drift” or “slide” into cohabitation gradually without much discussion about the future of their relationship (Manning & Smock, 2005). Although cohabiters are more committed to their partners than daters in non-cohabiting relationships, they are less committed than those who are married (Kamp Dush & Amato, 2005). Furthermore, cohabiters initially have less in common with one another than married partners (Blackwell & Lichter, 2000). Cohabiting couples may be more open to a partner who is different as compared to couples in conventional marriages, because there are fewer consequences for ending cohabitation.

Although the purpose of cohabitation is varied, it often functions as a “trial marriage” to gather information about whether a partner is compatible for marriage (Brien et al., 2006). Besides the practical economies of scale, many young adults embrace cohabitation in order to explore love, commitment, and the desired traits of a future partner (Arnett, 2000). About 60% of young adults believe that marital stability will be ensured by premarital cohabitation (Wilcox & Marquardt, 2009). For many cohabiters, the purpose of a shared living arrangement is to spend more time with their partner (Rhoades et al., 2009). The act of moving in together can be considered a joint investment, which may signify an increase in relationship commitment (Poortman & Mills, 2012). However, by keeping their arrangement informal, couples can “hedge their bets” against uncertainty before entering the socially and economically demanding endeavor of marriage.

Schoen and Weinick (1993) suggested that cohabitating couples have “looser bonds”, which implies, among other things, less time together than marital couples. To temper the risk of

union dissolution, cohabiting couples may want to stay engaged in their broader social world. By contrast, marriages are comparatively stable. Marriage has been described as a “greedy institution”, taking married people’s time and attention away from other relationships (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006). Spouses act as confidants and as the primary source of emotional support for each other (Treas, 2011). Marriage is a legally enforceable contract that creates a stronger interdependency between partners (Ono & Yeilding, 2008). Amato, Booth, Johnson, and Rogers (2007), however, have found that spouses act more independently today than in the past, spending less time together in daily activities, and generally living “alone together”.

Research on the social world of married individuals is inconclusive. Marriage is traditionally regarded as a socially integrative union that is essential for preserving ties (DePaulo, 2006). Compared to other relationship forms, individuals in marital relationships are said to have access to more instrumental and emotional forms of outside support (Dehle, Larsen, & Landers, 2001). Presumed to be a permanent arrangement, married persons are more embedded in their relationships with family and friends than the unmarried (Waite, 2000). Although marriage leads to an increase in social network size, the members of these networks are generally less close (Sprecher & Feilmlee, 2000). Other studies have suggested that couples withdraw from their networks when they enter marriage (Kalmijn, 2003). Musick and Bumpass (2012) found that people in co-residential relationships (either marriage or cohabitation) have less contact with their parents and spend less time with their friends than single people.

Individuals benefit from relationships with others. Besides socialization and social integration occurring in social interactions, others provide social capital (e.g., trust, reciprocity, and information) that is embedded in these relationships (Putnam, 2000). Cohabiters may maintain these social ties with others as insurance against their informal arrangement not

working out. They may also derive more utility by including their partner in the time they spend with others. Couples can demonstrate mutual commitment by investing in each other's social circles (Kalmijn, 2003). Having a shared network contributes to relationship satisfaction, personal well-being, and social resources (Stein & Hunt, 2003). Cohabitors may socialize with their partner and others for the added social control others can provide over the partner (Treas & Giesen, 2004). Close others can also provide a better assessment of the relationship quality as individuals may be "blind" to negative qualities about the partner that close others are not.

Seeing that family relationships are largely permanent and involuntary, including a partner when spending time with family signals a high level of investment in the union. Smock (2000) asserted that cohabiters are not integrated into marriage-like networks (e.g., with their partner's parents and relatives), because cohabitation lacks marriage's clear institutional norms about socializing with families. Until they are certain the relationship is long term, family members are less likely to incorporate a cohabiting partner than a spouse (Waite, 2000). Spending time with a partner and non-family persons may constitute less of a relationship investment because individuals have greater freedom in choosing their friendships than their family ties (Blieszner & Roberto, 2004).

Time Demands: Work is a large component of individuals' lives, influencing the availability of time for social relationships. Studies suggest that the more time people spend in paid labor, the less free time they spend alone (Blekesaune, 2005). Because work often takes place in the presence of bosses, coworkers, and customers, finding time for both work and a personal life is a major challenge for workers (Rotondo, Carlson, & Kincaid, 2003). Employment can take a toll on relationships with family and friends (Putnam, 2000).

Because couples typically work apart, work competes against the time couples can spend with each other. Compared to single-earner couples, dual-earner couples face more restrictions on their time (Bianchi, 2011). Although dual-earner couples certainly report more time pressure (Mattingly & Sayer, 2006), the actual difference in couple “alone time” between single- and dual-earners is small because difficulties in scheduling time together exist so long as at least one partner is at work (Glorieux, Minnen, & van Tienoven, 2011). For married couples, the obligations of work and family both require considerable time and energy, which often come at the expense of time with other persons (Rotondo et al., 2003).

There is some evidence that suggests that cohabiters, compared to married individuals, prioritize their work roles over their domestic responsibilities. It is more common in cohabiting relationships than in marriage for both partners to contribute equally to the household income (Brines & Joyner, 1999). There is less interdependence between cohabiting partners. For example, couples living in cohabitations are far less likely to pool money and resources than married couples (Hiekel et al., 2014). Cohabitation allows couples to experience intimacy while their careers mature, and cohabiters looking to marry may be driven to obtain financial goals to achieve economic stability for marriage (Smock, Manning, & Porter, 2005).

Children: The substantial number of cohabiting parents suggests that childrearing is no longer exclusive to marriage. Parenthood reduces parents’ free time, because children require care and create child-related household labor (Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003), especially when there are multiple children (Kalenkoski, Hamrick, & Andrews, 2011). The care of young children generally comes at the expense of couples’ alone time together (Fein, 2009).

A large social network likely increases the opportunities to spend time with others. Research on parenthood and social network size has yielded mixed results. Some studies have

shown that parenthood reduces social network size, but as children grow older, network size increases (Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003). Parents may reduce contact with friends who have yet to become parents (Kalmijn & Vermunt, 2007). Other studies found that parenthood increases social contact with family members (Bost, Cox, Burchinal, & Payne, 2002), because relatives provide childcare (Silverstein & Marengo, 2001). Though children likely influence social contact similarly regardless of marital status, cohabiters tend to have fewer children than married couples do (Poortman & Mills, 2012).

Homogamy: The desire to spend time with the partner may depend on how much the couple has in common. Married couples are more homogamous than cohabiting couples on age, race, and education (Goodwin et al., 2010). Blackwell and Lichter (2000) argued that heterogeneity in non-marital relationships is due to the extended courtship process involving cohabitation. Couples with a lower initial assessment of their match are more likely to cohabit than to get married right away, using their informal living arrangement as a means of evaluating marital prospects (Brien et al., 2006).

Couple homogamy will likely influence the time individuals spend with their partner and others. Partners who share similar characteristics are more likely to share similar lifestyles with more compatible schedules (Hamermesh, 2002). Common interests and opportunities may encourage time together even if the value of spending time together to learn about a partner may be less when partners are more similar. Individuals in heterogeneous relationships may be discouraged from introducing their social network to their partner who will have less in common with them (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001). However, partner dissimilarity may lead to couples spending more time together with others in an effort to gauge compatibility.

Socio-Demographic Factors: Women generally have less free time than men (Mattingly & Sayer, 2006). Socially, they tend to be the kin-keepers –maintaining contacts with family outside the household (Gerstel, 2000). Women also access a greater portion of their social network than men do. Men rely heavily on spouses for support, whereas women seek support from friends, relatives, and neighbors, as well as their partners (Antonucci, 2001).

Cohabitors are younger than their married counterparts (Yabiku & Gager, 2009). Suggesting the need to take account of age, older cohabiters are more likely to use their relationship as an alternative to marriage, whereas younger cohabiters use their relationship as a “trial marriage” (King & Scott, 2005). Network size decreases with age (Anjournch, Blandon, & Antonucci, 2005), and older individuals spend less time with others than younger individuals do (Cornwell, 2011a). Cohabitation is also more common among blacks (Bumpass & Lu, 2000), who are less likely than non-Hispanic whites to be in a “trial marriage” and more likely to be in a “substitute marriage” (Guzzo, 2009). More likely to give and receive kin support (Gerstel, 2000), black couples also spend less time together than non-Hispanic white couples (Fein, 2009).

Economically disadvantaged couples spend more time together than their higher income counterparts (Fein, 2009). Because cohabitation requires less commitment and economic stability, it is selective of those who are less educated and have unstable employment (Bumpass & Lu, 2000). Being more economically disadvantaged, cohabiters may rely more on relatives and friends for support than married individuals. Married men and women have higher incomes and more education than their unmarried counterparts (Waite & Gallagher, 2000), which suggests that they are able to live more independently from family and friends.

Theoretical Argument

Prior research on cohabitation proposes a number of hypotheses regarding the time they allocate to others. If cohabitation functions as a “trial marriage,” then this would imply that cohabiters invest time in their relationship in order to learn more about their partner. Presumably, compared to cohabiters, marital partners, who are typically homogamous, make these getting-to-know-you investments before entering their union and derive less new information from spending time together. However, given their informal union arrangement, the “looser bonds” of cohabitation argument implies that cohabiting partners are less tied to and invested in each other than married couples are. Following this line of reasoning, I hypothesize that:

H1: Cohabiting individuals will spend less time alone with their partner than married individuals do.

Cohabiters may be more likely to keep up outside relationship ties than married individuals because they are uncertain about the future of their partnership. Continual contact with the other people in their lives allows cohabiters to mitigate the dissolution risks of cohabitation as well as maintain sources of outside support. The “greedy institution” of marriage argument suggests that marital relationships are private unions where couples rely on each other for their emotional and material needs. Spouses can serve as primary sources of support as marital unions are more stable than cohabiting relationships. Based on this line of reasoning, I hypothesize that:

H2: Cohabiting individuals will spend more time alone with family members than married individuals do.

H3: Cohabiting individuals will spend more time alone with non-family persons than married individuals do.

Couples benefit from sharing social ties, because this time contributes to their sense of “being a couple”. A mutual network facilitates collective support, because partners can call on each other’s social connections in times of need. Cohabitors may choose to share a social network to increase informal control over each other through indirect monitoring. An overlapping network also increases union stability, because this relationship-specific investment increases the social costs of ending a union. Likely, spending time together with the partner and family members is a larger relationship investment than time together with the partner and non-family persons. However, because ties with non-family persons are voluntary (people cannot choose their family), cohabiting couples may be better able to form a shared and congenial non-family network. Thus, I hypothesize that:

H4: Cohabiting individuals will spend less time with their partner and family members together than married individuals do.

H5: Cohabiting individuals will spend more time with their partner and non-family persons together than married individuals do.

DATA AND METHODS

Data come from the 2003-2013 American Time Use Survey (ATUS). As the only large, representative U.S. time use survey on a full range of non-market activities, the ATUS measures the types of activities respondents do on a diary day, the amount of time spent on these activities, and who was present during them. There are a total of 148,345 respondents when the data from 2003 to 2013 are pooled.

Because this study compares cohabiting and married individuals and the time spent with a partner, all single (neither cohabiting nor married) respondents (N=68,914) are dropped from the analyses as well as cases with missing responses on co-presence during their diary day

(N=217). Key demographic variables of household members are linked from the Current Population Study (CPS), which occurs 2 to 5 months prior to the ATUS. Partner changes resulted in the loss of 1,403 cases. Partner age was recorded in the CPS and again in the ATUS; thus, a CPS to ATUS change in partner's age exceeding one year signals either an age reporting error or a change in partner. Respondents and partners who reported that they were married at the time of the CPS, but reported living with a non-marital partner or not being married at the time of the ATUS were dropped from analyses (N=126). Likewise, respondents and partners who reported being single, living with an unmarried partner, divorced, separated or widowed during the CPS, but married in the ATUS were dropped (N=998). Because same-sex couples are not able to marry in all states, they are removed from the sample (N=352), and respondents under the age of 18 are also dropped (N=8). The final analytic sample is a subset of ATUS respondents between the ages of 18 and 80 years old who are married or living with an unmarried partner (N=76,327).

The dependent variables are the absolute number of minutes cohabiting and married respondents spent during the diary day in six types of co-presence arrangements –with only a partner, family alone without partner, non-family alone without partner, partner with family, partner with non-family, and alone (i.e., no one co-present). These measures focus on adult relationships and do not incorporate the presence of respondents' children, because time with children often involving childcare and has qualitatively different benefits than time with others. Family members include grandchildren, parents, siblings, and relatives who may or may not be living in the household. Non-family persons include housemates, roomers, and other non-relatives that may or may not be living in the household.

The key independent variable, union status, measures whether the respondent lives with a cohabiting partner of the opposite sex (=1) or is married (=0). Respondents are coded as a

cohabiter if they list an unmarried partner on their household roster. Because cohabiting and married persons differ in activities constraining or facilitating social interactions, their time demands are measured with time spent working and doing school-related activities (in absolute minutes) as well as with partner's employment (part-time and full-time, with not employed as referent). Co-residence provides opportunities for co-presence. Therefore, household composition variables include the number of family and non-family household members as well as the number of children under the age of 18 and the age of the youngest child in the household. Shared partner characteristics were argued to promote time together. Age heterogamy is measured as the absolute difference in respondents' and partner's years of age (Kalmijn & Bernasco, 2001). Couples are considered racially homogamous if respondents identify themselves similarly as either non-Hispanic white, black, Hispanic, Asian, or other (similar=1, else=0). Couples are educationally homogamous if the respondent and partner both have less than a high school education or both have more than a high school education (similar=1, else=0). Drawn from the literature on time use (Bianchi, 2011), demographic controls include gender (female=1, male=0) and age of the respondent. Following Fein (2009), the race variable includes Hispanic as a separate category as well as black, Asian, and other, with non-Hispanic white as referent. Other variables include education (high school, some college, college, and post-graduate, with less than high school as referent), nativity (foreign born=1, else=0), and household income (\$20,000 to \$39,999, \$40,000 to \$59,999, \$60,000 to \$99,999, \$100,000 or more, with less than \$20,000 as referent). Because there is a temporal aspect to how we use time (Craig & Brown, 2014), controls for diary day distinguish the weekend (weekend=1, else=0), holiday (holiday=1, else=0), and season (spring, summer, and fall, with winter as referent). Because the ATUS oversampled some demographic groups, and the samples are not uniformly

distributed across the days of the week, I will be applying the included weights to ensure accurate estimates. Missing data are seen in the race homogamy (N=2,646, 3.47%) and household income (N=6,735, 8.82%) measures. Multiple imputation for missing values on both variables are based on union type, time demand, household composition, homogamy, socio-demographic, and diary day variables.

Analyses begin by comparing the descriptive statistics for cohabiting and married respondents in terms of their co-presence time as well as differences on control variables. Multivariate analyses use OLS regression models. Because time use surveys are usually collected over a short period of time (e.g., a day), there are many zero time observations for activities that were not done that day. Consistent with previous research analyzing time use data (Stewart, 2009), OLS regression models are preferred in producing unbiased estimations. The hypotheses relating union status and time spent co-present are tested in separate analyses for each of the six types of co-presence. Beginning with a baseline OLS model only controlling for diary day characteristics, four subsequent models add time demands, household composition, homogamy, and socio-demographic controls.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics comparing cohabiting and married respondents are shown in Table 1.1. In terms of co-presence, I find no significant difference in the time cohabiting and married individuals spend with their partner or apart from their partner with their family members. However, I do find significant differences in the time spent with others. On average, during the diary day, cohabiters spend 38 more minutes alone with non-family persons than married individuals do ($p < .001$). There are also significant differences in the time spent together with partner and others, whether kin or non-kin. Compared to their married counterparts, cohabiters

Table 1.1 Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=76,327)

	Cohabiting	Married
Time		
Partner	175.96	172.66
Family	25.60	24.23
Non-Family	109.95***	71.73
Partner and Family	14.20***	20.80
Partner and Non-Family	31.09***	13.56
Alone	225.41**	235.21
Time Demands		
Work	218.22***	190.21
School	9.45***	5.33
Partner Employment		
Not Employed	.26***	.32
Part-Time	.15	.14
Full-Time	.59***	.55
Household Composition		
#Family	.07**	.10
#Non-Family	.28***	.01
#Children	.93***	1.15
Youngest Child Age	2.93***	3.87
Homogamy		
Age	4.98***	3.72
Race	.82***	.92
Education	.85***	.92
Female	.53	.52
Age	37.50***	47.50
Race		
Non-Hispanic White	.68***	.75
Black	.12***	.07
Hispanic	.15***	.13
Asian	.02***	.04
Other	.03***	.01
Foreign Born	.12***	.17
Education		
Less than High School	.13***	.09
High School	.35***	.26
Some College	.22***	.16
College	.24***	.34
Graduate Degree	.06***	.14
Household Income		
Less than \$20k	.21***	.08
\$20k to \$39,999	.30***	.20
\$40k to \$59,999	.20	.19
\$60k to \$99,999	.20***	.32

Table 1.1 Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=76,327; continued)

\$100k or more	.09***	.22
Weekend	.50	.50
Holiday	.02	.02
Season		
Winter	.27	.26
Spring	.25	.25
Summer	.25	.25
Fall	.24	.24
N	3,783	72,544

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test of cohabiter-married difference.

spend seven fewer minutes together with their partner and family members ($p < .001$), but 17 more minutes together with their partner and non-family persons ($p < .001$), and about 10 fewer minutes alone ($p < .01$).

Cohabiting respondents have significantly more demands on their time than married respondents do, spending more minutes at work and at school, and being more likely to have an employed partner. In terms of household composition, there are fewer family members living with cohabiting respondents, more unrelated persons, and fewer children. Children in the household of married respondents are older than children in the households of cohabiting respondents. Gauging respondent and partner homogamy, married respondents are more similar in regards to age, race, and education. On average, there is a larger age gap between cohabiting respondents and their partners, 4.98 years compared to 3.72 years, respectively. Cohabiting respondents are about 10 years younger than married respondents. Black, Hispanic, and “other” races make up a larger proportion of cohabiters than married respondents. There is a higher proportion of foreign born among married respondents, and cohabiting respondents have significantly less education and household income.

Multivariate Analyses

Because cohabiting and married respondents differ on a number of variables, which are apt to influence how they allocate their time with others, OLS regressions evaluate the implications of union status for time with others while controlling for various covariates. In the interest of parsimony, Table 1.2 summarizes the cohabitation coefficients from successive models for six categories of co-presence, including a time alone comparison.

Table 1.2 OLS Coefficients for Cohabitation (in Minutes Total) by Co-Presence Type (N=76,327)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Diary Day	+ Time Demands	+ Household Composition	+ Homogamy	+ Controls
Partner	-8.88*	ns.	-10.63*	-9.93*	15.86***
Family	ns.	ns.	ns.	ns.	ns.
Non-Family	41.02***	31.61***	26.74***	27.56***	30.54***
Partner and Family	-7.17***	-5.15***	-6.93***	-6.54***	-4.10**
Partner and Non-Family	14.27***	14.96***	8.28***	8.68***	8.59***
Alone	-20.28***	-15.58***	-21.33***	-21.95***	17.81***

Note:

Diary day = weekend, holiday, season.

Time demands = work (minutes), school (minutes), partner employment.

Household composition = #family, #non-family, #children, youngest child age.

Homogamy = age, race, education.

Controls = sex, age, race, foreign born, education, household income.

ns.= not significant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

There were reasons to believe that cohabiters might spend less time (H1) with their partner than married individuals with theirs, but the OLS results are mixed. Unlike the bivariate relationship (Table 1.1), the result for cohabitation in baseline Model 1, which includes only controls for diary day, shows cohabiting respondents spending nine fewer minutes with their partner than married respondents do ($p < .05$). Furthermore, the relationship is sensitive to the variables that are controlled. Controlling for time availability (Model 2), there is no significant

different in time spent with partner. Further investigation (results not shown) reveals cohabiters' time together is sensitive to their longer work hours and partner's employed status.

Adding controls for household composition leads to the conclusion that cohabiters spend significantly less time alone with their partner (Model 3). Other analyses (results not shown) indicate that the cohabitation coefficient becomes negatively associated with partners' private time together when number of children is controlled. Although the addition of homogamy variables (Model 4) do not change this relationship, the full Model 5, which adds socio-demographic control variables, shows a large, positive association between cohabitation and time alone with partner. According to results not shown, cohabiters would spend more time alone together if they were as old as their married counterparts.

As for time respondents spend with family members apart from the partner, there is, on whole, little evidence that cohabiting individuals spend more time alone with family members than married individuals do (H2). By contrast, there is consistent support for the hypothesis that cohabiters spend more time alone with non-family persons than married individuals do (H3). All things equal (Model 5), cohabiters spend 31 more minutes daily alone in the company of non-family persons ($p < .001$). As noted above, cohabiters spend a half-hour more time during the day in paid work than marrieds, and the non-kin they spend time with may be co-workers. Adding controls for time availability, however, reduces the cohabiter-married difference by only nine minutes.

In comparing social time together with partner and family members, I find some support for the hypothesis that cohabiting individuals spend less time than married individuals do (H4). All things considered, cohabiters spend four fewer minutes with their partner and family members ($p < .01$); although the time disparity is small, the significance of the difference holds

across models. I also find support across models for the hypothesis that cohabiters spend more time together with their partner and non-family persons than married individuals do (H5). The final model shows that cohabiters spent nine more minutes daily with their partner and non-family persons than their married counterparts do ($p < .001$).

Time with no one present provides another perspective on cohabiters' time use. All things considered, cohabiters spend 18 more minutes alone than married individuals do ($p < .001$). However, this relationship appears to be especially sensitive to time demand, household composition, and demographic covariates. This positive association between cohabitation and time alone emerges only in the final model incorporating demographic variables. Further analyses (not shown) indicate that time spent in solitary activities appears to be sensitive to age. Less time spent alone by cohabiters compared to married individuals is due, in large part, to the fact that cohabiters are younger, and younger people are less likely to devote time to solitary activities.

Further Results

Table 1.3 shows the full results from Model 5 above for each co-presence type. The characteristics of the diary day reveal that individuals spend more time with their partner, with and without others present, on the weekends than the weekdays. Unsurprisingly, there is a bit more time with the partner and family together, and less time with non-family or alone, on the holidays. Time with the partner is greatest in the winter than other seasons. Summer, more so than winter, is the season to spend time with family, whereas spring and fall show more time alone.

Table 1.3 OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327)

Variable	Partner	Family	Non-Family	Partner and Family	Partner and Non-Family	Alone
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>
Cohabitation	15.86*** (4.32)	-1.67 (2.14)	30.54*** (4.67)	-4.10** (1.51)	8.59*** (1.89)	17.81*** (4.96)
<i>Diary day</i>						
Weekend	27.58*** (2.04)	-4.09*** (1.04)	-9.62*** (1.38)	15.50*** (0.90)	9.70*** (0.71)	-82.01*** (2.20)
Holiday	-4.72 (7.78)	5.20 (4.78)	-25.63*** (3.16)	39.15*** (5.34)	5.40 (3.32)	-106.03*** (7.18)
<i>Season</i>						
Spring	-4.67* (2.31)	0.31 (1.15)	2.36 (2.35)	0.33 (0.95)	-0.00 (0.74)	7.64** (2.75)
Summer	-12.34*** (2.43)	4.09** (1.28)	2.24 (2.37)	2.12* (1.02)	0.75 (0.84)	4.32 (2.81)
Fall	-6.11** (2.34)	0.67 (1.15)	2.71 (2.39)	-1.15 (0.94)	0.12 (0.80)	10.14*** (2.78)
<i>Time demands</i>						
Work	-0.17*** (0.00)	-0.04*** (0.00)	0.22*** (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.15*** (0.00)
School	-0.08*** (0.01)	-0.04*** (0.01)	0.22*** (0.02)	-0.02** (0.00)	0.01 (0.01)	0.33*** (0.02)
<i>Partner employ.</i>						
Part-time	-48.62*** (2.77)	8.18*** (1.55)	-3.59 (2.90)	-3.23** (1.14)	-0.82 (1.06)	36.33*** (3.39)
Full-time	-51.55*** (2.24)	4.98*** (1.15)	-5.74* (2.31)	-5.22*** (0.92)	-3.32*** (0.77)	39.56*** (2.68)
<i>Household composition</i>						
#Family	-3.59 (1.84)	22.16*** (1.44)	-0.01 (1.83)	14.32*** (1.15)	-0.78* (0.34)	-0.09 (2.20)
#Non-Family	8.88* (4.24)	0.85 (2.76)	19.04*** (4.59)	-0.81 (0.94)	22.01*** (3.30)	3.02 (4.45)

Table 1.3 OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327; continued)

#Children	-39.16*** (0.87)	-6.86*** (0.45)	-2.96** (0.93)	-6.86*** (0.30)	-4.93*** (0.32)	-22.37*** (1.01)
Youngest Child Age	-3.48*** (0.14)	0.07 (0.08)	0.07 (0.19)	-0.50*** (0.05)	-0.16* (0.07)	2.32*** (0.20)
<i>Homogamy</i>						
Age	-0.55* (0.23)	0.03 (0.11)	-0.51* (0.20)	-0.24** (0.08)	-0.13 (0.07)	1.38*** (0.26)
Race	-5.59 (3.13)	0.27 (1.88)	-3.78 (3.42)	1.31 (1.16)	-0.81 (1.42)	-5.37 (3.86)
Education	-5.90 (3.60)	-2.66 (1.89)	6.87* (2.79)	-1.39 (1.42)	1.71 (1.13)	4.97 (3.90)
<i>Controls</i>						
Female	-15.83*** (1.85)	10.92*** (0.88)	0.30 (1.79)	1.48* (0.75)	-0.69 (0.63)	-25.74*** (2.14)
Age	2.31*** (0.09)	-0.07 (0.04)	-0.08 (0.08)	0.20*** (0.03)	-0.07* (0.03)	3.00*** (0.09)
Race						
Black	-38.13*** (3.07)	5.58** (1.72)	11.20*** (3.14)	-6.76*** (0.97)	-4.94*** (0.92)	46.94*** (4.06)
Hispanic	-20.82*** (3.05)	2.94 (1.75)	7.06* (3.39)	0.82 (1.27)	-2.03* (0.97)	-9.47* (3.81)
Asian	-2.65 (5.07)	0.46 (2.15)	4.98 (5.41)	-2.22 (1.66)	-3.92* (1.57)	-1.31 (5.89)
Other	-16.15* (7.78)	5.28 (4.41)	-11.04 (7.53)	0.21 (2.91)	-3.94 (2.13)	9.62 (10.28)
Foreign Born	-8.04** (2.88)	-8.81*** (1.34)	-0.01 (3.18)	-5.63*** (1.17)	-0.21 (0.97)	4.85 (3.64)
Education						
High school	6.77 (3.80)	-0.94 (2.04)	-0.68 (3.05)	0.74 (1.50)	1.12 (1.13)	11.71** (4.28)
Some college	9.36* (4.12)	-4.98* (2.22)	-0.11 (3.48)	0.30 (1.63)	1.93 (1.20)	13.75** (4.67)

Table 1.3 OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327; continued)

College	8.96*	-8.70***	4.96	-0.83	4.31***	12.64**
	(3.97)	(2.12)	(3.39)	(1.59)	(1.19)	(4.51)
Graduate degree	4.94	-9.26***	-3.71	-1.00	6.40***	12.58*
	(4.46)	(2.26)	(3.98)	(1.77)	(1.41)	(5.07)
HH income						
\$20k to \$39,999	-4.51	-0.04	3.65	0.07	-0.61	3.39
	(4.04)	(1.95)	(3.00)	(1.58)	(1.49)	(4.43)
\$40k to \$59,999	-12.49**	1.30	5.78	0.60	-0.84	12.27*
	(4.16)	(2.11)	(3.29)	(1.73)	(1.53)	(4.89)
\$60k to \$99,999	-20.31***	-0.02	7.93*	0.80	-0.36	13.79**
	(4.07)	(1.99)	(3.31)	(1.66)	(1.55)	(4.80)
\$100k or more	-23.72***	-1.47	32.27***	0.37	1.96	21.50***
	(4.39)	(2.13)	(3.73)	(1.79)	(1.70)	(5.24)
Constant	225.17***	40.76***	32.82***	20.81***	21.73***	133.50***
	(8.47)	(4.59)	(7.59)	(3.33)	(3.20)	(9.28)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

As for the time demands, work during the diary day is significantly associated with more time with non-family apart from the partner, but is linked to less time in all other social situations. Similarly, minutes spent in school-related activities have the same general time availability implications and relation to co-presence as work, but it is positively, not negatively linked to time alone. Unsurprisingly, partner employment reduces time spent with the partner. Partner employment is positively associated both with time alone and with time spent with family.

Considering household composition, living with family members increases the time spent with them, with or without the partner, but having kin in the household takes away time couples spend with non-family persons. The number of non-family persons in the household, however, is positively related to time alone with the partner. Each additional non-family person in the household is associated with nine more minutes of alone couple time. As with family members, the presence of non-family persons apparently increases the time spent with them, with and without the partner present. Each additional child decreases time alone with the partner by a substantial 39 minutes ($p < .001$). The age of the youngest child is also negatively associated with time with the partner, but is not significant for time with family and non-family persons. As children in the household grow older, respondents have more time alone.

With regards to homogamy, the age gap between partners is negatively associated with the time they spend alone together and together with family members, but positively associated with the time respondents spend alone. Racial homogamy is not predictive of time in any co-presence category. Compared to couples who differ in education, respondents with a partner of similar educational attainment spend more time alone with non-family persons.

Women report spending less time alone with their partner than men do, but women do spend more time with family members, with or without their partner. Women also spend less time alone than men. Age is positively associated with time spent with the partner, together with the partner and family, and alone, but there is a small, but significant, negative association with time spent just with the partner and non-family persons. Compared to non-Hispanic whites, blacks, Hispanics, and other races spend less time with their partner. Blacks spend more time alone, alone with family and non-family persons than non-Hispanic whites, but less time with their partner in the presence of these others. Foreign born individuals spend less time with their partner, family, and partner and family together than their native born counterparts. Educational attainment does not appear to have a meaningful pattern in regards to time alone with the partner, but better educated individuals spend less time with family and more time alone. Compared to individuals in households earning less than \$20,000, those in higher income households spend less time with their partner, but more time with non-family persons and alone.

CONCLUSION

Compared to married individuals, partners and non-family persons have a more prominent place in the social world of cohabiters. These findings challenge the “looser bonds” perspective of cohabitation and lend support to the “trial marriage” claim that cohabitation is a testing ground for marriage. Although Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006) reported that married couples are more detached from others, I find no support to their inference that married couples are redirecting their time to activities alone together. Given the instability of non-marital unions, cohabiters may benefit from maintaining close ties with kin, but cohabitation seems no less “greedy” than marriage—at least, judged by time spent in family relationships. However, the differences in the social worlds of cohabiters and married persons are small. If cohabiters follow an insurance

against dissolution strategy in allocating time, it seems to be limited to non-family persons. Consistent with previous studies, cohabiting partners are not brought into the family network to the same extent that married ones are (Smock, 2000; Waite, 2000). However, I find cohabiting couples do spend more time in the company of non-family persons, even when work time is considered as a control on exposure to co-workers. This further buttresses the notion that cohabitation serves as an exploratory union where couples not only spend a disproportionate time alone, but also in the company of friends.

By asking who cohabiters and married persons spend their time with, this study brings a novel perspective to our understanding of cohabitation. This analysis of social time advances the debate on the nature of cohabitation. It offers indirect evidence supporting its function as a “trial marriage” versus simply an alternative to marriage. The social worlds of cohabiters and married individuals also provide new evidence regarding the characterizations made about informal and formal unions. Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006) argued that marriage is a “greedy institution” that reduces couples’ involvement with their parents, siblings, and greater community. Comparing how much time cohabiters and married spend with others places this generalization into a broader context of union formation where cohabiting couples spend even more time alone together than their married counterparts do, but without sacrificing time with others.

Despite the speculation that there are fewer and fewer differences between married and cohabiting individuals, cohabiters still differ in a number of ways. Cohabiting couples are less homogamous in age, race, and education than married couples, but homogamy is found to have little association to time allocation. Time demands, household composition, and demographic factors influence the time cohabiting partners spend together and alone. Cohabiters work more, and are more likely to have a partner who works, than married individuals, which prove to be

obstacles to spending time together. Conversely, cohabiters spend less time alone if only because they are likely to spend more time in the presence of co-workers. Cohabitors have fewer children in the household than their married counterparts, thus less tied to the household, which likely allows them to socialize with others together. When their younger age is considered, cohabiters spend more time alone than marrieds.

There are two limitations with this study that need to be considered. We take co-presence as a proxy for interaction, but the ATUS reports on co-presence do not measure interaction directly. At best, being in the same room captures the potential for interaction and miss interactions (e.g., phone calls) that do not demand co-presence. Second, neither the CPS nor ATUS provide any information regarding the duration of marriages or the history of co-residential partnerships. Thus, we have no way of identifying long-term cohabitation from recently formed unions or singling out married couples whose social time use patterns were formed earlier during a cohabitation preceding marriage.

By viewing time allocation as a relationship investment, this study provides a snapshot of romantic relationships through the layers of a social world, from casual friends and acquaintances to close family members. The result is fresh evidence that positions cohabitation as a socially embedded relationship that also offers learning opportunities regarding couple compatibility. In demonstrating that union status shapes individuals' time with others, we establish a foundation for future research.

CHAPTER 2

The Leisure Time Use of Cohabitors and Marrieds

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to compare the leisure time use patterns of married and cohabiting individuals. Building on prior studies, which have considered time devoted to work, household labor, and childcare, this paper focuses on the leisure time of married people and who they spend it with. It provides insight on Gerstel and Sarkisian's (2006) characterization of marriage as a "greedy institution" that pulls people away from their social networks and broader community. Conventional wisdom would argue that married people will spend most of their discretionary time with their partner. After all, shared residence increases access and the opportunities to spend leisure with a partner. The emotional ties and commitment that bind marital relationships likely draw couples together when time is available. However, emerging alternative arrangements, such as cohabitation, share many of the same qualities as marriage (albeit, less committed, at least in the institutional sense). Although cohabiting couples have much to gain from spending leisure together (e.g., learning more about their partner, vetting marital prospects), they also have a lot to lose, given the informal and non-institutionalized nature of their union. This difference is likely to also be reflected in the broader social world of married people and cohabiters.

Although relationships are generally embedded in a larger social network of family and friends, leisure is a less rigid and obligatory time expenditure compared to other daily activities, which likely influences who leisure is spent with. Leisure is defined as activities that reflect personal choice, such as socializing, relaxing, sports, exercise, and recreation. Some research has pointed to people devoting less time to leisure activities as life is becoming busier (Jacobs &

Gerson, 2001; Garhammer, 2004). Other studies suggest that having less time for leisure is a sign of higher social class (Gershuny, 2000). Notwithstanding, participating in leisure activities has been found to be psychologically and physically beneficial (Caldwell, 2005; Trost et al., 2002; Warburton et al., 2006; Trenberth & Dewe, 2002) as well as important for individual development, family life, social relationships, and culture (Rubin, Flowers, & Gross, 1986). Because time is a scarce resource, how discretionary time is shared is suggestive of cohabitation's role in union formation and its position vis-à-vis marriage along the relationship spectrum. Drawing on nationally representative data from the American Time Use Survey, this study asks the following questions: 1) As captured by co-presence of other persons in leisure activities, who do marrieds and cohabiters spend their time with? 2) To what extent do differences reflect differences in circumstances of –and perhaps selection into –the two union types? 3) What do the differences say about the nature and function of the two union statuses?

This study takes a novel approach to understanding the influence of romantic relationships on social worlds by focusing on the time allocated to various social relationships. Building on a typology of co-presence –one distinguishing time with the partner, family, and non-kin –this study contributes to a deeper understanding of the similarities and differences between marriage and contemporary cohabitation by acknowledging that time is often a zero-sum game in relationships, that is, the cost of spending time with a partner often comes at the expense of spending time alone with others. This analysis of time invested in social ties provides new evidence on whether marriage is a “greedy institution”, if it is uniquely “greedy”, or whether co-residential unions, such as cohabitation, influence time with family and non-kin similarly.

BACKGROUND

Despite high divorce rates and the growing acceptance of alternative unions, such as non-marital cohabitation, marriage remains important to Americans (Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001). The historical rise of the companionate marriage (Burgess & Locke, 1945), couples' mobility (Treas, 2011), and a decline in kin availability (Wachter, 1997) may have heightened the salience of the marital partner in individual lives (Treas, 2011). Marriage in Western societies –once considered largely a societal institution, regulated by social norms, public opinion, law, and religion –has transformed into a more private and personalized arrangement sustained by emotional ties (Amato, 2004). Studies examining how marital couples coordinate their daily schedules to maximize their time together (Hamermesh, 2000; Halberg, 2003; Jenkins & Osberg, 2003) not only speak to this transformation of marriage and the harried nature of modern life, but also to the value attributed to maintaining these ties. Voorpostel and colleagues (2010) examined changes in leisure time with a spouse using U.S. time use data spanning four decades. According to their study, while the availability of leisure time has decreased, marital couples are spending a greater proportion of their leisure time together. Spouses have a greater role in supporting each other emotionally than in the past and often serve as each other's confidant (McPherson et al., 2006). Prioritizing time with each other, married partners have less time to spend alone with others, including extended family and friends (Putnam, 2000). Indeed, Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006) characterized marriage as a “greedy institution” that reduces couples' involvement with their parents, siblings, and the greater community.

Total time together offers insights into the importance of marital ties. Leisure time (that is, time spent socializing, relaxing, or in recreation) may be even better for gauging the significance of marriage. Leisure activities are in large part discretionary and oriented to personal

gratification. The extent to which leisure is spent with a spouse versus others may be a particularly good indicator of the “greediness” of marriages that exclude others. Furthermore, the individual benefits of participating in leisure activities for psychological and physical health are well documented in recent studies (Caldwell, 2005; Trost et al., 2002; Warburton et al., 2006; Trenberth & Dewe, 2002). In particular, sharing leisure with a spouse is shown to confer important advantages. Although the nature of marital relationships may have changed, research has consistently found a positive association between joint couple leisure and marital satisfaction (Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Orthner, 1975; Holman & Jacquart, 1988; Smith, Snyder, Trull, & Monsma, 1988; Baldwin, Ellis, & Baldwin, 1999). For example, Reissman et al. (1993) found that sharing leisure as a couple helps to fend off relationship boredom by creating new experiences together. Because shared leisure helps facilitate communication between couples, joint leisure is a relationship-maintaining strategy and an indicator of union-specific investments (Orthner, 1975; Claxton & Perry-Jenkins, 2008).

People benefit from socialization, social integration, and the opportunity to build social capital (e.g., trust, reciprocity, and information) when they spend time with others (Putnam, 2000). Traditionally, married people have been regarded as being more socially integrated insofar as singles are depicted as isolated and alone (DePaulo, 2006). Through marriage, people build upon their own social network with the addition of in-laws and their partner’s friends. In an article detailing the detriments of cohabitation, Waite (2000) argued that people cohabiting do not experience the same gains, because family and friends are reluctant to grow attached to a cohabiting partner and include them in activities due to the unstable and temporary nature of many informal unions. This claim is supported by research showing that Dutch cohabiters are less likely to merge their friendship circles than married couples, because they do not want to

become too socially dependent on their partner (Kalmijn & Bernasco, 2001). Although married people have access to more family and friends, the frequency with which they activate their social networks is questionable. These assertions that the married are highly integrated into broader social worlds contrast with empirical studies motivated by the social psychology literature on “dyadic withdrawal,” which suggest that people disengage from their social groups as they enter romantic relationships (Johnson & Leslie, 1982; Kim & Stiff, 1991; Milardo, 1982; Milardo & Allan, 2000; Parks et al., 1983).

The concept of dyadic withdrawal dates from an era when marriage dominated couple relationships. Cohabitation has overtaken marriage as the first co-residential union formed by young adults (Goodwin et al., 2010). In 2010, approximately 7.5 million couples were in heterosexual cohabiting relationships in the United States (Krieder, 2010). As cohabitation is growing increasingly common, research has noted the similarities between marital and cohabiting unions. For example, couples benefit from economies of scale by sharing a residence and personal resources (Waite & Gallagher, 2000). Indeed, some couples use cohabitation as a substitute for marriage (Reed, 2006). Another way in which marriage and cohabitation may be similar is that the co-residential partner offers an alternative to the companionship that family and friends provide. Of course, no relationship exists in a vacuum, and many leisure activities are more enjoyable when they are done with others (Young & Lim, 2014). Whether married couples spend more time together than cohabiting ones offers insights into whether marriage is, in fact, a uniquely “greedy institution” deterring the development of richer social ties. Of interest is whether institutional differences between married and cohabiting people influence who they spend their time with.

Compared to cohabitation, marriage is a formal union that is presumed to be permanent, which would suggest differences in who married and cohabiting people socialize with. Spending time together as a couple with others represents an investment on both ends –the couple and the others. Because family relationships are also permanent as well as involuntary, including a partner in the time spent with family is a high level of investment in the relationship. For married couples, this investment is protected by, among other things, the enforceable trust (i.e., the legal contract of marriage) inherent in the institution (Cherlin, 2000). By contrast, cohabiters may be too uncertain about the future of their relationship to include their partner when socializing with family members or to socialize with their partner’s family members. For kin, there may be a reluctance to socialize with a cohabiting partner who may not become a permanent fixture in family life (Waite, 2000). Smock (2000) argued that cohabitation lacks the clear institutional norms that encourage families to socialize with and accept both partners as a couple. As a result, cohabiters are not as integrated into marriage-like networks (e.g., with partner’s parents and relatives). Participating in leisure activities with a partner and non-family persons, on the other hand, may constitute less of a relationship investment, because friendships, like cohabitations, are not bounded by permanency (Spencer & Pahl, 2006). Cohabiting couples are also more likely to seek out friends who are accepting of the uncertainty of their relationship than family members are (Blieszner & Roberto, 2004).

Previous empirical studies have alluded to how marriage as an institution impacts both family and friendship networks. According to Johnson and Leslie (1982), people follow a cultural script that dictates their involvement with their partner and others at various relationship stages. Their study found married people had fewer friends than their dating counterparts. Although they found no significant difference in the number of kin, married people were less

close to family and friends than were the unmarried. The use of cross-sectional data limited conclusions to an assessment of network differences by marital status rather than changes in social networks. Adopting a life course perspective, Kalmijn (2012) addressed this issue by capturing relationship transitions using Swiss data spanning a 12-year period. The study found that the size of family networks increased for people who entered a co-residential living arrangement, whether through marriage or cohabitation, while friendship networks remained relatively steady. Granted, an increase in family contact was found primarily for women in these unions, the decrease in actual contact with friends for both men and women suggested that live-in partners serve as an alternative to friendships, but not family relationships. In both studies, however, retrospective reports on network size and frequency of social contact were subject to bias and memory recall error, perhaps providing poor resolution on actual time use.

Although some research has considered the social time of marrieds, little attention has been given to cohabiters despite the popularity of cohabiting unions. Couples have reported that they enter cohabitation to spend more time with their partner (Rhoades et al., 2009). However, Kalmijn and Bernasco (2001) offered contrary evidence when examining the lifestyles of married and cohabiting Dutch couples using 12 items on the frequency of social contacts, entertainment, indoor, and outdoor activities. Controlling for relationship duration and several indicators of individual autonomy and gender equality, they found cohabiters to spend more of their leisure time separately doing activities. According to their study, sharing leisure cultivates a joint lifestyle, which, in turn, creates interdependency between partners; this is a particularly risky venture for cohabiting couples, because informal unions are prone to dissolution. They contend that when much discretionary time is spent with a cohabitating partner and their partner's social circle, social well-being gets attached to these relationships, which raises the

social costs of a potential break-up. However, cohabitation has legal provisions in the Netherlands making it more similar to marriage than in the United States. To the extent that cohabiters may value the input of others in the partnering process, they may socialize as a couple with others for the monitoring and social control their group offers over their partner (Treas & Giesen, 2004).

Time Demands: Work is a more rigid expenditure in people's daily time budget, thus influencing the time available for leisure. Employment not only reduces the amount of solitary leisure for men and women, but the perceived quality of that leisure tends to be lower (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003). However, the negative relationship between the time people spend in paid labor and the free time they spend alone (Blekesaune, 2005), suggests that the value of free time is higher when there are others to share it with.

Nonetheless, individuals and couples who are employed full-time invest less in their social relations (Kraaykamp, van Gils, & van der Lippe, 2009). Although, dual-earner couples experience a conflict between work demands and recreation and have less time for others, they attempt to synchronize their paid work time to share leisure together (Hamermesh, 2002). For married couples, the obligations of work and family both require considerable time and energy, which often come at the expense of time with other persons (Rotondo et al., 2003).

There is some evidence that suggests that cohabiters place a greater emphasis on their work roles compared to married individuals. Due to the uncertainty of cohabiting relationships, cohabiting couples are less dependent on each other, keeping separate purses and resources (Hiekel et al., 2014) and contribute more equally to the household income (Brines & Joyner, 1999). Cohabiters looking to marry, however, may be driven to reach the necessary economic

stability for marriage, using cohabitation to experience intimacy while their careers mature (Smock et al., 2005). Of course, there are other constraints on time use.

Children: The substantial number of cohabiting parents suggests that childrearing is no longer exclusive to marriage. Both men and women have less leisure alone and shared leisure with their partner after the birth of their child (Claxton & Perry-Jenkins, 2008). Parents often stagger their schedules to meet the growing list of household labor related to childcare and to minimize childcare expenses, especially when children are young (Barnet-Verzat, Pailhe, & Solaz, 2011).

Parenthood is shown to reduce social network size, but as children grow older, network size increases (Nomaguchi & Milkie, 2003). Parents may reduce contact with friends who have yet to become parents (Kalmijn & Vermunt, 2007). Although parenthood increases social contact with family members (Bost et al., 2002), it is because relatives provide childcare (Silverstein & Marengo, 2001). Though children likely influence social contact similarly regardless of marital status, cohabiters tend to have fewer children than married couples (Poortman & Mills, 2012).

Homogamy: Partners may spend more of their free time together if they have more in common. Couples who are similar are more likely to share interests in a wider range of activities and to merge social networks than dissimilar couples are. Cohabiters are more heterogeneous than marital couples on age, race, and education (Goodwin, et al. 2010). Because cohabitation is an early stage in the courtship process, cohabiting couples may be more open to pairing with a partner who is different (Blackwell & Lichter, 2000). Couples who have different characteristics are more likely to enter into cohabitation than get married right away, using their informal living arrangements as a means of evaluating marital prospects (Brien et al., 2006).

The degree to which couples are similar is likely to influence the time they spend with others, too. Introducing a partner to friends and family is easier when the couple shares more in

common, because the partner will likely have much in common with the family and friends as well (McPherson et al., 2001). Common interests facilitate leisure time together even though the value of spending time together to learn about a partner may be less when the partners are similar. On the other hand, partners who are different may spend more time together with others in an effort to gauge compatibility.

Socio-Demographic Factors: Several socio-demographic factors have been shown to be associated with leisure time and network size. Women generally have less time for leisure than men (Mattingly & Sayer, 2006). Regardless of their employment, women take on greater responsibility for unpaid household labor and childcare (Beaujot & Andersen, 2007). However, women tend to maintain contacts with family outside the household more so than men (Gerstel, 2000), and they access a greater portion of their social network than men do (Antonucci, 2001).

Age is positively associated with leisure time (Lee & Bhargava, 2004). However, network size decreases with age (Anjourn et al., 2005), and older individuals spend less time with others than younger individuals do (Cornwell, 2011a). Because cohabiters are younger than their married counterparts (Yabiku & Gager, 2009), analyses take age into account. Older cohabiters are more likely to use their relationship as an alternative to marriage, whereas younger cohabiters use their relationship as a “trial marriage” (King & Scott, 2005); this suggests that younger cohabiters may be spending more time together to learn about their relationship before entering marriage. Blacks are also more likely to be in cohabitation as a “substitute marriage” than non-Hispanic whites are (Guzzo, 2009).

Highly educated and high income individuals participate in less leisure than low-educated and economically disadvantaged individuals (Gershuny, 2005). This is a reversal of historical trends where greater leisure was associated with upper social classes. Because cohabitation tends

to be selective of individuals with less education and unstable employment (Bumpass & Lu, 2000), cohabiters may face fewer time demands and have more leisure time than marrieds.

Theoretical Argument

Prior research on time use proposes a number of hypotheses regarding who people spend their time with. Following Gerstel and Sarkisian's (2006) argument that marriage is a "greedy institution" that takes married people away from their friends and family, couples are expected to rely instead on each other for their emotional needs. Spending leisure jointly also benefits the marital relationship, which is an added incentive for spending this time together. Although cohabiters can enjoy the same advantages, devoting more time to their partner than to others is particularly risky, because cohabiting unions have uncertain futures. This need to hedge against the break-up of a cohabitation suggests one hypothesis:

H1: Cohabiting individuals will spend less leisure time alone with their partner than married individuals do.

Studies found that the time available for leisure has decreased for the married in recent decades (Voorpostel et al., 2010), but marital partners make a concerted effort to spend it together (Hamermesh, 2000; Hallberg, 2003; Jenkins & Osberg, 2003). Because leisure time is limited, married people prioritizing leisure with their partner may be squeezing out leisure time alone with others. Cohabiters may not allocate their leisure with the same consideration, because maintaining a social life away from their partner buffers against interdependency and allows them to temper the risks and costs should their cohabiting arrangement end. Based on this line of reasoning, I hypothesize that:

H2: Cohabiting individuals will spend more leisure time alone with family members than married individuals do.

H3: Cohabiting individuals will spend more leisure time alone with non-family persons than married individuals do.

Even if married people prioritize leisure time with their partner more so than cohabiters do, it may not mean that married couples exclude others in their socializing. After all, socializing with larger and more heterogeneous groups may be a particularly efficient use of time. As DePaulo (2006) noted, people accrue a larger network with their partner's family and friends and are embedded in these relationships through marriage. Having access to a larger network may lead married couples to share leisure with others. Although cohabiters may be introduced to their partner's social circle or introduce their partner to theirs, spending leisure time as a couple with family members may be a larger relationship investment than with friends, especially if the future of the cohabiting relationship is uncertain. Based on this line of reasoning, I hypothesize that:

H4: Cohabiting individuals will spend less leisure time with their partner and family members together than married individuals do.

H5: Cohabiting individuals will spend more leisure time with their partner and non-family persons together than married individuals do.

DATA AND METHODS

Data come from the 2003-2013 American Time Use Survey (ATUS). As the only large, representative U.S. time use survey on a full range of non-market activities, the ATUS measures the types of activities respondents do on a diary day, the amount of time spent on these activities, and who was present during them. There are a total of 148,345 respondents when the data from 2003 to 2013 are pooled.

The purpose of this study is to compare the time cohabiting and married individuals spend in leisure activities with their partner, so all single (neither cohabiting nor married) respondents are dropped from the analyses (N=68,914) as well as cases with missing responses on co-presence during their diary day (N=217). Key demographic variables on household members are linked from the Current Population Study (CPS), which occurs 2 to 5 months prior to the ATUS. Partner changes resulted in the loss of 1,403 cases. Partner age was recorded in the CPS and again in the ATUS; thus, a CPS to ATUS change in partner's age exceeding one year signals either an age reporting error or a change in partner. Respondents and partners who reported that they were married at the time of the CPS, but reported living with a non-marital partner or not being married at the time of the ATUS, were dropped from analyses (N=126). Likewise, respondents and partners who reported being single, living with an unmarried partner, divorced, separated or widowed during the CPS, but reported being married in the ATUS, were dropped (N=998). Because same-sex couples are not able to marry in all states, they are removed from the sample (N=352), and respondents under the age of 18 are also dropped (N=8). The final analytic sample is a subset of ATUS respondents between the ages of 18 and 80 years old who are married or living with an unmarried partner (N=76,327).

The dependent variables are the absolute number of minutes in leisure activities that cohabiting and married respondents spent during the diary day in four leisure group configurations that vary by size (alone with no one co-present, one other, two others, and three or more others) and five types of co-presence arrangements (with only a partner, family alone without partner, non-family alone without partner, partner with family, and partner with non-family). These measures focus on co-presence that does not incorporate the presence of respondents' children, because leisure with children often involves childcare and likely has

qualitatively different benefits than time with others. Family members include grandchildren, parents, siblings, and other relatives who may or may not be living in the household. Non-family persons include friends, co-workers, housemates, roomers, and other non-relatives who may or may not be living in the household.

The key independent variable, union status, measures whether the respondent lives with a cohabiting partner of the opposite sex (=1) or is married (=0). Respondents are coded as a cohabiter if they list an unmarried partner on their household roster. Because cohabiting and married persons differ in activities constraining or facilitating social interactions, their time demands are measured with time (in absolute minutes) spent working and doing school-related activities on the diary day as well as with partner's employment (part-time and full-time, with not employed as referent). Co-residence provides opportunities for co-presence. Therefore, household composition variables include the number of family and non-family household members as well as the number of children in the household under the age of 18 and the age of the youngest child. Shared partner characteristics were argued to promote time together. Age heterogamy is measured as the absolute difference in respondent's and partner's years of age (Kalmijn & Bernasco, 2001). Couples are considered racially homogamous if respondents identify themselves similarly as either non-Hispanic white, black, Hispanic, Asian, or other (similar=1, else=0). Couples are educationally homogamous if the respondent and partner both have less than a high school education or both have more than a high school education (similar=1, else=0). Drawn from the literature on time use (Bianchi, 2011), demographic controls include gender (female=1, male=0) and age of the respondent. Following Fein (2009), the race variable includes Hispanic as a separate category as well as black, Asian, and other, with non-Hispanic white as referent. Other variables include education (high school, some college,

college, and post-graduate, with less than high school as referent), nativity (foreign born=1, else=0), and household income (\$20,000 to \$39,999, \$40,000 to \$59,999, \$60,000 to \$99,999, and \$100,000 or more, with less than \$20,000 as referent). Because there is a temporal aspect to how we use time (Craig & Brown, 2014), controls for diary day distinguish the weekend (weekend=1, else=0), holiday (holiday=1, else=0), and season (spring, summer, and fall, with winter as referent). Because the ATUS oversampled some demographic groups, and the samples are not uniformly distributed across the days of the week, I will be applying the included weights to ensure accurate estimates. Missing data are seen in the race homogamy (N=2,646, 3.47%) and household income (N=6,737, 8.82%) measures. Multiple imputation for missing values on both variables are based on all the variables in the model.

Analyses begin by comparing the descriptive statistics for cohabiting and married respondents in terms of their leisure co-presence time as well as differences on control variables. Multivariate analyses use OLS regression models. Consistent with previous research analyzing time use data (Stewart, 2009), OLS regression models are preferred in producing unbiased estimations. The hypotheses relating union status and leisure time are tested in separate analyses for each group size and co-presence measure. Beginning with a baseline OLS model only controlling for diary day characteristics, four subsequent models add time demands, household composition, homogamy, and socio-demographic controls.

RESULTS

Table 2.1 shows the descriptive statistics comparing cohabiting and married respondents. I find statistically significant differences in total leisure time. Cohabiting respondents spend 17 more minutes on daily leisure than married respondents do ($p < .001$). Although there is no significant difference in the time spent alone in leisure activities, there are differences in the size of the

Table 2.1 Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=76,327)

	Cohabiting	Married
Leisure Total	313.16***	296.39
Leisure Group Size		
Alone	83.80	81.36
+1 person	132.61***	116.07
+2 person	26.11***	17.30
+3 or more	11.29***	6.97
Leisure Co-Presence		
Partner	103.37**	96.42
Family	11.14*	9.54
Non-Family	22.96***	13.28
Partner and Family	7.59***	11.05
Partner and Non-Family	18.42***	7.10
Time Demands		
Work	218.22***	190.21
School	9.45***	5.33
Partner Employment		
Not Employed	.26***	.32
Part-Time	.15	.14
Full-Time	.59***	.55
Household Composition		
#Family	.07***	.10
#Non-Family	.28***	.01
#Children	.93***	1.15
Youngest Child Age	2.93***	3.87
Homogamy		
Age	4.98***	3.72
Race	.82***	.92
Education	.85***	.92
Female	.53	.52
Age	37.50***	47.50
Race		
Non-Hispanic White	.68***	.75
Black	.12***	.07
Hispanic	.15***	.13
Asian	.02***	.04
Other	.03***	.01
Foreign Born	.12***	.17
Education		
Less than High School	.13***	.09
High School	.35***	.26
Some College	.22***	.16
College	.24***	.34
Graduate Degree	.06***	.14

Table 2.1 Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=76,327; continued)

Household Income		
Less than \$20k	.21***	.08
\$20k to \$39,999	.30***	.20
\$40k to \$59,999	.20	.19
\$60k to \$99,999	.20***	.32
\$100k or more	.09***	.22
Weekend	.50	.50
Holiday	.02	.02
Season		
Winter	.27	.26
Spring	.25	.25
Summer	.25	.25
Fall	.24	.24
N	3,783	72,544

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test of cohabiter-married difference.

groups cohabiting and married respondents socialize in. Compared to married respondents, cohabiters spend 17 more minutes daily in leisure activities with one other person ($p < .001$), nine more minutes with two other persons ($p < .001$), but only four more minutes in larger groups of three or more ($p < .001$). In sum, the additional leisure time of cohabiters is allocated disproportionately to smaller groups.

In terms of who leisure time is spent with, cohabiting respondents, compared to married respondents, spend seven more minutes alone with their partner ($p < .01$), only a minute more alone with family members ($p < .05$), and 10 more minutes alone with non-family persons ($p < .001$). Including their partner in this social time, cohabiting respondents spend just three fewer minutes with their partner and family members together ($p < .001$), but 11 more minutes with their partner and non-family persons combined ($p < .001$). With or without the partner, cohabiters are seen to allocate a bit more time with non-relatives than married people do.

Because the characteristics of married and cohabiting respondents may shape their leisure time use, it is useful to identify the ones that distinguish the two groups. Comparing measures of

competing time demands, cohabiting respondents spend, on average, 28 more minutes at work daily and four more minutes at school, and they are more likely to have an employed partner, than married respondents. Household composition is markedly different between the two unions. There are fewer family members and children, but more unrelated persons, living with cohabiting respondents. Children in the household of cohabiting respondents are younger than children in the household of married respondents. Turning to partner homogamy, cohabiting respondents and their partners are more dissimilar in regards to age, race, and education. On average, there is a larger age gap between cohabiting respondents and their partners than seen for their marital counterparts, 4.98 years compared to 3.72 years, respectively. Black, Hispanic, and “other” races make up a larger proportion of cohabiters than of married respondents. There is a higher proportion of foreign born among married respondents, and cohabiting respondents have significantly less education and lower household income. Cohabiting respondents are, on average, 10 years younger than married respondents. These differences in the characteristics of married and cohabiting respondents suggest the need to control for other variables in assessing the time use differences between married and cohabiting persons.

Multivariate Analysis for Leisure Group Size

Table 2.2 summarizes the cohabitation coefficients from successive OLS regression models for total leisure time and group size, including a time alone comparison. Because cohabiting and married respondents differ on a number of variables that influence how they allocate their leisure time with others, the analysis evaluates the implications of union status on leisure time with others while controlling for these covariates.

Contrary to the bivariate results, controlling for only diary day measures shows no significant difference between cohabiting and married respondents in total leisure time spent

during the diary day (Table 2.2, Model 1). Thus, union status does not seem to matter for how partnered Americans allocate their leisure time across the week and year. Including time demand variables in Model 2, the leisure gap increases to a substantial 25 minutes ($p < .001$). Cohabitors spend a half-hour more during the day in paid work than married people do. If they spent the same time working as their married counterparts, cohabiters would have even more leisure time. However, controlling for household composition (Model 3), the difference in leisure time is reduced to 17 minutes ($p < .001$). Married individuals have more related household members who apparently take away from their free time for leisure. There is little change when homogamy variables are added in Model 4. All things considered (Model 5), cohabiters spend 18 more minutes in leisure activities than their married counterparts do ($p < .001$).

Table 2.2 OLS Coefficients for Cohabitation (in Minutes Leisure) by Group Size (N=76,327)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Diary Day	+ Time Demands	+ Household Composition	+ Homogamy	+ Controls
Total Leisure	ns.	25.45***	17.38***	15.72***	17.69***
Alone	ns.	17.91***	ns.	ns.	ns.
+1 person	8.09*	19.06***	7.47*	7.13*	16.26***
+2 person	6.60***	7.94***	4.43**	4.67**	3.74*
+3 or more	2.59*	3.07**	ns.	ns.	ns.

Note:

Diary day = weekend, holiday, season.

Time demands = work (minutes), school (minutes), partner employment.

Household composition = #family, #non-family, #children, youngest child age.

Homogamy = age, race, education.

Controls = sex, age, race, foreign born, education, household income.

ns.= not significant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

Examining leisure time alone in solitary activities, there is no significant difference when only diary day measures are controlled in Model 1. When time demand variables are included in Model 2, however, cohabiters spend 18 more minutes in solitary leisure than their married counterparts ($p < .001$). Because cohabiters and their partners have greater work demands on their

time, their greater solitary leisure is suppressed in bivariate measures. In Model 3, where household composition variables are added, the cohabitation coefficient is no longer statistically significant. Cohabitors, having fewer children in the household than married individuals, have more opportunities to pursue leisure alone. All things considered (Model 5), I find no significant difference between cohabiting and married respondents in the time they spend in solitary leisure.

Consistent across all models, cohabitors spend more time in leisure with just one other person than married individuals do. The full model (Model 5) shows a difference of 16 minutes for one-on-one leisure ($p < .001$). Results for groups of three (the respondent and two others) also hold across models, but differences between cohabitors and married respondents are smaller. Controlling for all variables, cohabitors spend four more minutes of leisure with two others than married respondents do (Model 5; $p < .001$).

Findings for larger groups of four or more (the respondent and at least 3 others) are sensitive to household composition measures. Model 1 shows that cohabitors spend only three more minutes in large leisure groups than married individuals do ($p < .05$). The addition of household composition makes the coefficient non-significant. Although the number of family and non-family persons in the household are positively associated with leisure participation in larger groups, having children in the household, particularly young children, apparently works against spending time in larger adult social gatherings.

Multivariate Analysis for Leisure Co-Presence

Similar to Table 2.2, Table 2.3 summarizes the cohabitation coefficients from successive OLS regression models. Its focus is five categories of co-presence in leisure –with partner only, family only, non-family only, partner and family, and partner and non-family.

I find no evidence for the hypothesis that cohabiters spend less leisure time alone with their partner than married individuals do, as the “greedy” argument would suggest (H1). However, the relationship between marital status and leisure time spent alone with partner is sensitive to the variables controlled. The baseline Model 1 indicates no significant difference in the time cohabiters and married respondents spend in couple leisure. The addition of time demand measures in Model 2 shows cohabiting couples spending 10 more minutes together in leisure than their married counterparts ($p < .001$). Cohabiters work more hours and are more likely to have partners who work, which likely reduces the amount of free time they can spend alone together. This relationship, however, disappears in Model 3 when household composition is accounted for. Similar to leisure time alone, the number of children in the household conflicts with couples’ leisure time alone together. The cohabitation coefficient is again positive and significant in Model 5 when all variables, including socio-demographic characteristics, are

Table 2.3 OLS Coefficients for Cohabitation (in Minutes Leisure) by Co-Presence Type (N=76,327)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Diary Day	+ Time Demands	+ Household Composition	+ Homogamy	+ Controls
Partner	ns.	9.54**	ns.	ns.	10.20**
Family	ns.	2.68*	ns.	ns.	ns.
Non-Family	7.84***	8.34***	6.94***	7.13***	6.34***
Partner and Family	-3.78***	-2.72**	-3.75***	-3.72***	-2.76**
Partner and Non-Family	9.06***	9.50***	5.99***	6.33***	5.45***

Note:

Diary day = weekend, holiday, season.

Time demands = work (minutes), school (minutes), partner employment.

Household composition = #family, #non-family, #children, youngest child age.

Homogamy = age, race, education.

Controls = sex, age, race, foreign born, education, household income.

ns.= not significant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

controlled. In this full model, cohabiters spend 10 more minutes during the diary day alone with their partner than married individuals do ($p < .001$). Age appears to be a key contributing factor (results not shown). Holding age constant, cohabiters spend more alone time together than married couples.

What about leisure shared with others outside the company of the partner? I find no support for the hypothesis that cohabiters spend more time with family members than married individuals do (H2). In Model 2, cohabiters spend a few more minutes with kin, but this relationship disappears when household composition variables are added (Model 3). If there is no evidence that cohabiters spend more time with family members, I do find modest support for the hypothesis regarding non-family persons (H3). Cohabiters do spend a modest six more leisure minutes alone with non-family persons than married individuals do ($p < .001$). This finding is rather consistent throughout the five models. Including the partner in leisure with others, I also find support for the hypothesis that cohabiting couples spend less time with family members (H4) and the idea of more time spent with non-family persons (H5). While statistically significant, the differences by marital status are very small: cohabiting couples spend three fewer minutes in leisure with family members ($p < .01$) and five more minutes with non-family persons ($p < .001$), than married couples do. All things considered, the differences between cohabiters and married respondents in leisure time use are modest at best, but cohabiting couples' extra ten minutes spent alone together contradicts notions of a uniquely "greedy" marital institution.

Further Results

Table 2.4 shows the full results from Model 5 in Table 3 for each co-presence type. Compared to weekdays, respondents spend more leisure time during the weekends with their partner –with and without others present –and less time alone with non-family persons. Respondents spend more

time with their partner and others (either together or alone with family and non-family) during the holidays than non-holidays. Unsurprisingly, respondents spend less leisure time alone with non-family persons during the festive parts of the year. Time alone with partner is greater in the winter, when less time is spent alone with non-family persons, than any other season. Compared to the winter, more time is spent alone with family members in the summer.

Competing time demands influence leisure time in expected ways. Time spent in work and school-related activities are negatively associated with leisure across all types of co-presence. Partner employment generally reduces the time partners spend together. Although there is no relationship between partner employment and time spent alone with non-family persons, respondents with a partner who works spend more time alone with family members compared to respondents with unemployed partners. Respondents with a full-time employed partner also spend less time together as a couple with family members compared to respondents with unemployed partners, however, only full-time partner employment is negatively associated with couples' time with non-family persons.

Household composition influences who leisure time is spent with, presumably due to the availability of others. The number of family members in the household is positively related to the time spent with kin –with or without the partner present –and negatively related to couples' time with non-family persons. The number of non-family persons in the household is also positively related to leisure activities involving non-family persons. The number of children in the household is negatively related to leisure time with every co-presence category. The age of the youngest child is also negatively related to all leisure co-presence involving the partner.

The relationship between partner homogamy measures and leisure time is mixed. The full models suggest that couples' age difference is not significantly associated with time spent with

Table 2.4 OLS Models of Leisure Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327)

Variable	Partner	Family	Non-Family	Partner and Family	Partner and Non-Family
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>
Cohabitation	10.20** (3.12)	0.07 (1.34)	6.34*** (1.48)	-2.76** (0.98)	5.45*** (1.23)
<i>Diary day</i>					
Weekend	10.99*** (1.46)	-0.25 (0.58)	-2.43*** (0.62)	9.71*** (0.58)	5.96*** (0.46)
Holiday	-5.73 (5.12)	7.02 (3.58)	-8.64*** (1.51)	27.32*** (3.97)	5.39* (2.32)
<i>Season</i>					
Spring	-4.28** (1.64)	0.42 (0.62)	2.16*** (0.64)	-0.10 (0.61)	-0.43 (0.47)
Summer	-9.18*** (1.76)	1.47* (0.68)	2.25*** (0.63)	0.75 (0.65)	0.53 (0.55)
Fall	-4.40** (1.67)	0.62 (0.65)	3.58*** (0.71)	-0.26 (0.64)	-0.21 (0.51)
<i>Time demands</i>					
Work	-0.10*** (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)
School	-0.10*** (0.01)	-0.02*** (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01*** (0.00)	-0.01* (0.00)
<i>Partner employ.</i>					
Part-time	-31.62*** (1.96)	2.52** (0.85)	-1.24 (0.79)	-1.73* (0.74)	-0.97 (0.60)
Full-time	-28.38*** (1.62)	1.40* (0.58)	-0.50 (0.67)	-2.44*** (0.58)	-1.79*** (0.51)
<i>Household composition</i>					
#Family	-2.16 (1.31)	7.38*** (0.79)	-0.28 (0.60)	7.28*** (0.84)	-0.45* (0.20)
#Non-Family	5.61 (3.73)	0.33 (1.17)	4.53** (1.46)	-0.25 (0.70)	11.42*** (2.01)

Table 2.4 OLS Models of Leisure Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327; continued)

#Children	-21.08*** (0.59)	-3.11*** (0.24)	-1.81*** (0.25)	-3.60*** (0.20)	-2.91*** (0.20)
Youngest Child Age	-1.94*** (0.10)	0.08 (0.04)	0.04 (0.05)	-0.27*** (0.04)	-0.10*** (0.02)
<i>Homogamy</i>					
Age	-0.28 (0.16)	0.05 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.06)	-0.07 (0.05)	-0.06 (0.05)
Race	-5.82** (2.18)	-0.66 (1.19)	-0.76 (1.06)	0.14 (0.77)	1.16* (0.57)
Education	-6.61* (2.81)	-1.41 (1.04)	2.33** (0.81)	-1.62 (1.02)	0.54 (0.73)
<i>Controls</i>					
Female	-20.51*** (1.32)	1.91*** (0.49)	-6.82*** (0.58)	-0.02 (0.50)	-0.54 (0.41)
Age	1.28*** (0.07)	-0.08*** (0.02)	-0.11*** (0.03)	0.10*** (0.02)	-0.10*** (0.02)
Race					
Black	-16.24*** (2.34)	5.78*** (1.27)	3.09** (1.02)	-3.65*** (0.66)	-3.47*** (0.51)
Hispanic	-15.44*** (2.16)	0.62 (0.88)	-0.25 (0.88)	0.24 (0.84)	-2.09*** (0.60)
Asian	-7.70* (3.07)	0.17 (1.24)	-1.72 (1.11)	-1.38 (1.12)	-2.87** (0.90)
Other	-13.05* (5.48)	-0.51 (1.72)	-1.01 (3.80)	-1.87 (1.57)	-1.51 (1.35)
Foreign Born	-10.54*** (1.99)	-4.42*** (0.73)	-2.34** (0.75)	-3.25*** (0.71)	0.18 (0.58)
Education					
High school	-0.47 (2.98)	-1.24 (1.14)	-1.80 (0.97)	-0.83 (1.08)	0.37 (0.73)
Some college	-1.43 (3.14)	-2.15 (1.28)	-1.41 (1.08)	-1.18 (1.15)	1.48 (0.77)

Table 2.4 OLS Models of Leisure Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=76,327; continued)

College	-5.23 (3.04)	-4.00*** (1.18)	-1.70 (1.03)	-1.63 (1.14)	2.64*** (0.78)
Graduate degree	-9.73** (3.32)	-4.18** (1.28)	-3.39** (1.16)	-2.74* (1.19)	3.54*** (0.94)
HH income					
\$20k to \$39,999	-5.51 (3.17)	-0.07 (1.08)	2.22* (0.95)	-0.98 (1.13)	-0.17 (0.96)
\$40k to \$59,999	-12.47*** (3.25)	0.92 (1.16)	3.76*** (1.10)	-0.78 (1.16)	-0.95 (1.00)
\$60k to \$99,999	-18.48*** (3.15)	-0.12 (1.08)	4.51*** (1.00)	-0.90 (1.13)	-0.85 (0.99)
\$100k or more	-22.18*** (3.20)	-0.35 (1.16)	6.53*** (1.15)	-1.25 (1.19)	0.21 (1.07)
Constant	154.86*** (6.48)	21.64*** (2.70)	24.13*** (2.33)	14.26*** (2.30)	14.02*** (1.96)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

any co-presence type, including the leisure time partners spend together. However, couples who are similar in racial and educational backgrounds spend less time together than their dissimilar counterparts. Couples of similar racial backgrounds spend more time together with non-family persons participating in leisure activities.

Socio-demographic variables influence leisure co-presence. Compared to men, women report less time with their partner, more time with family, and less time with non-family persons. Age is positively associated with both partner and partner with family shared leisure, but negatively associated with family alone and non-family leisure with or without a partner. Non-Hispanic whites spend the most time with their partner. Compared to non-Hispanic whites, blacks spend more time with both family and non-family, but less often include their partner in this leisure. Hispanics, along with Asians, spend less time with their partner and non-family together compared to non-Hispanic whites. Compared to native born respondents, foreign born respondents spend less time in all co-presence types with the exception of partner with non-family, which is not statistically significant. Generally, better educated respondents spend less time in leisure across all co-presence categories than their less educated counterparts. However, better educated respondents spend more time together with their partner and non-family persons. Compared to respondents from lower income households, respondents from higher income households spend less time with their partner, but more time with non-family persons with and without their partner.

CONCLUSION

In summary, cohabiters enjoy significantly more daily leisure than married people do. According to the “greedy institution” of marriage argument (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006), married couples have less engagement with others besides each other, which would suggest they will spend more

leisure alone together as a couple and less with anyone else. All things considered, the married spend about ten fewer minutes of discretionary time alone with the partner than cohabiters do. While this contradicts expectations from the “greedy institution” argument, it is consistent with the notion that cohabiters may particularly value this time together as a way of gaining information of the partner’s suitability for a long-term relationship such as marriage. Other differences between married and cohabiting respondents in time allocated to others are small at best. These findings suggest that while marriage may be “greedy”, it is not uniquely so. Both married and cohabiting couples are quite similar in the time they spend with family and other persons. They are certainly not dedicating their free time solely to each other. The trivial differences in other co-presence measures put into question the “looser bonds” perspective of cohabitation. They also call into question beliefs that families are especially reluctant to embrace cohabiting couples and vice versa.

Analysis of group size shows no significant cohabiter-married differences in participating in leisure alone or in larger groups of four or more. However, cohabiters do spend most of their free time in the company of just one other person, perhaps often the partner. Finding time to spend with a few others is likely easier than coordinating leisure with larger group, especially during the weekdays when adults are apt to work.

As it stands, the results are not substantively significant enough to insist that there are any meaningful differences in how cohabiting and married individuals manage their leisure and social relationships. Marriage is no “greedier” for kin relationships than cohabiting relationships. Cohabitors’ time away from their partner indicates some degree of independence in informal unions and points to marriage being somewhat insulated from certain ties. Compared to married persons, cohabiters spend slightly more leisure time alone with non-family persons. However,

the difference is not convincing enough to infer that cohabiters are maintaining outside social ties as insurance in case their relationship does not work. Although marriage may be a barrier for finding time with unrelated persons, it does not take time away from family so long as the marital partner is involved. Cohabiting couples spend marginally less leisure time with family members, but more leisure time with non-family persons, than married couples do. Again, the negligible differences make it unclear whether others have a hand in the courtship of cohabiting couples and whether marital partners are truly more integrated in their family networks. The findings here call for a cautious interpretation of social worlds alongside what we already know of the two unions.

It is important to note that these findings are differences in leisure time allocated in a single day. Although I find a generous portion of the day is spent in leisure activities (about five hours, on average), how it is spent with others, and the small daily differences between the two unions, may not be too surprising. There is a convenience aspect to leisure that should not be understated. The overarching routine of day-to-day life, which usually involves paid and unpaid work, may leave little time or desire to freely spend time with others outside of the household. Although sharing leisure is socially beneficial (Putnam, 2000), leisure itself is not obligatory. Sharing leisure may be expediently relegated to the home and who is around or available, rather than towards seeking out particular persons and relationships. Nevertheless, the differences are still indicative of the social worlds cohabiters and married people live in. Taken in weeks or even months, these differences are not inconsequential. For example, cohabiters spend only six more minutes on an average day alone with non-family persons than married persons do, but over a week, it becomes a 42 minute difference. Most relationships with those outside one's household are not maintained with short, daily contact, but rather by intervals of co-presence that take place

occasionally. These are not captured by daily time use averages, but may signal potentially meaningful differences in the social relationships of cohabiting and married people.

Leisure activities are distinct from other activities. Compared to, say, time spent at work, people generally have a choice on how and with whom to spend their free time. This type of time can be seen as an investment in particular relationships, because time is a scarce resource. Leisure time can be used consciously to integrate people from different parts of one's social world or just to meet disparate social obligations in one occasion. Beyond intimacy with the partner, this study cannot argue differences in investments in social relationships nor can it say whether one union is more socially unifying than the other. However, the findings do uncover some mischaracterizations of marriage and cohabitation. The institution of marriage is no "greedier" than co-residential romantic relationships. Although marriage is said to be "greedy", it is not because marital couples are engrossed in their own relationship. The bonds between cohabiting couples may not be as "loose" as previously thought if only because cohabiting and spending leisure time together as a couple may be parts of a vetting process, either for marriage or for a long-term relationship. The findings also raise an interesting question as to whether the similarities in the social worlds of married persons and cohabiters reflect the dominant influence of proximity –particularly co-residence –on contact patterns (Treas & Gubernskaya, 2012).

Both the telling difference in alone together time and the general similarity in time with others is particularly interesting in light of the many distinguishing factors that do affect time use. Though it has been argued that cohabitation is becoming more commonplace and less selective in the U.S., cohabiters still differ from married people in a number of ways, which influence how free time is spent. Cohabiters spend more time at work, which reduces their solitary free time. Cohabiting couples have fewer children in the household, which allows them

more couple leisure alone together. It is worth noting that cohabiters with children are, on average, seven years younger than cohabiters living without children. Being younger, on average, than married people, cohabiters are more inclined to experience leisure in groups rather than alone. Although cohabiting couples are less homogamous in age, race, and education, homogamy is found to have little association with the allocation of leisure.

There several limitations with this study to be considered. First, the ATUS reports on co-presence do not measure interaction, but rather who was present during an activity; thus men and women participating in different activities in the same room could produce different activity and co-presence reports. Or, they could be alone together without any interaction and engagement with one another. Co-presence does not measure the quality of time together, but rather the quantity. Second, because the ATUS measures co-presence as who else is present during the time an activity takes place, individuals in smaller homes may be recorded as spending more time with their partner than those in larger housing units that allow individuals more privacy. The significance of household composition suggests that the size of the housing unit may be important for the likelihood of being with others or alone. The CPS has a housing type variable, but aggregates house and apartment into a single category and does not report on the number of rooms or size of the unit. Lastly, neither the CPS nor ATUS provide any information regarding the duration of marriages and cohabitations. This drawback may carry some implications particularly for leisure time use, because couples in newer relationships may be getting to know one another by spending more free time together than couples in older relationships. In addition, two measures need to be reconsidered for future analysis. Restricting the age of the sample would minimize the effect of age-related changes in social networks. Educational homogamy

also needs to be more nuanced, rather than a dichotomous measure of difference, to accurately gauge its influence on time with a partner.

In adopting the idea that sharing leisure time with a partner (and the inclusion and exclusion of others in these activities) is a specific form of relationship investment and risk mitigation, this study offers a different take on this uncertainty of cohabitation. By looking purely at discretionary time, the results suggest that cohabiters invest the available time they have into their relationships more so than married people. Thus, this study contributes to our growing understanding of its place in the courtship process, and provides another basis for future research.

CHAPTER 3

The Social Worlds of Divorced and Never-Marrieds

INTRODUCTION

Approximately, half of all first marriages end in divorce (Copen, et al., 2012). The negative effects of divorce are well-documented in the academic literature. More than a single event in the life course, ending a marital relationship is a source of chronic strain that begins long before the actual divorce and continues on for an extended period of stress after divorce (Fischer, De Graff, & Kalmijn, 2005). As a result, divorce has been found to be an emotionally disturbing life event that reduces personal well-being (Williams & Uberson, 2004) and increases depressive symptoms (Kalmijn & Monden, 2006). Divorce has also been cited as one of the driving forces behind the rise in singlehood in the United States (Fokkema & Liefbroer, 2008).

Despite the growth of singlehood, relatively few studies have compared the social worlds of divorced and never-married people –that is, who they choose to spend their time with. Distinguishing divorcees from people who have yet to wed recognizes the heterogeneity between people who occupy the state of singlehood. In keeping with the “greedy institution” characterization of marriage put forth by Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006), we would anticipate that divorced persons will have experienced the smaller networks that are associated with the married in comparison to the never-married. This raises the question of what happens after divorce. On the one hand, divorcees, having typically nurtured fewer social relationships while married, may have accommodated to a smaller social network. Thus, divorcees would be expected to spend less time with others than those who have never-married. On the other hand, divorce may liberate individuals socially from the constraints associated with marriage, permitting an expanded social life. Furthermore, they may be motivated to compensate for the loss of a

spouse's company by meeting new people and spending more time with the people they already know. These factors imply that divorced individuals will spend more time with others than the married, perhaps even having social worlds comparable to their counterparts who are never-married.

Drawing on nationally representative data from the American Time Use Survey, this study asks the following questions: 1) How do the social worlds of divorced and never-married differ? 2) To what extent do differences reflect differences in the people who are divorced and who never married? 3) What do these differences mean for the well-being of persons in these two states of singlehood?

To understand the implications of marital disruption on social worlds, this study takes a novel approach towards time allocated to various social relationships. The analyses take into account a comprehensive typology of co-presence, distinguishing time with family, non-family, and alone as well as the size of groups experienced by divorced and never-married people.

BACKGROUND

Social relationships are especially important to explore, given their influence on well-being (Antonucci, 2001). Research on the loneliness of older adults (Pinquart, 2003) emphasizes the important benefits individuals yield from relationships with others at home, work, and in their local community. Besides socialization and social integration occurring in social interactions, others provide social capital (e.g., trust, reciprocity, and information) that is embedded in these relationships (Putnam, 2000). The value of spending time with others can be seen in the literature on how people use their discretionary time. Young and Lim (2014) compared the social experience of employed and unemployed workers and found that the unemployed benefited little from their days off, because they had no one to share their time with. Other studies found that

participating in leisure activities is psychologically and physically beneficial (Caldwell, 2005; Trost et al., 2002; Warburton et al., 2006; Trenberth & Dewe, 2002) as well as important for individual development, family life, social relationships, and culture (Rubin et al., 1986). However, a person's social world is comprised of different relationships that vary in intimacy and availability.

In this study, social relationships are broadly divided into two categories: family and non-family ties. Arguably, the most crucial relationships are those that are the most durable and longest-lasting, such as with kin (Connidis, 2001), because other relationship ties are subject to change, voluntary, and less permanent (Spencer & Pahl, 2006). A growing number of young adults rely on the resources of their parents, and many return home after leaving the nest out of financial and practical necessity (Fry, 2013). Although kinship ties are important and stronger than other relationships, kin are not always accessible. High rates of geographic mobility results in many people living too far apart to spend much time with their family members (van Diepen & Mulder, 2009). Past studies suggest that friends can compensate for the missing support of family (Collins & Madsen, 2006; Milevsky, 2005), offering tangible and practical assistance that can be as close, intensive, and supportive for people's well-being as family relationships (Doherty & Feeney, 2004). Friendship networks tend to be larger than family networks (Cable, Bartley, Chandola, & Sacker, 2012). However, the never-married continue to form new relationships and have greater contact with their friends compared to those who were previously married (Connidis, 2001). Given the differences in family and non-family networks, I expect to find the social interaction involving both family and non-family to be less intimate than family alone, but more intimate than with only non-family persons.

There are reasons to expect the social lives of divorced and never-married people to differ. During marriage, there is less need for support from extended family and friends (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006), because spouses act as confidants and as the primary source of emotional support for each other (McPherson et al., 2006; Treas, 2011). Whereas divorced adults may have primarily relied on their partner during marriage, never-married adults sought others over a longer period, and perhaps more consistently, which may lead to greater support from these relationships (Pinquart, 2003). Research has found that, compared to previously married young adults, the never-married have more frequent contacts with neighbors, friends, and relatives (Barrett, 1999). Other studies suggest increases in the number of social relationships. If divorcees may feel the need or opportunity for more social contact once their partner is no longer available, they may actively rebuild their networks and social life. Divorce can be a liberating experience that allows a person to re-establish and grow their social networks. Indeed, Albeck and Kaydar (2002) found that the formerly-married years are a period of social “blossoming”. Another study found that about a third of divorcees have more social gains than losses in the first few years of marriage (Terhell et al., 2004).

Changes in the nature of marriage suggest that divorce today may not affect social ties much. Some scholars argue that marriage today is more individualized than in the past (see Yodanis & Lauer, 2014). Marital couples maintain their own identities and pursue their own interests and goals while in marriage and are less dependent on their partner. Being less integrated as a couple may mean less blending of social worlds and fewer social consequences in divorce. Amato and colleagues (2007) compared a nationally representative sample of married people in 1980 and 2000 and found that spouses act more independently in the later period, spending less time together in daily activities, and generally living “alone together”. In a span of

two decades, the proportion of friends shared between spouses declined, while the percentage of spouses who do not share close friends increased. The effect of divorce on social networks will be tempered if, in marriage, people are living more separate lives, which suggests that the social world of divorcees may resemble that of never-married persons.

The rise of alternative living arrangements, such as cohabitation, which exercises individualism, has also blurred the differences between divorcees and never-married persons. Cohabitation is fast becoming a part of the courtship process (Goodwin et al., 2010). In 2013, nearly a quarter of never-married Americans ages 25 to 34 lived with an unmarried partner (Wang & Parker, 2014). Some couples enter cohabiting unions as a “trial marriage” (Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001), because it allows them to simulate marriage through economies of sharing residence and personal resources, and the gratification of intimate relations (Waite & Gallagher, 2000). However, cohabiting unions are typically short-lived. According to the National Center of Health Statistics, premarital cohabitation generally lasted a year and a half for women in their late twenties before ending in marriage or break-up (Copen, Daniels, & Mosher, 2013). These findings suggest that like divorcees, the never-married may have experienced the ending of a union, albeit an informal one, which may have had a similar impact on their social world.

Another recent change in households is the uncoupling of childbearing and marriage. Marriage is becoming less of a prerequisite for having children. Between 1970 and 2009, the percentage of all births outside of marriage increased from 11% to 41% (Wildsmith, Steward-Streng, & Manlove, 2011). Single-parents spend just as much time with their children as married parents (Milkie, Mattingly, Nomaguchi, Bianchi, & Robinson, 2004). Parenthood, especially when children are young and require more of parents’ time (Bittman & Wacjman, 2000), reduces

the amount of time people can spend fostering adult relationships, because most of their time is spent tending to their children and child-related household labor (Sayer, 2005). Given non-marital parenting, the never-married are no longer insulated from the effects of children on their social lives.

Divorcees' and never-marrieds' social time use may be much the same, because young adults are marrying later and a greater number of middle-aged adults have never been married. In 2011, the median age of first marriage was 26.5 for women and 28.7 for men (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Among adults aged 45-54, the proportion never-married increased 300% between 1986 and 2009 (Kreider & Ellis, 2011). Divorcees who had married at later ages spent more of their social lives never-married and may be just as embedded in their social world as those who never marry. Furthermore, divorcees also have less interest in marriage than never-married adults (Wang & Parker, 2014). Because dual-earner marital households are more common now than the traditionally gender specialized households of previous generations (Bianchi & Raley, 2005), women who divorce maintain the social relations of their workplace and, thus, may have lives similar to never-married persons outside of the home.

Although the number of years divorcees and never-married people spend single may be converging, age is a major demographic distinction that has implications for time allocation to others. Compared to never-married persons, divorcees are older (Ono, 2005). The Pew Research Center reports that in 2012, among those who were ages 25 and older, the median age of divorcees was 58, while the median age for never-married adults was 35 (Wang & Parker, 2014). People in the early stages of adulthood are still completing school or establishing themselves in their careers. In the process of reaching complete independence, young adults might reduce their expenses by living with other relatives or unrelated roommates. Sharing a household with family

or friends can lead to more time in their presence. Compared to the never-married, divorcees are less likely to live with their parents (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2008).

Research has noted the age-related changes in social networks. Although the number and salience of relationships fluctuate throughout one's life span, studies have found that older adults tend to spend less time with others than younger adults do (Cornwell, 2011a). Carstensen (2006) suggested that around the age of 30 or 40, people begin to shrink their social circle to a smaller, closer network. Because network size decreases with age, there is a smaller number of potential others to spend time. Previous research has offered several explanations for this reduction. Older adults have fewer social roles than younger and middle-aged adults, which limit the different social settings they are exposed to. Health problems also hinder the participation of older adults in social activities, making it difficult to stay connected with others (Cornwell, 2009). In addition, the need to feel a part of larger social groups may lessen at older ages. Compared to younger adults, older adults may engage more selectively with others and seek fewer, but more emotionally rewarding, relationships (Carstensen, Isaacowitz, & Charles, 1999). Given the age difference between divorced and never-married persons, I expect age to play a large role in time allocation to others. Other factors have also been shown to influence the allocation of time to others, such as time demands and socio-demographic characteristics.

Time Demands: Because never-married adults tend to be younger than divorcees, they have different labor market demands on their time. Compared to the never-married, the divorced are more likely to be working (Brown, Lee, & Bulanda, 2006), because younger adults are still finishing school or establishing their careers, as previously mentioned. We know that work consumes much of people's lives often at the expense of relationships with family and friends (Whybrow, 2005). Research has also found a negative relationship between the time people

spend in paid labor and the time they spend alone (Blekesaune, 2005); this suggests that whatever time is left after work obligations are fulfilled is apt to be spent with others. Because time is considered a network good, people prefer to spend it in the company of others (Young & Lim, 2014). Although work takes place in the presence of bosses, coworkers, and customers, finding time for both work and a personal life is a major challenge for workers (Rotondo et al., 2003). Compared to those who are unemployed or go to school, those who work for pay report higher rates of family contact (Cornwell, 2011b). Work demands, however, have been found to impinge on time for friendships outside of work (Spencer & Pahl, 2006).

Admittedly, the relation of employment and divorce is complex. Although employment insecurity may lead to divorce (Sayer, England, Allison, & Kangas, 2011), divorce also has a negative effect on careers. Kalmijn (2005) found that men are more likely to experience unemployment and a change to lower occupational status jobs after divorce. For women, research findings on post-divorce labor market participation are mixed. To the extent they have specialized in home production during marriage, women suffer the economic consequences of having less work experience (Bradbury & Katz, 2002). However, Mueller (2005) found no significant change in the labor supply of women after divorce, speculating that women who have anticipated a divorce increased their market work in preparation for being independent financially.

Socio-Demographic Factors: Women are much less likely to remarry than men (Livingston, 2014), and they generally have less free time (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003). Socially, however, they tend to be the kin-keepers –maintaining contacts with family outside the household (Liebler & Sandefur, 2002). Although men are less likely to maintain family contacts than women in marriage, divorced men have a higher reliance on friends and extended kin than divorced women

(Duran-Aydintug, 1998). Divorce rates are higher for some groups than others. Blacks have higher divorce rates (Bramlett & Mosher, 2002) and have less kin contact than non-Hispanic whites (Cornwell et al., 2008). However, never-marrieds are disproportionately black (Krieder & Ellis, 2011). The never-married, on average, have more education than the divorced (Ono, 2005). Education is positively associated with the number of people available to discuss important matters, but more educated people have a lower proportion of kin in their network than people with less education (McPherson et al., 2006). However, better-educated divorcees are more likely to maintain or increase contacts they had while in marriage than their less educated counterparts (Terhell, Broese van Groenou, & van Tilburg, 2007). Compared to divorcees, never-married persons are better-off financially (Arber, 2004), which suggests less need for social relations that provide material support.

Theoretical Argument

Gerstel and Sarkisian's (2006) "greedy institution" of marriage argument that marriage takes people away from their family, friends, and community is suggestive of several hypotheses regarding the social worlds of divorced and never-married. Based on prior research, we anticipate that never-married individuals will maintain active social lives with rich social networks. According to Gerstel and Sarkisian (2006), marriage is linked to having fewer social ties. To the extent that both marriage and its disruption have a negative effect on one's social network, we would expect divorcees to have social worlds that compare unfavorably with those of the never-married. However, if divorce provides both motive and opportunity to rebuild social networks, we would expect divorcees to have richer social worlds, perhaps even approaching those of never-married singles. Assuming marriage has long-run negative consequences for social relationships, I hypothesize that:

H1: Divorced individuals will spend more time alone than never-married individuals do.

However, obligatory relationships such as those with kin may be easier to activate than voluntary ties with friends and acquaintances. Divorce will likely have a greater negative effect on social relations with non-family persons, limiting the time that is spent together with family and non-family persons. Based on this line of reasoning, I hypothesize the following:

H2: Divorced individuals will spend more time alone with family members than never-married individuals do.

H3: Divorced individuals will spend less time alone with non-family persons than never-married individuals do.

H4: Divorced individuals will spend less time alone with family members and non-family persons together than never-married individuals do.

DATA AND METHODS

Data come from the 2003-2013 American Time Use Survey (ATUS). As the only large, representative U.S. time use survey on a full range of non-market activities, the ATUS measures the types of activities respondents do on a diary day, the amount of time spent on these activities, and who was present during them. There are a total of 148,345 respondents when the data from 2003 to 2013 are pooled.

Because this study compares divorced and never-married individuals, all married, cohabiting, and widowed respondents (N=94,379) are dropped from the analyses as well as cases with missing responses on co-presence during their diary day (N=116). Widowed respondents are excluded, because they are much older and the effect of their marital disruption on their social world is qualitatively different from divorcees. Respondents under the age of 18 are also

removed (N=6705). The final analytic sample is a subset of ATUS respondents between the ages of 18 and 80 years old who are divorced or never-married (N=47,145).

The dependent variables are the absolute number of minutes respondents spent during the diary day in three group size configurations: alone, with one person, and with two or more persons. Three co-presence arrangements are also measured: family members, non-family persons, and family members and non-family persons together. Family members include grandchildren, parents, siblings, and relatives who may or may not be living in the household. Non-family persons include housemates and roomers as well as other non-relatives who may or may not be living in the household.

The key independent variable measures whether the respondent is divorced (=1) or never-married (=0). Because divorced and never-married persons differ in activities constraining or facilitating social interactions, their time demands are measured with time spent working and doing school-related activities (in absolute minutes). Co-residence provides opportunities for co-presence. Therefore, household composition variables include the number of family and non-family household members as well as the number of children under the age of 18 and the age of the youngest child.

Drawn from the literature on time use (Bianchi, 2011), demographic controls include gender (female=1, male=0) and age of the respondent. Following Fein (2009), the race variable includes Hispanic as a separate category as well as black, Asian, and other, with non-Hispanic white as referent. Other variables include education (high school, some college, college, and post-graduate, with less than high school as referent), nativity (foreign born=1, else=0), and household income (\$20,000 to \$39,999, \$40,000 to \$59,999, \$60,000 to \$99,999, and \$100,000 or more, with less than \$20,000 as referent). Because there is a temporal aspect to how we use

time (Craig & Brown, 2014), controls for the diary day distinguish the weekend (weekend=1, else=0), holiday (holiday=1, else=0), and season (spring, summer, and fall, with winter as referent). Because the ATUS oversampled some demographic groups, and the samples are not uniformly distributed across the days of the week, I will be applying the included weights to ensure accurate estimates. In the ATUS, missing data is seen in household income (N=4,075, 8.64%). Multiple imputation based on all the variables in the model is used for missing values.

Analyses begin by comparing the descriptive statistics for divorced and never-married respondents in terms of group size and co-presence time as well as differences on control variables. Multivariate analyses use OLS regression models. Because time use surveys are usually collected over a short period of time (e.g., a day), there are many zero time observations for activities that were not done that day. Consistent with previous research analyzing time use data (Stewart, 2009), OLS regression models are preferred in producing unbiased estimations. Hypotheses are tested in separate analyses for each co-presence measure. Beginning with a baseline OLS model only controlling for diary day characteristics, four subsequent models add time demands, household composition, socio-demographic controls, and age.

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics comparing divorced and never-married respondents are shown in Table 3.1. Consistent with the first hypothesis, divorced respondents, on average, spend a noteworthy 76 more minutes alone during the diary day than never-married respondents do ($p < .001$). Divorced respondents spend 37 fewer minutes with only one other person present ($p < .001$) and 32 fewer minutes with two or more other persons ($p < .001$), than their never-married counterparts. In short, the intimate social world of the divorced are more solitary and involve smaller groups than the social world of the never-married.

Table 3.1 Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=47,145)

	Divorced	Never-Married
Network Size		
Alone	440.98***	364.83
+1 Person	165.83***	217.22
+2 or more Persons	51.48***	83.77
Co-Presence		
Family	67.61***	89.74
Non-Family	140.07***	195.22
Family and Non-Family	9.63***	16.02
Time Demands		
Work	183.56***	199.20
School	6.15***	29.57
Household Composition		
#Family	.18***	.88
#Non-Family	.06***	.13
#Children	.53***	.50
Youngest Child Age	2.76***	2.38
Female	.63***	.53
Age	52.24***	36.19
Race		
Non-Hispanic White	.66***	.56
Black	.19***	.24
Hispanic	.12***	.15
Asian	.01***	.03
Other	.02	.02
Foreign Born	.12**	.13
Education		
Less than High School	.12***	.15
High School	.29***	.26
Some College	.21***	.23
College	.27	.27
Graduate Degree	.10	.10
Household Income		
Less than \$20k	.32***	.29
\$20k to \$39,999	.31***	.28
\$40k to \$59,999	.18	.17
\$60k to \$99,999	.14***	.17
\$100k or more	.05***	.09
Weekend	.50	.51
Holiday	.02	.02
Season		
Winter	.26	.26
Spring	.25	.26
Summer	.25	.24

Table 3.1 Descriptives (Means and Proportions Unweighted, N=47,145; continued)

	Fall	.24	.24
N		21,507	25,638

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test of divorcee-never-married difference.

In terms of co-presence, compared to the never-married, divorced respondents spend 22 fewer minutes with only family members ($p < .001$) and 55 fewer minutes with only non-family persons ($p < .001$). Divorced respondents also spend less time in groups containing both family and non-family persons. Compared to never-married respondents, divorced respondents spend a modest six fewer minutes together with family and non-family persons ($p < .001$).

The divorced and never-married have different demands on their time. Divorced respondents spend less time at work, while never-married respondents spend more time at school and in school-related activities. Home life also appears to differ. Divorced respondents have, on average, fewer family members and non-family persons, and more children living in the household –circumstances that may contribute to their differences in time spent with others. Never-married respondents also live with younger children than divorced respondents do. The sample in this study has a greater proportion of divorced females than never-married females. Divorced respondents are, on average, 16 years older than never-married respondents. There are a greater proportion of non-Hispanic white, and smaller proportion of black, Hispanic, and Asian divorcees. There are also more foreign born never-married respondents than foreign born divorcees. Divorced and never-married respondents do not differ significantly in levels of higher education, but divorcees have less household income than their never-married counterparts.

Multivariate Analysis for Group Size

Because divorced and never-married respondents differ on a number of variables that are apt to influence how they allocate their time, OLS multivariate regressions evaluate these implications

while controlling for various covariates. In the interest of parsimony, Table 3.2 summarize the divorce coefficients from successive models for three group sizes.

Table 3.2 OLS Coefficients (in Minutes Total) for Divorced by Group Size (N=47,145)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Diary Day	+ Time Demands	+ Household Composition	+ Controls	+ Age
Alone	103.29***	103.41***	75.61***	81.49***	-16.56***
+1 Person	-72.02***	-68.94***	-38.73***	-38.62***	ns.
+2 or More Persons	-48.91***	-47.89***	-14.78***	-16.06***	ns.

Note:

Diary day = weekend, holiday, season.

Time demands = work (minutes), school (minutes).

Household composition = #family, #non-family, #children, youngest child age.

Controls = sex, race, foreign born, education, household income.

ns.= not significant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

Despite the bivariate results, I find no support for the hypothesis that divorcees spend more time alone than never-married individuals do (H1) once key variables, particularly age, are controlled. As with the bivariate relationship between relationship status and time alone (Table 3.1), controlling only for diary day (Table 2, Model 1) shows divorcees spending more solitary time than never-marrieds. Divorced respondents spend 103 more minutes alone than never-married respondents do ($p < .001$). These findings hold when time demand measures are added in Model 2, but decrease to 76 minutes when household composition variables are added in Model 3. Control variables added in Model 4 increase the coefficient to 81 minutes. However, when age is controlled in Model 5, the relationship reverses. In the full model, divorcees spend 17 fewer minutes alone than the never-married do ($p < .001$). The analysis indicates that time alone is sensitive to age. Because divorcees are, on average, 16 years older than the never-married, they tend to have more solitary time.

I find a similar pattern for group size. Divorcees spend significantly less time in interactions involving one ($p < .001$) and two or more persons ($p < .001$), until age is controlled in Model 5. There is no significant difference in group sizes of one other person and two or more other persons in the full models. Once again, I find that age explains the change in association. Divorcees, who are older, spend more time alone than their younger never-married counterparts.

Multivariate Analysis for Co-Presence

Table 3.3 shows the divorce coefficient for the five models measuring each co-presence typology. I find no support for the hypothesis that divorcees spend more time alone with family than never-married persons do (H2). Divorced respondents spend an impressive 40 fewer minutes with kin than never-married respondents, controlling for whether the diary day falls on a weekend and/or holiday (Model 1; $p < .001$). The coefficient remains significant in Model 2 when time demand variables are added ($p < .001$). However, when the model accounts for household composition, the difference narrows as divorced respondents spend only six fewer minutes than never-married spend alone with family members. This is due to never-married respondents, on average, living with more family members than divorced respondents. The analysis (not shown) also finds that never-married respondents have fewer children in the household, which increases contact with kin. When controls for socio-demographic variables are added in Model 4, the difference between divorced and never-married respondents increases, but only to eight fewer minutes ($p < .001$). In model 5, which controls for age, I find no significant difference in the time divorced and never-married respondents spend with family.

Turning to persons outside the family, I find no support for the hypothesis that divorcees spend less time with non-family persons than never-married people do (H3). In Model 1, divorced respondents spend 72 fewer minutes on a typical day with non-family persons than

never-married respondents do ($p < .001$). The inclusion of time demand variables in Model 2 reduces the coefficient to 62 minutes ($p < .001$). Because never-married individuals are more likely to be sharing a household with non-kin, Model 3 controls for household composition. With household composition

Table 3.3 OLS Coefficients (in Minutes Total) for Divorced by Co-Presence Type (N=47,145)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Diary Day	+ Time Demands	+ Household Composition	+ Controls	+ Age
Family	-40.26***	-46.04***	-5.79**	-7.81***	ns.
Non-Family Persons	-72.33***	-61.59***	-44.81***	-43.67***	ns.
Family and Non-Family Persons	-8.34***	-9.20***	-2.91***	-3.20***	ns.

Note:

Diary day = weekend, holiday, season.

Time demands = work (minutes), school (minutes).

Household composition = #family, #non-family persons, #children, youngest child age.

Controls = sex, race, foreign born, education, household income.

ns.= not significant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

controlled, divorced respondents spend only 45 fewer minutes with non-family persons than never-married respondents do ($p < .001$). The coefficient holds steady when socio-demographic controls are added in Model 4. In the full model (Model 5), I find that age explains differences in minutes spent alone with non-family persons. Again, never-married respondents are, on average, younger than divorced respondents, and younger respondents are more likely to spend time with non-family persons.

I also find no support for the hypothesis that divorced individuals spend less time interacting with family and non-family together (H4). In the baseline model (Model 1), divorced respondents spend only eight fewer minutes together with family and non-family ($p < .001$). These findings hold when work and school minutes are taken into account (Model 2). Controlling for

household composition variables (Model 3), the difference reduces to three minutes ($p < .001$). In the Model 4, I find that socio-demographic characteristics do not explain this difference. However, when age is added in Model 5, there is no significant difference in the time divorced and never-married respondents spend with family and non-family together.

Further Analyses

Table 3.4 shows the full models measuring the co-presence of family, non-family, and family and non-family together. Respondents spend more time in all three co-presence types on the weekends than the weekdays. Not surprisingly, holidays appear to be the time devoted to family or family and friends together. More time is spent with family during the winter than the spring, but respondents spend more time with non-family in the spring and summer than the winter. Time in work and school-related activities is negatively associated with time with family as well as time together with family and non-family, but work and school are positively associated with time alone with non-family. Unsurprisingly, the number of family members in the household is positively related to time spent alone with family and with family and non-family together. Similarly, the more non-family persons there are living under one roof, the more time is spent with non-family, but also with family and non-family together. The number of children in the household, however, reduces time alone in all three co-presence types. Interestingly, the age of the youngest child is positively associated with family time and time with family and non-family together.

Turning to socio-demographic variables, women spend more time alone with family ($p < .001$) and family and non-family together ($p < .01$) than men do, but less time alone with non-family alone ($p < .001$). Compared to non-Hispanic whites, Hispanics spend more time alone with family ($p < .05$) and less time with non-family persons ($p < .05$). Blacks spend less time with non-

Table 3.4 OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=47,145)

Variable	Family	Non-Family	Family and Non-Family
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>
Divorced	-4.32 (2.64)	-4.44 (3.60)	1.71 (0.94)
<i>Diary day</i>			
Weekend	9.66*** (2.84)	10.19** (3.51)	8.88*** (1.21)
Holiday	49.97*** (13.42)	-29.83* (13.02)	27.26*** (7.52)
<i>Season</i>			
Spring	-7.25* (3.31)	10.98* (4.78)	-0.56 (1.36)
Summer	-5.80 (3.40)	13.94** (5.02)	0.39 (1.48)
Fall	-3.71 (3.39)	9.43 (5.02)	0.92 (1.41)
<i>Time demands</i>			
Work	-0.14*** (0.00)	0.10*** (0.01)	-0.02*** (0.00)
School	-0.17*** (0.01)	0.14*** (0.02)	-0.03*** (0.00)
<i>Household composition</i>			
#Family	37.88*** (1.32)	-2.90 (1.68)	4.25*** (0.50)
#Non-Family	-8.63*** (1.99)	63.98*** (4.49)	4.61*** (1.10)
#Children	-23.76*** (1.75)	-23.83*** (2.24)	-4.27*** (0.63)
Youngest Child Age	0.18 (0.30)	0.97* (0.42)	0.28* (0.12)
<i>Controls</i>			
Female	22.11*** (2.48)	-17.56*** (3.65)	2.83** (1.04)
<i>Race</i>			
Black	-4.85 (3.12)	-24.89*** (4.16)	-0.88 (1.19)
Hispanic	10.24* (4.15)	-12.93* (6.20)	3.49 (1.78)
Asian	10.19 (8.62)	4.85 (15.00)	-4.06 (2.63)
Other	13.44 (9.26)	-14.17 (12.66)	4.62 (4.69)
Foreign Born	-5.80	-12.69*	-4.92**

Table 3.4 OLS Models of Co-presence Minutes by Type (N=47,145; continued)

	(4.43)	(6.28)	(1.57)
Education			
High school	-1.61 (4.32)	7.52 (5.48)	3.51* (1.75)
Some college	-12.03** (4.26)	28.60*** (5.90)	-4.72** (1.81)
College	-8.48 (4.36)	22.79*** (6.14)	-2.19 (2.00)
Graduate degree	-15.28** (4.73)	34.57*** (8.07)	1.03 (2.39)
HH income			
\$20k to \$39,999	-1.62 (3.38)	7.73 (4.45)	2.74* (1.26)
\$40k to \$59,999	-13.31*** (3.80)	25.70*** (5.76)	3.97* (1.57)
\$60k to \$99,999	-12.94** (4.34)	33.52*** (6.03)	2.59 (1.68)
\$100k or more	-13.52* (5.67)	58.42*** (8.58)	3.25 (2.07)
Age	-0.22* (0.10)	-2.48*** (0.12)	-0.31*** (0.04)
Constant	115.37*** (7.18)	239.96*** (9.43)	24.34*** (2.84)

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$; two-tailed test.

family persons than their non-Hispanic white counterparts do ($p < .001$). Foreign born respondents spend less time with non-family persons ($p < .05$) and together with family and non-family persons ($p < .01$) than native born respondents do. Better educated individuals have less time for family members than less educated individuals do ($p < .001$). However, compared to less educated individuals, the higher educated spend more time with non-family persons ($p < .001$). Similarly for household income, compared to individuals in households earning less than \$20,000, those in households earning \$40,000 or more spend less time alone with family members, but more time alone with non-family persons. This is likely due to better educated and higher income earners

spending more time at work or in work-related activities. Even controlling for children in the household, age is negatively related to time spent in any of the three arrangements.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to reconcile the conflicting evidence on what we should expect to find when comparing the social worlds of divorcees and never-married persons. If marriage is socially isolating (Gerstel & Sarkisian, 2006), individuals who experience divorce should return to smaller social networks. If divorce emancipates individuals socially, then divorcees have greater freedom to explore relationships (Albeck & Kaydar, 2002), leading to larger social networks. If marital couples are living more “alone together” than in the past, spending time with their separate friends (Amato et al., 2007), then divorce should not affect access to and frequency of contact with the social others in their lives. Contrary to expectations of disrupted social lives, divorcees spend less time alone than those who never marry. Unexpectedly, findings show no significant difference between divorced and never-married individuals in the time spent with family members and with non-family persons.

However, differences in various characteristics of divorcees and never-married individuals play a role in how they spend their time. How much time one spends with others, however, appears to be more dependent on age than on marital status or other variables. Differences in time allocations between divorced and never-married individuals disappear once age is controlled. Never-married persons are younger than divorcees, and younger people have larger social networks (Carstensen, 2006) and spend more time with others (Cornwell, 2011a). Divorcees, being older than never-marrieds, generally spend more time alone. Some of the age effect can be understood in terms of age with other variables shaping social lives. There is a dominant part of age even when time demands and household composition are controlled;

however, as people grow older, regardless of marital status or other characteristics, they are likely to spend more time alone –a consequential fact for divorcees’ social world.

This study acknowledges that singlehood may have a history –people may have ended their marriage, have experienced their spouse’s death, or have yet to tie the knot. The study chooses to compare divorcees and never-married individuals to show how social worlds of singles differ between those who have married but ended this union and those who have yet to wed. If marriage constrains social networks and singlehood allows individuals to be independent and free to explore social relationships, divorce is a reentrance to the richer social world of singles. By contrasting the social time use of divorcees with those who have never-married, this study indirectly addresses the benefits and consequences of the trends of delayed union formation. Examining social worlds as an indication of the social support for divorcees is especially important, given research on the negative effects of marital disruption on emotional well-being (Williams & Uberson, 2004) and economic distress (Raz-Yurovich, 2013).

There are several limitations with this study that need to be considered. We take co-presence as a proxy for interaction, but the ATUS reports on co-presence do not measure interaction directly, rather those who are present. However, being in the same room captures the potential for interaction. Second, neither the CPS nor ATUS provide any information regarding the time since the previous marriage has ended or the number of previous marriages. Divorcees whose marriages ended more recently or have experienced multiple remarriages likely socialize differently than those whose marriages ended long ago or have only married once. Age, however, acts as an imperfect proxy for time since divorce.

This study cannot make causal claims. Although I argue that marital status influences social lives, social lives may be influencing marital status. The divorced may differ from the

never-married if only because they once entered marriage, suggesting perhaps more interest in dyadic relationships, lower preference for time alone and privacy, or less commitment to a social life organized around larger groups. Married persons who prefer time alone or in large groups may well be more likely to divorce, whereas divorcees who favor committed romantic relationships may remarry. Furthermore, some never-married singles may lack the social skills necessary to interact with others enough to form romantic unions.

Although there is heterogeneity among people who are single, this study finds no significant differences in the social worlds of divorced and never-married persons when age is taken into account. By recognizing differences in singlehood, this study is consistent with the notion that ending a marriage incurs fewer social costs than expected. It provides a better understanding of how divorcees navigate their lives with others when a previous partner is no longer available. These findings suggest that future time use research need to further disaggregate relationship status to identify the nuances of being unmarried.

CHAPTER 4

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this dissertation was to take another look at Gerstel and Sarkisian's "greedy institution" argument that marriage is an insular union in which couples devote most of their time to each other rather than family, friends, and the community. Using the American Time Use Survey 2003-2013, I contrast the time use of those married and cohabiting as well as divorced and never-married. The lives of married people may very well revolve around their partner. We know that many marital couples try to find time to spend together despite leading busier and busier lives (Jacobs & Gerson, 2001; Garhammer, 2004). We also know that married couples' time together is positively correlated with marital satisfaction (Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Orthner, 1975; Holman & Jacquart, 1988; Smith et al., 1988; Baldwin et al., 1999). What is unclear, however, is whether cohabitation, which functions like marriage in many respects, draws couples together in a similar fashion. I also compare divorcees with never-married persons. Without a co-residential partner, time is distributed to other social relationships. However, if marriages are partner-centric, divorcees and people who have yet to marry should differ in how much time is spent on social relationships and the kinds of social relationships they spend their time with. To measure the "greediness" of marriage, it is important to not only consider time spent with a partner, but also all relationships that are a part of a social world; the social ties with family and friends that are maintained with or without a partner present.

Aside from extending the "greedy institution" perspective to cohabitation, contrasting the social worlds of people in cohabitation versus marriage is compelling, because couples cohabit for diverse reasons. Some couples have very committed marriage-like relationships, but do not tie the knot –perhaps for pragmatic reasons or on ideological grounds (Reed, 2006). Other

couples cohabit out of financial or practical necessity or find the inertia of their relationship pulling them into co-residency (Manning & Smock, 2005). Other widely reported reasons couples cohabit are to spend more time with their partner (Rhoades et al., 2009) and to experience what it is like to be married (Brien et al., 2006). The closer cohabiters are to marrieds in the way they organize their social lives, the more likely it is that typical cohabiters share married people's commitment to an invested and permanent union.

Co-residential dating is also an appealing option for couples, because there are no socially agreed upon norms and expectations regarding the behavior of cohabiting partners (Cherlin, 2004). Differences in the social worlds of cohabiters and marrieds then might also speak to how cohabiting unions are "incompletely institutionalized" with fewer norms to determine time use patterns compared to marriage. Identifying the similarities or differences in time use between cohabiters and married persons will give us a better understanding of the motives behind cohabitation. The disparate intentions of cohabiters, and the fact that the roles within their relationship are not clearly defined, contribute to an antithetical characterization of couples in cohabitation. Cohabiting partners are described as having "looser bonds" than couples in marriage (Schoen & Weinick, 1993). To the extent that this true, analysis of who cohabiters surround themselves with, and if they include their partner, will tell us how time is dispersed when partners are less tied to one another. Having "looser bonds", cohabiting people might spend less time with their partner, but more with others, than married people do.

I also approach the "greedy institution" of marriage argument by focusing on differences in the time co-presence of divorced and never-married people. Although both statuses can be considered "single", the social world of divorcees is likely affected by the transition into and out of marriage. Differences between divorced and never-married persons in who time is spent with

should reflect these consequences. If marriage takes people away from their networks, then post-marriage social life could be markedly different compared to those who never married. Research has shown the negative effects of divorce on personal well-being (Williams & Uberson, 2004; Kalmijn & Monden, 2006). Because studies have noted the importance of maintaining social relationships (Putnam, 2000; Antonucci, 2001), analyses of time use comparing divorced and never-married persons can point to any negative social consequences of marriage and its dissolution. Compared to the never-married, who presumably do not experience discontinuity in growing and maintaining their social relationships, divorcees may find themselves with a weakened social network by virtue of marriage's "greedy" reduction of social ties and the network disruptions from divorce. Alternatively, if divorcees need more social support than never-married persons, they may actively seek others to make up for loss of resources from their spouse.

Without distinguishing between particular activities, chapter 1 looks broadly at total time and who it is spent with. Chapter 2 focuses squarely on leisure activities. Leisure is defined as activities that involve socializing, relaxing, sports, exercise, and recreation. Unlike many people we encounter in our day-to-day lives (e.g., coworkers), people generally choose voluntarily to spend their discretionary leisure time with others who make this time enjoyable. Because modern life is more harried, making free time scarcer, who people spend their leisure time with speaks to the relationships they want to invest in. Although this study makes this distinction between overall and leisure time, the findings are similar and only differ in effect size, thus I will discuss time generally unless leisure time is otherwise specified. Chapter 3 turns our attention to differences in the social worlds of divorced and never-married people.

Findings

Cohabitors spend *more* time alone with partners than their married counterparts do, which contradicts the hypothesis of marriage being particularly “greedy” of partners’ social time and calls into question the “looser bonds” perspective on cohabitation (Schoen & Weinick, 1993). Hypotheses and findings are summarized in Table 4.1. As beneficial as it is in terms of marital satisfaction and relationship maintenance for married couples to spend time, especially leisure time, alone together, cohabiting couples may well reap the same benefits for their relationships. Because research suggests that couples enter cohabitation to spend more time with their partner (Rhoades et al., 2009), there are two implications of this finding. First, cohabitation may in fact be a “trial marriage” for many couples; partners may use this period in their relationship to gather more information about each other before making a marital decision. Although many cohabiters have no clear plans about the direction of their relationship when they move in together, they still use intimate time alone together to explore their relationship. Second, while marriage may take people away from their family and friends, this does not necessarily mean that they redirect their energies to time alone with their partner. For example, the legally binding contract of marriage traditionally allows marital couples to specialize more so than cohabiters. Thus, one partner might devote more time to work in the home, while the other in paid employment in the workplace, leading to less time together.

The time cohabiters and married persons spend in other co-presence configurations only differ by a few minutes on a given day. In all likelihood, people do not maintain their social relationships with those living outside the household on a daily basis via face-to-face meetups. People might stay in contact online or through text messages and phone calls, which can sustain relationships between get-togethers. Although daily differences do not lend themselves to

unequivocal interpretations, taken as averages per day over time might lead to meaningful differences in these social relationships. At minimum, it appears that cohabiting relationships are just as “greedy” as marital ones.

Cohabitors spend slightly more total time and leisure-specific time as a couple with friends, neighbors, and coworkers. This finding aligns with the idea that cohabitation is a staging ground for marriage. Cohabitors can demonstrate their relationship commitment by merging their social worlds (Kalmijn, 2003). Spending time with a cohabiting partner and others together can raise the cost of exiting a cohabiting relationship, because couples become invested in each other’s friends. Friends’ active presence in the lives of cohabitors also allows them to monitor their partner (Treas & Giesen, 2004), which carries some value, given the instability of informal unions. If cohabitation is a “trial run” for marriage, others may be better at appraising the relationship’s potential and cohabitors may seek others’ approval of the match before getting married. However, the daily difference in cohabiting and married couples’ time with others is not large enough to decisively say that others play this role in cohabiting relationships.

Table 4.1 Hypothesis for Cohabiting Compared to Married Individuals for Total and Leisure Time Co-Presence

Co-Presence	Hypothesis	Total Time	Leisure Time
Partner	–	Not Supported	Not Supported
Family	+	Not Supported	Not Supported
Non-Family	+	Supported	Supported
Partner and Family	–	Supported	Supported
Partner and Non-Family	+	Supported	Supported

People have many social relationships that vary in levels of importance and meaningfulness. I speculated that while sharing friends and acquaintances may signify relationship commitment, spending time together with family may constitute an untenable

investment for uncertain relationships. The degree of seriousness in a romantic relationship can be measured by how much a partner is brought together with family members who generally have importance and permanence in kin's lives. Results from comparing the time cohabiting and married couples spend with family members are suggestive of this. Although cohabiting couples spend more time together with non-family persons, they spend less time together with family members. However, the differences are too small to suggest some sort of reluctance on the cohabiters' part to bring their partner around family. We also cannot say for certain that cohabiting partners are not brought into the same kin networks as married partners. There may be greater expectations for families to socialize with marital partners than cohabiting partners (Smock, 2000), but these norms at work are not evident here.

Compared to cohabitation, marriage is somewhat "greedier" when it comes to time apart from the partner. Although there is no significant difference in time spent alone with family members, cohabiters do appear to reserve slightly more overall solitary time as well as time (overall and leisure) for non-family persons without their partner present. Cohabiters find ways to moderate the risks in committed romantic relationships. They live together before marriage (Brien et al., 2006), handle their finances separately (Hiekel et al., 2014), and contribute equally to the household (Brines & Joyner, 1999). It is not obvious whether having time to oneself and socializing without a partner are insurance strategies against being too invested in the relationship should it not work out. Interestingly, the opportunity to spend alone time with other people may be better afforded to those in cohabiting relationships, because marital partners are expected to be the primary source of support for one another. The appeal of cohabitation is that it does not have the same constraints and sanctions as marriage, it is "incompletely institutionalized", and cohabiting couples can define their roles however they see fit (Cherlin,

2004). Despite these social advantages, how cohabiters manage their social relationships more or less fall in line with those in marriage.

Married couples are more similar on measures of age, race, and education than cohabiters are. Homogamy was expected to imply similar interests and, hence, increase opportunities for shared activities and social networks. However, the partner homogamy measures of age, race, and education do not prove to be important factors for social time use. Homogamy was not highly associated with co-presence categories that included the partner. Age differences do appear to matter for overall time with a partner. Larger age differences between partners reduce overall time spent alone and together with family members; they are positively related to time together with non-family, but do not have these effects on leisure time. For leisure time, couples who are homogamous on race and education actually spend less time together than partners who are dissimilar. Similar couples may have less need to pursue activities to gain information on their partner; they may find less utility in sharing leisure, because there is less to learn about each other. Net of respondent's race, partners who have the same race spend more leisure time as a couple with non-family persons than couples who are dissimilar, which suggests some social consequences for heterogamy. Because people are connected with those similar to themselves (McPherson, et al., 2001), couples who are different are likely to share differences with their partner's social network, which lead to less time socializing together with others.

Although it has been argued that cohabiting and married people conduct their day-to-day lives similarly (Manning & Smock, 2005; Goodwin et al., 2010), past research has shown that cohabiters and married persons differ on a number of characteristics. These differences have implications for time use. Cohabiters are younger than married persons, and age is a major determinant of who people spend their time with. The young have larger social networks than the

old (Carstensen, 2006), which explains, in part, the age differences in time with the partner and overall time alone. Because cohabiters are younger, they may spend most of their day surrounded by others, either family or non-family, rather than alone with their partner or to themselves. Age has more of an impact on solitary time or time alone with a partner than it does on any other co-presence category.

Research has noted the conflict between work demands and free time, which often results in less time for couples to spend together (Hamermesh, 2002). Cohabiting couples have greater work demands compared to married couples, which reduce the time they have to spend together, especially discretionary time. Because cohabitation is an informal union, there is greater risk in having a specialized household where one partner does paid work, while the other does domestic unpaid labor. Marriage, on the other hand, better allows for this interdependency between partners, because of legal agreements that protect husbands and wives financially should their union dissolve (Ono & Yeilding, 2008). By contrast, cohabiters lead more separate lives. They are more likely to have separate bank accounts (Hiekel et al., 2014) and contribute to the household income equally (Brines & Joyner, 1999). The cultural expectations for married people –being self-sufficient and able to support themselves (Cherlin, 2004) –may also push cohabiting couples who want to get married to focus on their careers to reach financial stability and be marriage-ready.

Parenthood especially affects leisure patterns and practices. Cohabiting couples have, on average, fewer children in the household than married couples do. This allows cohabiters to spend less overall time alone together, presumably because they are less tied to the household by parenting responsibilities and better able to socialize with others. Children require care and demand child-related household labor (Sayer, 2005), which create more opportunities for parents

to spend alone time together in the home without other adults. Turning to leisure time, cohabiters, having fewer children, have more solitary leisure and share more leisure time alone as a couple. Children, especially when they are young, make greater demands on parents, which come at the expense of leisure time (Bittman & Wacjman, 2000). Furthermore, parents' leisure is becoming more child-oriented. Much of parents' free time is spent attending, supervising, and facilitating children's activities (Mattingly & Bianchi, 2003). Interestingly, the presence of children impacts cohabiter's solitary leisure time more so than overall time alone. As mentioned above, cohabiters are younger, and younger persons are more likely to be around others in their daily activities. However, when it comes to individual discretionary pursuits, which cohabiters have more of than marrieds, children become a hindrance.

Chapter 3 applied the implications of the "greedy institution" of marriage to the social world of divorcees. Hypotheses and findings are summarized in Table 4.2. Compared to another population of singles, never-married persons, divorcees have less solitary time on an average day, but there is no difference in the time respondents' spend alone with others, either family or non-family. This was an unexpected finding. Gerstel and Sarkisian's assertion that marriage is socially isolating suggests divorcees, having turned away from friends and family in marriage, will have weaker social ties post-marriage. Running counter to Dutch studies suggesting that smaller social networks are a by-product of divorce (Kalmijn, 2006; Terhell et al., 2004), I found no difference in the time divorcees and never-married persons spend in larger groups. Divorced people may seek the support of others in anticipation of or following the traumatic event of a marital break-up in order to compensate for the loss of their partners' company. Of course, causal direction is unclear, because of selection out of marriage into divorce. Insufficient time devoted solely towards the marital partner can lead to separation as indicated by the positive

correlation between time together and marital satisfaction (Burgess & Cottrell, 1939; Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Orthner, 1975; Holman & Jacquart, 1988; Smith et al., 1988; Baldwin et al., 1999). Divorce may also be socially liberating as suggested by Albeck and Kaydar (2002). Another explanation as to why there are no significant differences for divorced and never-married persons is that married couples are living more independently of each other today than in the past (Amato et al., 2007) making divorce less socially detrimental.

Table 4.2 Hypothesis for Divorced Compared to Never-Married Individuals for Total Time Co-Presence

Co-Presence	Hypothesis	Total Time
Alone	+	Not Supported
Family	+	Not Supported
Non-Family	-	Not Supported
Family Members and Non-Family	-	Not Supported

Who are divorcees spending time with if they spend less time alone than never-marrieds and there are no significant differences in co-presence? Interestingly, the social world of divorcees appear to orbit around their children (Appendix C). Even controlling for household composition and presence of children, divorcees spend more time alone with their children, and with children and others, than never-married persons do. Single-parent households that are a result of divorce may draw in more kin support than households with children born out of marriage. Research has shown that children are affected more negatively by transitions from a two-parent to single-parent household than by just being born into the latter (Amato, 2010), which suggests that divorcees may turn to others for support. Marital dissolution may be a distress signal to others in one's social world and activate latent kin networks, thus, creating more opportunities for outside family members to be involved socially (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006). Because non-family networks are bigger than family networks (Cable et al., 2012),

friends may also be called upon for assistance. Having not experienced divorce, never-married people may be better adjusted to being a single-parent. Nevertheless, I find divorcees, more often than never-marrieds, have their children in tow when spending time with others.

As with the previous analyses comparing cohabiters and marrieds, factors associated with relationship status play a role in time use. Household composition explains differences in who divorcees and never-married people spend their time with. Never-married people have fewer children and live with more family members than divorcees, which leads never-married people to spend less time with children and family members together. Similarly, differences in time spent with children and non-family persons can be attributed to divorcees having fewer children and living with fewer non-family persons. However, the findings seem to suggest that divorcees spend less time with their children in the presence of others who they are not related to. The age difference between divorcees and never-married people offers some explanation as to how time is allocated. Because divorcees tend to be older, they spend more time alone and less time alone with others than never-married people do. This is consistent with the general influence of age on time use—as people get older, their social groups get smaller (Carstensen, 2006).

Limitations

There are several limitations with this study that need to be considered. The ATUS reports on co-presence are measures of who was around when an activity took place and does not measure engagement. Actual social interaction during co-presence would measure the quality of time and importance of others. In addition to being unable to determine the quality of time spent together, this may be problematic because respondents living in smaller homes may be recorded as spending more time with others. Larger homes not only allow for more privacy, but can also accommodate spending time with more people. Unfortunately, the CPS housing type variable

aggregates house and apartment into a single category and does not report on the number of rooms or size of the unit. Although co-presence might not adequately measure interaction, it still gives us a sense of respondents' social world, that is, who they encounter on an average day.

Neither the CPS nor ATUS distinguish between long-term and recently formed relationships. There is also a need to account for the duration of marriage and cohabiting relationships as well as time since divorce when dealing with time allocated towards a partner or others. Couples in newer co-residential relationships may be spending more time together than couples in long established relationships, especially in leisure activities, and any effect of divorce on social lives likely dissipates over time. In the same vein, relationship history is likely to influence how people dedicate their time to others. The time use patterns of couples who had cohabited prior to marriage are likely different than couples who enter marriage directly. People who have experienced many cohabitations may be more reluctant to become too dependent on a partner (or encourage dependence in others), or those who divorced several times may be less likely to receive support from others. Knowing how long respondents have been divorced and their union history may lead to key differences in how they socialize compared to those who only had one marriage. At best, we are only able to control for age, which is an imperfect proxy for time since divorce.

In addition, sample and coding considerations need to be evaluated for future analysis. Restricting the age of the sample to respondents 65 years or younger may be more appropriate when comparing marital status and social worlds. Respondents who are employed likely have more responsibilities, a greater need to be connected with others, and more active social relationships than those who are retired. Health problems of older adults may constrain their social interactions. Because marital status is indirectly tied with age, placing a lower ceiling on

age will address the oversampling of older married people and divorcees. In the analysis of cohabiters and married respondents, educational homogamy needs to be more nuanced, rather than a dichotomous measure of difference. The CPS recorded the educational attainment of the respondent and his or her partner. However, several primary school years are aggregated into single categories and higher education levels show degrees earned rather than years in school. This coding makes it difficult to accurately determine differences in education between partners. Instead, coding respondents and partners as either both having less than a high school education or both more than a high school education was used to measure extreme cases of heterogamy.

In addition to analytic concerns with measurement, there are also limits to the inferences, which can be drawn from this study. This dissertation provides the foundation for future research on social worlds, but additional studies need to recognize the unobserved heterogeneity within marital status. For some couples, cohabitation is simply a temporary arrangement, while other couples are more committed and may see their relationship as a step towards marriage. Although some studies ask cohabiters about their intention to marry, the ATUS does not have this sort of information. Thus, the cohabiting category contains people with unions that share more in common with committed married relations as well as unions that exemplify “looser bonds” of casual, uncommitted, and expedient unions. These unobserved differences likely influence the couple relationship and its ties to others –perhaps cancelling out genuine influences of cohabiting unions on social worlds. Similarly, there is no doubt unobserved heterogeneity among the divorced. For instance, information on whether divorce was initiated by the respondent or by his or her former partner might tell us which respondents escape marriage for wider social pastures and which, being forced out of a union, require greater social support.

Another challenge to inference, especially causal attribution, comes from selection. Marriage and cohabitation draw in different types of people. People are selected into marriage based on many factors (e.g., education, income, and health), the most consequential of which to social independence and time with others may be the desire to settle down and start a family. People who are not quite at this point in their lives might enter cohabitation to reserve some personal autonomy. While longitudinal data will not completely resolve the problems of causal inference, the lack of ATUS data before and after union formation complicates attributing causal status in social time use to being married or cohabiting. Adding another point of comparison – married people – to the study of divorced might clarify some issues, but many problems remain.

Discussion

In summary, the previous chapters comparing people with different relationship statuses show mixed support for Gerstel and Sarkisian's claim that marriage is a "greedy institution" that isolates people from their family, friends, and community. Cohabitation, which may or may not lead to a walk down the aisle, demands more individual attention from a partner than the established relationships of marriage. Regardless of where a person stands with their partner, or whether they have one currently or previously, contact with family ties remain relatively consistent. If anything, marriage is "greediest" when it comes to spending time with those outside of one's kin relationships. Marriage is a time-intensive endeavor. Efficiently running a marital household, which often involves some form of specialization between partners, can present difficulties for marital couples in finding some time for each other, let alone others. Marriage reorients people's focus towards kin as a whole, their partner and extended family members. Cohabitation, on the other hand, is exploratory not only in romantic relationships, but

in personal relationships as well. The social world of divorcees appear to recover from marriage, at least when compared to never-marrieds.

Although cohabitation and marriage are similar in many ways (Waite & Gallagher, 2000), differences in their social worlds have us reevaluate whether cohabitation is a threat to marriage. In fact, spending more time with a partner before a legal commitment would ultimately be beneficial to the institution of marriage. Cohabiting couples get to know one another before deciding to get married, or having already decided to wed, use this opportunity to pool their income or share living arrangements in preparation. Given the increased role of friends in people's everyday life (Collins & Madsen, 2006; Milevsky, 2005), meshing social worlds may very well be a part of the courtship process. Friends can offer their approval or disapproval and appraise the quality of their friends' relationships. Thus, concerns over the rise in singlehood, cohabitation, and age of first marriage may also be overblown if delays in partnering are due to not finding an adequate match. Vetting potential marital partners either through dating or cohabitation may be more important now than in the past. Divorce is becoming a more common life event and it takes a toll on the social well-being of those who experience it (Fischer, et al., 2005). Even those who are married are deriving less personal satisfaction in their relationship. Glenn (2005) found that the proportion of people who reported being very happy in marriage declined by 20% from 1973 to 2002, which suggests that matrimony may no longer be a source of happiness. However, most people still want to get married (Cherlin, 2009). Because people have a strong attachment to marriage, detours on the pathway towards marriage do speak to the greater level of commitment required of marriage.

How people construct their social world may have more to do with age than relationship status. In fact, differences between divorced and never-married individuals were seen often to

disappear when age was controlled. Age is associated with relationship status; younger people may have yet to marry and are more likely to cohabit, whereas older people are more likely to be married or divorced. As discussed in chapter 3, as people age they become more particular about who they spend their time with. There are also several aspects to being older that lead to smaller social networks, such as fewer social roles, health problems, and a weaker desire to expand social groups. Married people, more so than cohabiters, are in a stage in their life course where these factors harmonize well with the “greedy institution” thesis. Peripheral and friendship ties weaken, and partner and family ties become more prominent. The influence of age on social world is especially apparent in comparisons between divorcees and never-married persons. Emerging adults who have yet to marry explore romance, career opportunities, and their personal identity, which is conducive to expanding and developing social relationships. Divorcees, on the other hand, have already graduated from this period in their lives and have fewer opportunities to revamp their social world.

It is also important to recognize that people are a part of the social world of others. Friends not only share many similar characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors (McPherson, et al., 2001), but they may also have similar marital statuses (Kalmijn & Vermunt, 2007). There are several reasons as to why people of the same marital status might congregate together. They might be drawn to the same social settings, such as night clubs or bars, which are more favorable to singles than people in relationships. There might also be preferences to confide in a person of the same marital status. For example, newlyweds might turn to married couples for guidance in managing a household, whereas singles might speak with other singles about dating advice. Social relationships might also influence romantic relationships. People with married friends might feel pressured to marry, cohabitation or divorce becomes more acceptable when others you

know are doing it, and singles might stay single longer if they have single friends to socialize with. Because married people likely have married friends, they may find it difficult to coordinate time together, than say, single people and their single friends. Thus, changes in marital status can put peers on different tracks along the life course. Married people may be less connected to friends who have yet tied the knot, and singles may feel alienated from their married friends.

REFERENCES

- Albeck, S., & Kaydar, D. (2002). Divorced mothers: Their network of friends pre- and post-divorce. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 36, 111-138. doi:10.1300/J087v36n03_07
- Amato, P. R. (2004). Tension between institutional and individual views of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 959-965. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00065.x
- . (2010). Research on divorce: Continuing trends and new developments. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 650-666. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00723.x
- Amato, P. R., Booth, A., Johnson, D. R., & Rogers, S. J. (2007). *Alone together: How marriage in America is changing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anjouch, K. J., Blandon, A. Y., & Antonucci, T. C. (2005). Social networks among men and women: The effects of age and socioeconomic status. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychology Sciences and Social Sciences*, 60, S311-S317.
doi:10.1093/geronb/60.6.S311
- Antonucci, T. C. (2001). Social relations: An examination of social networks, social support and sense of control. In J. E. Birren, K. W. Schaie, & R. P. Abeles (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of aging* (pp. 427-453). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Arber, S. (2004). Gender, marital status, and ageing: Linking material, health, and social resources. *Journal of Aging Studies*, 18(1), 91-108. doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2003.09.007
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480.
doi:10.1037//0003-066X.55.5.469
- Attias-Donfut, C. (2000). Cultural and economic transfers between generations: One aspect of age integration. *The Gerontologist*, 40(3), 270-272. doi:10.1093/geront/40.3.270

- Baldwin, J. H., Ellis, G. D., & Baldwin, B. M. (1999). Marital satisfaction: An examination of its relationship to spouse support and congruence of commitment among runners. *Leisure Sciences*, 21(2), 117-131. doi:10.1080/014904099273183
- Barnet-Verzat, C., Pailhe, A., & Solaz, A. (2011). Spending time together: The impact of children on couples' leisure synchronization. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 9(4), 465-486. doi:10.1007/s11150-010-9112-3
- Barrett, A. E. (1999). Social support and life satisfaction among never married: Examining the effects of age. *Research on Aging*, 21(1), 46-72. doi:10.1177/0164027599211003
- Baxter, J. (2005). To marry or not to marry: Marital status and the household division of labor. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(3), 300-321. doi:10.1177/0192513X04270473
- Beaujot, R. P., & Anderson, R. (2007). Time-crunch: Impact of time spent in paid and unpaid work, and its division in families. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 32(3), 295-315. doi:2307/20460645
- Bengston, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of intergenerational bonds. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 1-16. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00001.x
- Bianchi, S. M. (2011). Family change and time allocation in American families. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 638(1), 21-44. doi:10.1177/0002716211413731
- Bianchi S. M., & Raley, S. (2005). Time allocation in working families. In S. M. Bianchi, L. M. Casper, & R. B. King (Eds.), *Work, family, health, and well-being* (pp. 21-42). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

- Bittman, M., & Wacjman, J. (2000). The rush hour: The character of leisure time and gender equity. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 165-189. doi:10.2307/2675568
- Blackwell, D. L., & Lichter, D. T. (2000). Mate selection among married and cohabiting couples. *Journal of Family Issues*, 21(3), 275-302. doi:10.1177/019251300021003001
- Blekesaune, M. (2005). Working conditions and time use. *Acta Sociologica*, 48(4), 308-320. doi:10.1177/0001699305059944
- Blieszner, R., & Roberto, K. A. (2004). Friendship across the life span: Reciprocity in individual relationship development. In F. Lang & K. L. Fingerman (Eds.), *Growing together: Personal relationships across the life span* (pp. 159-182). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bost, K. K., Cox, M. J., Burchinal, M. R., & Payne, C. (2002). Structural and supportive changes in couples' family and friendship networks across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 64(2), 517-531. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00517.x
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 83-95). New York, NY: Greenwood.
- Bradbury, K., & Katz, J. (2002). Women's labor market involvement and family income mobility when marriages end. *New England Economic Review*, Q4, 41-47.
- Bramlett, M. D., & Mosher, W. D. (2002). Cohabitation, marriage, divorce, and remarriage in the United States. *National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Statistics*, 23(22), 1-103.

- Brien, M. J., Lillard, L. A., & Stern, S. (2006). Cohabitation, marriage, and divorce in a model of match quality. *International Economic Review*, 47(2), 451-494.
doi:10.1111/j.1468-2354.2006.00385.x
- Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 64(3), 333-355. doi:10.2307/2657490
- Brown, S. L. (2000). Union transitions among cohabitators: The significance of relationship assessments and expectations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(3), 833-846.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00833.x
- Brown, S. L., Lee, G. R., & Bulanda, J. R. (2006). Cohabitation among older adults: A national portrait. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B, Psychological and Social Sciences*, 61(2), S71-79. doi:10.1093/geronb/61.2.S71
- Bumpass, L., & Lu, H.-H. (2000). Trends in cohabitation and implications for children's family contexts in the U.S. *Population Studies*, 54, 29-41. doi:10.1080/713779060
- Burgess, E. W., & Cottrell, L. S. (1939). *Predicting success or failure in marriage*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.
- Burgess, E. W., & Locke, H. J. (1945). *The family: From institution to companionship*. New York, NY: American Book Company.
- Cable, N., Bartley, M., Chandola, T., & Sacker, A. (2012). Friends are equally important to men and women, but family matters more for men's well-being. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 67(2), 166-171. doi:10.1136/jech-2012-201113
- Caldwell, L. L. (2005). Leisure and health: Why is leisure therapeutic? *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling*, 33, 7-26. doi:10.1080/03069880412331335939

- Carlson, M. J., & Furstenberg, F. F. (2006). The prevalence and correlates of multipartnered fertility among urban U.S. parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(3), 718-732. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00285.x
- Carstensen, L. L. (2006). The influence of a sense of time on human development. *Science*, 312(5782), 1913-1915. doi:10.1126/science.1127488
- Carstensen, L. L., Isaacowitz, D., & Charles, S. T. (1999). Taking time seriously: A theory of socioemotional selectivity. *American Psychologist*, 54(3), 165-181. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.54.3.165
- Cherlin, A. J. (2000). Demographic trends in the United States: A review of research in the 2000s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 403-419. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00710.x
- . (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 848-861. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00058.x
- . (2009). The origins of the ambivalent acceptance of divorce. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(2), 226-229. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00593.x
- Claxton, A., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2008). No fun anymore: Leisure and marital quality across the transition to parenthood. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(1), 28-43. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00459.x
- Cohn, D., Passel, J. S., Wang, W., & Livingston, G. (2011). New marriages down 5% from 2009 to 2010: Barely half of U.S. adults are married—a record low. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

- Collins, J. S., & Madsen, S. D. (2006). Personal relationships in adolescence and early adulthood. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Pettman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 191-209). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Connidis, I. A. (2001). *Family ties and aging*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Copen, C. E., Daniels, K., & Mosher, W. D. (2013). First premarital cohabitation in the United States: 2006-2010 National Survey of Family and Growth. *National Health Statistics Reports*, 64. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr064.pdf>
- Copen, C. E., Daniels, K., Vespa, J., & Mosher, W. D. (2012). First marriages in the United States: Data from the 2006-2010 National Survey of Family and Growth. *National Health Statistics Reports*, 49. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr049.pdf>
- Cornwell, B. (2009). Good health and the bridging of structural holes. *Social Networks*, 31(1), 92-103. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2008.10.005
- . (2011a). Age trends in daily social contact patterns. *Research on Aging*, 33(5), 598-631. doi:10.1177/0164027511409442
- . (2011b). Independence through social networks: Bridging potential among older women and men. *The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychology Sciences and Social Sciences*, 66, 782-794. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbr111
- Cornwell, B., Laumann, E. O., & Schumm, L. P. (2008). The social connectedness of older adults: a national profile. *American Sociological Review*, 73(2), 185-310. doi:10.1177/000312240807300201
- Cragg, J. G. (1971). Some statistical models for limited dependent variables with application to the demand for durable goods. *Econometrica*, 39(5), 829-844. doi:10.2307/1909582

- Craig, L., & Brown, J. E. (2014). Weekend work and leisure time with family and friends: Who misses out? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(4), 710-727. doi:10.1111/jomf.12127
- Daunfeldt, S.-O., & Hellstrom, J. (2007). Intra-household allocation of time to household production activities: Evidence from Swedish household data. *Labour*, 21(2), 189-207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9914.2007.00376.x
- Dehle, C., Larsen, D., & Landers, J. E. (2001). Social support in marriage. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 29, 307-324. doi:10.1080/01926180126500
- Demir, M., & Weitekamp, L. A. (2007). I am so happy 'cause today I found my friend: Friendship and personality as predictors of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 8(2), 181-211. doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9012-7
- DePaulo, B. M. (2006). *Singled out: How singles are stereotyped, stigmatized, and ignored, and still live happily ever after*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Morris, W. L. (2005). Singles in society and in science. *Psychological Inquiry*, 16(2/3), 57-83. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2005.9682918
- Doherty, N. A., & Feeney, J. A. (2004). The composition of attachment networks throughout the adult years. *Personal Relationships*, 11(4), 469-488. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2004.00093.x
- Duran-Aydintug, C. (1998). Emotional support during separation: Its sources and determinants. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 29(3-4), 131-141. doi:10.1300/J087v29n03_08
- Fein, D. J. (2009). Spending time together: Time use estimates for economically disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged married couples in the United States. MDRC, Working Paper.

- Fields, J., & Casper, L. (2001). America's families and living arrangements: Population characteristics. Current Population Reports, P20-537. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Fingerman, K. L. (2009). Consequential strangers and peripheral ties: The importance of unimportant relationships. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 1(2), 69-86.
doi:10.1111/j.1756-2589.2009.00010.x
- Fischer, T. F. C., De Graff, P. M., & Kalmijn, M. (2005). Friendly and antagonistic contact between former spouses after divorce patterns and determinants. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(8), 1131-1163. doi:10.1177/0192513X05275435
- Fokkema, T., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2008) Trends in living arrangements in Europe: Convergence or divergence? *Demographic Research*, 19(36), 1351-1418.
doi:10.4054/DemRes.2008.19.36
- Foster, G., & Kalenkoski, C. M. (2010). The multitasking of household production. IZA Discussion Paper No. 4845.
- Fry, R. (2013). A rising share of young adults live in their parents' home: A record 21.6 million in 2012. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Garhammer, M. (2004). 'Time pressure and quality of life'. Paper presented at the International Workshop on Time Competition, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, June 24-25.
- Gershuny, J. (2000). *Changing times: Work and leisure in postindustrial society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . (2005). What do we do in post-industrial society? The nature of work and leisure time in the 21st century. Institute for Social Economic Research, Working Paper.

- Gerstel, N. (2000). The third shift: Gender, employment, and care work outside the home. *Qualitative Sociology*, 23(4), 467-483. doi:10.1023/A:1005530909739
- Gerstel, N., & Sarkisian, N. (2006). Marriage: The good, the bad, and the greedy. *Contexts*, 5(4), 16-21. doi:10.1525/ctx.2006.5.4.16
- Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Glenn, N. D. (2005). *With this ring: A national survey on marriage in America*. National Fatherhood Organization. Gaithersburg, MD.
- Glorieux, I., Minnen, J., & van Tienoven, T. P. (2011). Spouse “together time”: Quality time within the household. *Social Indicators Research*, 101, 281-287.
doi:10.1007/s11205-010-9648-x
- Goodwin, P. Y., Mosher, W. D., & Chandra, A. (2010). Marriage and cohabitation in the United States: A statistical portrait based on cycle 6 (2002) of the National Survey of Family Growth. *Vital and Health Statistics*, 23(28), 1-47.
- Gronau, R. (1977). Leisure, home production and work –the theory of allocation of time revisited. *Journal of Political Economy*, 85(6), 1099-1123. doi:10.1086/260629
- Guzzo, K. B. (2009). Marital intentions and the stability of first cohabitations. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30, 179-205. doi:10.1177/0192513X08323694
- Halberg, D. (2003). Synchronous leisure, jointness and household labor supply. *Labour Economics*, 10(2), 185-203. doi:10.1016/S0927-5371(03)00006-X
- Hamermesh, D. S. (2000). Togetherness: Spouses’ synchronous leisure, and the impact of children. NBER, Working Paper.
- . (2002). Timing, togetherness and time windfalls. *Journal of Population Economics*, 15(4), 601-623. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-55573-2_1

- Hiekel, N., Liefbroer, A. C., & Poortman, A.-R. (2014). Income pooling strategies among cohabiting and married couples. *Demographic Research*, 30(55), 1527-1560.
doi:10.4054/DemRes.2014.30.55
- Holman, T. B., & Jacquart, M. (1988). Leisure-activity patterns and marital satisfaction: A further test. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(1), 60-77. doi:10.2307/352428
- Iso-Ahola, S. E., & Weissinger, E. (1990). Perceptions of boredom in leisure: Conceptualization, reliability and validity of the leisure boredom scale. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 22(1), 1-17. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.052
- Jacobs, J. A., & Gerson, K. (2001). Overworked individuals or overworked families: Explaining trends in work, leisure, and family time. *Work and Occupations*, 28(1), 40-63.
doi:10.1177/0730888401028001004
- Jenkins, S. P., & Osberg, L. (2003). Nobody to play with? The implications of leisure coordination. IZA Discussion Paper No. 850.
- Johnson, M. P., & Leslie, L. (1982). Couple involvement and network structure: A test of the dyadic withdrawal hypothesis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 45(1), 34-43.
doi:10.2307/3033672
- Joyce, M., & Stewart, J. (1999). What can we learn from time use data? *Monthly Labor Review*, 122, 3-6.
- Kalenkoski, C. M., Hamrick, K. S., & Andrews, M. (2011). Time poverty thresholds and rates for the US population. *Social Indicators Research*, 104, 129-155.
doi:10.1007/s11205-010-9732-2

- Kalenkoski, C. M., Ribar, D. C., & Stratton, L. S. (2005). Parental child care in single-parent, cohabiting, and married-couple families: Time-diary evidence from the United Kingdom. *American Economic Review*, 95(2), 194-198. doi:10.1257/000282805774670176
- Kalmijn, M. (2003). Shared friendship networks and the life course: An analysis of survey data on married and cohabiting couples. *Social Networks*, 25(3), 231-249. doi:10.1016/S0378-8733(03)00010-8
- . (2005). The effects of divorce on men's employment and social security histories. *European Journal of Population*, 21(4), 347-366. doi:10.1007/s10680-005-0200-7
- . (2006). Educational inequality and family relationships: Influences on contacts and proximity. *European Sociological Review*, 22(1), 1-16. doi:10.1093/esr/jci036
- . (2012). Longitudinal analyses of the effects of age, marriage, and parenthood on social contacts and support. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 17(4), 177-190. doi:10.1016/j.alcr.2012.08.002
- Kalmijn, M., & Bernasco, W. (2001). Joint and separated lifestyles in couple relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(3), 639-654. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00639.x
- Kalmijn, M., & Moden, C. W. S. (2006). Are the negative effects of divorce on well-being dependent on marital quality? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(5), 1197-1213. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00323.x
- Kalmijn, M., & Vermunt, J. K. (2007). Homogeneity of social networks by age and marital status: A multilevel analysis of ego-centered networks. *Social Networks*, 29(1), 25-43. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2005.11.008
- Kamp Dush, C. M., & Amato, P. R. (2005). Consequences of relationship status and quality for subjective well-being. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22, 607-627.

doi:10.1177/0265407505056438

Kennedy, S., & Bumpass, L. L. (2011). Cohabitation and trends in the structure and stability of children's lives. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Population Association of America, Washington, DC, March 31 – April 2.

Kim, H. J., & Stiff, J. B. (1991). Social networks and the development of close relationships. *Human Communication Research*, 18(1), 70-91.

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1991.tb00529.x

Kimmel, J., & Connelly, R. (2007). Mothers' time choices in the United States: Caregiving, leisure, home production, and paid work. *Journal of Human Resources*, 42(3), 643-681.

doi: 10.3368/jhr.XLII.3.643

King, V., & Scott, M. E. (2005). A comparison of cohabiting relationships among older and younger adults. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 271-285.

doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2005.00115.x

Kraaykamp, G., van Gils, W., & van der Lippe, T. (2009). Working status and leisure: An analysis of the trade-off between solitary and social time. *Time & Society*, 18(2-3), 264-283. doi:10.1177/0961463X09337845

Kreider, R. M. (2010). Increase in opposite-sex cohabiting couples from 2009 to 2010 in the Annual Social and Economic Supplement (ASEC) to the Current Population Survey (CPS) U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division; Washington, DC.

Kreider, R. M., & Ellis, R. (2011). Living arrangements of children: 2009. Current Population Reports. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

- Kroeger, R. A., & Smock, P. J. (2014). Cohabitation: Recent research and implications. In J. K. Treas, J. Scott, & M. Richards (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to the sociology of families* (pp. 217-235). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Lee, Y. G., & Bhargava, V. (2004). Leisure time: Do married and single individuals spend it differently. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 32(3), 254-274.
doi:10.1177/1077727X03261631
- Liebler, C. A., & Sandefur, G. D. (2002). Gender differences in the exchange of social support with friends, neighbors, and co-workers at midlife. *Social Science Research*, 31(3), 364-391. doi:10.1016/S0049-089X(02)00006-6
- Lin, T.-F., & Schmidt, P. (1984). A test of the Tobit specification against an alternative suggested by Cragg. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 66(1), 174-177.
doi:10.2307/1924712
- Livingston, K. (2014). Four-in-ten couples are saying “I do,” again: Growing number of adults have remarried. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2002). First comes cohabitation and then comes marriage? A research note. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(8), 1065-1087.
doi:10.1177/019251302237303
- . (2005). Measuring and modeling cohabitation: New perspectives from qualitative data. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(4), 989-1002.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00189.x
- Mattingly, M. J., & Bianchi, S. M. (2003). Gender differences in the quantity and quality of free time: The U.S. experience. *Social Forces*, 81(3), 999-1030.
doi:10.1353/sof.2003.0036

- Mattingly, M. J., & Sayer, L. C. (2006). Under pressure: Gender differences in the relationship between free time and feeling rushed. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(1), 205-221. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00242.x
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Brashears, M. E. (2006). Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review*, 71(3), 353-375. doi:10.1177/000312240607100301
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), 415-444. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc. 27.1.415
- Milardo, R. M. (1982). Changes in social networks of women and men following divorce: A review. *Journal of Family Issues*, 8(1), 78-96. doi:10.1177/019251387008001004
- Milardo, R. M., & Allan, G. (2000). Social Networks and Marital Relationships. In R. M. Milardo & S. Ducks (Eds.), *Families as relationships* (pp. 117-134). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Milevsky, A. (2005). Compensatory patterns of sibling support in emerging adulthood: Variations in loneliness, self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(6), 743-755. doi:10.1177/0265407505056447
- Milkie, M. A., Mattingly, M. J., Nomaguchi, K. M., Bianchi, S. M., & Robinson, J. P. (2004). The time squeeze: Parental statuses and feelings about time with children. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(3), 739-761. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00050.x
- Mueller, R. (2005). The effect of marital dissolution on the labour supply of males and females: Evidence from Canada. *Social Science Research Network*, Scholarly Paper.

- Musick, K., & Bumpass, L. (2012). Reexamining the case for marriage: Union formation and changes in well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(1), 1-18.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00873.x
- Nomaguchi, K. M., & Milkie, M. A. (2003). Costs and rewards of children: The effects of becoming a parent on adults' lives. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(2), 356-374.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00356.x
- Ono, H. (2005). Marital history homogamy between the divorced and the never married among non-Hispanic whites. *Social Science Research*, 34(2), 333-356.
doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.04.002
- Ono, H., & Yeilding, R. (2008). Marriage, cohabitation and childcare: The US and Sweden. *Social Indicators Research*, 93, 137-140. doi:10.1007/s11205-008-9417-2
- Orthner, D. K. (1975). Leisure activity patterns and marital satisfaction over the marital career. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37(1), 91-102. doi:10.2307/351033
- Parks, M. R., Stan, C. M., & Eggert, L. L. (1983). Romantic involvement and social network involvement. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 46(2), 116-131. doi:10.2307/3033848
- Pinquart, M. (2003). Loneliness in married, widowed, divorced, and never-married older adults. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20(1), 31-53.
doi:10.1177/02654075030201002
- Poortman, A.-R., & Mills, M. (2012). Investments in marriage and cohabitation: The role of legal and interpersonal commitment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(2), 357-376.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00954.x
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

- Raz-Yurovich, L. (2013). Divorce penalty or divorce premium? A longitudinal analysis of the consequences of divorce for men's and women's economic activity. *European Sociological Review*, 29(2), 373-385. doi:10.1093/esr/jcr073
- Reed, J. (2006). Not crossing the 'extra line': How cohabitators with children view their unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 68(5), 1117-1131.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00318.x
- Reinhold, S. (2010). Reassessing the link between premarital cohabitation and marital instability. *Demography*, 47(3), 719-733. doi:10.1353/dem.0.0122
- Reissman, C., Aron, A., & Bergen, M. R. (1993). Shared activities and marital satisfaction: Causal direction and self-expansion versus boredom. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10(2), 243-254. doi:10.1177/026540759301000205
- Rhoades, G. K., Stanley, S. M., & Markman, H. J. (2009). Couple's reasons for cohabitation: Associations with individual well-being and relationship quality. *Journal of Family Issues*, 30(2), 233-258. doi:10.1177/0192513X08324388
- Rindfuss, R. R., & VandenHeuvel, A. (1990). Cohabitation: A precursor to marriage or an alternative to being single? *Population and Development Review*, 16, 703-726.
doi:10.2307/1972963
- Robinson, J. P., & Godbey, G. (1997). *Time for life: The surprising ways that Americans use their time*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Rotondo, D. M., Carlson, D. S., & Kincaid, J. F. (2003). Coping with multiple dimensions of work-family conflict. *Personnel Review*, 3(32), 275-296.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480310467606

- Rubin, J., Flowers, N. M., & Gross, D. R. (1986). The adaptive dimensions of leisure. *American Ethnologist*, 13(3), 524-536. doi:10.1525/ae.1986.13.3.02a00080
- Sarkisian, N., & Gerstel, N. (2008). Till marriage do us part: Adult children's relationship with their parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(2), 360-376. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00487.x
- Sayer, L. C. (2005). Gender, time and inequality: Trends in women's and men's paid work, unpaid work and free time. *Social Forces*, 84(1), 285-303. doi:10.1353/sof.2005.0126
- Sayer, L. C., England, P., Allison, P., & Kangas, N. (2011). She left, he left: How employment and satisfaction affect men's and women's decisions to leave marriages. *American Journal of Sociology*, 116(6), 1982-2018. doi:10.1086/658173
- Schoen, R., & Weinick, R. M. (1993). Partner choice in marriages and cohabitations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 55(2), 408-414. doi:10.2307/352811
- Seltzer, J. A. (2000). Families formed outside of marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62(4), 1247-1268. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.01247.x
- . (2004). Cohabitation in the United States and Britain: Demography, kinship, and the future. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66(4), 921-928. doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00062.x
- Silverstein, M., & Marengo, A. (2001). How Americans enact the grandparent role across the family life course. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(4), 493-522. doi:10.1177/019251301022004006
- Smith, G. T., Snyder, D. K., Trull, T. J., & Monsma, B. (1988). Predicting relationship satisfaction from couple's use of leisure time. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 16(1), 3-13. doi:10.1080/01926188808250702

- Smock, P. J. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings, and implications. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 1-20.
doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.1
- Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Porter, M. (2005). "Everything's there except money": How money shapes decisions to marry among cohabitators. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(3), 680-696. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00162.x
- Solberg, E. J., & Wong, D. C. (1991). Family time use: Leisure, home production, market work, and work related to travel. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 27(3), 485-510.
doi:10.2307/146173
- Souza-Poza, A., Schmid, H., & Widmer, R. (2001). The allocation and value of time assigned to housework and child-care: An analysis for Switzerland. *Journal of Population Economics*, 14(4), 599-618. doi:10.1007/s001480000057
- Spencer, L., & Pahl, R. (2006). *Rethinking friendship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sprecher, S., & Felmlee, D. (2000). Romantic partners' perceptions of social network attributes with the passage of time and relationship transitions. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 325-340. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00020.x
- Stein, C. H., & Hunt, M. G. (2003). Social networks. In J. J. Ponzetti (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of marriage and family*, vol. 4 (pp. 1540-1554). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2007). Marriage and divorce: Changes and their driving forces. NBER, working paper.
- Stewart, J. (2009). Tobit or not Tobit. *U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics*, Working Paper.

- Surra, C. A., & Hughes, D. K. (1997). Commitment processes in accounts of the development of premarital relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59(1), 5-21.
doi:10.2307/353658
- Sweeney, M. M. (2010). The reproductive context of cohabitation in the United States: Recent change and variation in contraceptive use. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(5), 1155-1170. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00756.x
- Taylor, S. E. (2010). Social support: A review. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of health psychology* (pp. 189-214). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Terhell, E. L., Broese van Groenou, M. I., & van Tilburg, T. (2004). Network dynamics in the long-term period after divorce. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21(6), 719-738. doi:10.1177/0265407504047833
- . (2007). Network contact changes in early and later postseparation years. *Social Networks*, 29(1), 11-24. doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2005.11.006
- Thornton, A., & Young-DeMarco, L. (2001). Four decades of trends in attitudes toward family issues in the United States: The 1960s through the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63(4):1009-1037. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.01009.x
- Treas, J. K. (2011). Revisiting the Bott thesis on kin networks and marriage. *Social Science Research*, 40(3), 716-726. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.12.005
- Treas, J. K., & Giesen, D. (2004). Sexual infidelity among married and cohabiting Americans. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(1), 48-60. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00048.x
- Treas, J. K., & Gubernskaya, Z. (2012). Farewell to moms? Maternal contact for seven countries in 1986 and 2001. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(2), 297-311.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00956.x

- Trenberth, L., & Dewe, P. (2002). The importance of leisure as a means of coping with work related stress: An exploratory study. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*, 15(1), 59-72.
doi:10.1080/09515070110103999
- Trost, S. G., Owen, N., Bauman, A. E., Sallis, J. F., & Brown, W. (2002). Correlates of adults' participation in physical activity: Review and update. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 34(12), 1996-2001. doi:10.1249/01.mss.0000038974.76900.92
- U.S. Census Bureau (2012). U.S. Census Bureau CPS, Families and Living Arrangements: 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/families/data/marital.html>
- van Diepen, A. M. L., & Mulder, C. H. (2009). Distance to family members and relocations of older adults. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 24, 31-46.
doi:10.1007/s10901-008-9130-0
- Voorpostel, M., van der Lippe, T., & Gershuny, J. (2010). Spending time together –Changes over four decades in leisure time spent with a spouse. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 42(2), 243-265.
- Wachter, K. W. (1997). Kinship resources for the elderly. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal B Society*, 352(1363), 1811-1817. doi:10.1098/rstb.1997.0166
- Waite, L. J. (2000). The family as a social organization: Key ideas for the twenty-first century. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29(3), 463-469.
- Waite, L. J., & Gallagher, M. (2000). *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Wang, W., & Parker, K. (2014). Record share of Americans have never married: As values, economics and gender patterns change. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

- Warburton, D. E., Nicol, C. W., & Bredin, S. S. (2006). Health benefits of physical activity: The evidence. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 174(6), 801-809.
doi:10.1503/cmaj.051351
- Weissinger, E., Caldwell, L. L., & Bandalos, D. L. (1992). Relation between intrinsic motivation and boredom in free time. *Leisure Sciences*, 14(4), 317-325.
doi:10.1080/01490409209513177
- Whybrow, P. C. (2005). *American mania: When more is not enough*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Wilcox, W. B., & Marquardt, E. (2009). *The state of our unions, 2009: Money & marriage*. Charlottesville, VA: National Marriage Project/Institute for American Values.
- Wildsmith, E., Steward-Streng, N. R., & Manlove, J. (2011). *Childbearing outside of marriage: Estimates and trends in the United States*. Washington, DC: Child Trends.
- Williams, K., & Uberson, D. (2004). Marital status, marital transitions, and health: A gendered life course perspective. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45(1), 81-98.
doi:10.1177/002214650404500106
- Winther, N. (1989). Recreation: An agent of social change in remote northern communities. *Recreation Canada*, 47(5), 20-23.
- Yabiku, S. T., & Gager, C. T. (2009). Sexual frequency and the stability of marital and cohabiting unions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(4), 983-1000.
doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00648.x
- Yodanis, C., & Lauer, S. (2014). Is marriage individualized? What couples actually do. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(2), 184-197. doi:10.1111/jftr.12038

Young, C., & Lim, C. (2014). Time as a network good: Evidence from unemployment and the standard workweek. *Sociological Science*, 1, 10-27. doi:10.15195/v1.a2

APPENDIX A

Variable Coding

Time Alone is defined as the total time respondents spend without anyone else present. The variable is constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 18=self or 19=self with no others co-present.

Time with Partner only is defined as the total time respondents spend alone with their partner. The variable is constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 20=spouse or 21=unmarried partner.

Time with Family Members only is defined as the total time respondents spend alone with family members. Family members include non-own children, such as grandchildren, nephews, and nieces, and related adults living in or outside the household. The variable is constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 23=grandchild and/or 24=parent and/or 25=brother/sister and/or 26=other related person and/or 51=parents (not living in the household) and/or 52=other non-household family members < 18 and/or 53=other non-household family members 18 and older (including parents-in-law).

Time with Non-Family Persons only is defined as the total time respondents spend alone with non-family persons. Non-family persons include unrelated children and unrelated adults living in or outside the household. The variable is constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 28=housemate/roommate and/or 29=roomer/boarder and/or 30=other nonrelative and/or 54=friends and/or 55=co-workers/colleagues/clients and/or 56=neighbors/acquaintances and/or 57=other non-household children < 18 and/or 58=other non-household adults 18 and older and/or 59=boss or manager and/or 60=people whom I supervise and/or 61=co-workers and/or 62=customers.

Time with Partner and Family Members is defined as the total time respondents spend with both their partner and family members together. Family members include non-own children such as grandchildren, nephews, and nieces, and related adults living in or outside the household. The variable is constructed using *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 20=spouse or 21=unmarried partner and 23=grandchild and/or 24=parent and/or 25=brother/sister and/or 26=other related person and/or 51=parents (not living in the household) and/or 52=other non-household family members < 18 and/or 53=other non-household family members 18 and older (including parents-in-law).

Time with Partner and Non-Family Persons is defined as the total time respondents spend with both their partner and non-family persons together. Non-family persons include unrelated

children and unrelated adults living in or outside the household. The variable is constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 20=spouse or 21=unmarried partner and 28=housemate/roommate and/or 29=roomer/boarder and/or 30=other nonrelative and/or 54=friends and/or 55=co-workers/colleagues/clients and/or 56=neighbors/acquaintances and/or 57=other non-household children < 18 and/or 58=other non-household adults 18 and older and/or 59=boss or manager and/or 60=people whom I supervise and/or 61=co-workers and/or 62=customers.

Time with Family Members and Non-family persons is defined as the total time respondents spend alone with family members and non-family persons. Family members include non-own children such as grandchildren, nephews, and nieces, and related adults living in or outside the household. Non-family persons include unrelated children and unrelated adults living in or outside the household. The variable is constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File indicating all members in the respondents' household and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity. The sum of the *tuactdur24* variable is taken for activities where the *tuwho_code* variable is coded 23=grandchild and/or 24=parent and/or 25=brother/sister and/or 26=other related person and/or 51=parents (not living in the household) and/or 52=other non-household family members < 18 and/or 53=other non-household family members 18 and older (including parents-in-law) and 28=housemate/roommate and/or 29=roomer/boarder and/or 30=other nonrelative and/or 54=friends and/or 55=co-workers/colleagues/clients and/or 56=neighbors/acquaintances and/or 57=other non-household children < 18 and/or 58=other non-household adults 18 and older and/or

59=boss or manager and/or 60=people whom I supervise and/or 61=co-workers and/or 62=customers.

Group Size variables are constructed using the *tuwho_code* variable in the ATUS Who File and the *tuactdur24* variable in the ATUS Activity File indicating the number of minutes spent in an activity.

Cohabitation is constructed using *terr* variable in the ATUS Roster File indicating all the members in the respondents' household. Respondents listing an Unmarried Partner is considered cohabiter.

Divorced is constructed using the *pemaritl* variable in the CPS File indicating the marital status of the respondents.

Weekend is constructed using the *tudiaryday* variable in the ATUS Summary File. Weekends are coded 1 and weekdays are coded 0.

Season is constructed using the *tumonth* variable in the ATUS Respondent File. December, January, and February are coded as winter months (referent). March, April, and May are coded as spring months. June, July, and August are coded as summer months. September, October, and November are coded as fall months.

Work is constructed using the ATUS Summary File, which contains the minutes respondents spent in various activities during the diary day. The work variable is the sum of the minutes respondents spent on "Work & Work-Related Activities" (coded 5 in the *trtier1p* variable) as well as "Traveling" for work (coded 180501, 18502, and 180589 in the *trcodep* variable).

School is constructed using the ATUS Summary File, which contains the minutes respondents spent in various activities during the diary day. The school variable is the sum of the minutes

respondents spent on “Education” (coded 6 in the *trtier1p* variable) as well as “Traveling” for school (coded 180601, 18682, and 180699 in the *trcodep* variable).

Partner Employment is constructed using the *tespempnot* and *trspftpt* variable in the ATUS Respondent File. The *tespempnot* is coded 1=employed and 2=not employed. The *trspftpt* variable is coded 1=full-time, 2=part-time, and 3=hours vary. The partner employment variable is coded not employed (referent) if *tespempnot*=0, part-time if *tespempnot*=1 and *trspftpt*=2 or *tespempnot*=1 and *trspftpt*=3, and full-time if *tespempnot*=1 and *trspftpt*=1.

#Family is constructed using the *terr* variable in the ATUS Roster File indicating all the members in the respondents’ household. This variable includes grandchildren, parents, siblings, and other relatives.

#Non-Family is constructed using the *terr* variable in the ATUS Roster File indicating all the members in the respondents’ household. This variable includes housemates or roommates, roomers or boarders, and other non-relatives.

#Children is constructed using the *trchildnum* variable in the ATUS Respondent File. The *trchildnum* variable measures the number of household children under 18 years of age.

Youngest Child’s Age is constructed using the *tryhhchild* variable in the ATUS Respondent File.

Age Homogamy is constructed using the *teage* variable for both the respondent and his or her partner in the ATUS Roster File. Age homogamy is the absolute difference in age between the respondent and his or her partner.

Race Homogamy is constructed using the *ptdtrace* variable for both the respondent and his or her partner in the ATUS CPS File. Respondents and partners of a similar race are coded 1.

Respondents and partners of a different race are coded 0 (see **Race** coding below).

Education Homogamy is constructed using the *peeduca* variable in the ATUS CPS File for both the respondent and his or her partner. Education homogamy is coded 1 if the respondent and his or her partner both have less than a high school education or both have more than a high school education. Education homogamy is otherwise coded 0.

*Note: Education homogamy was also coded as the absolute difference in years of education between the respondent and his or her partner. The *peeduca* variable for both the respondent and his or her partner is coded 31=Less than 1st grade, 32=1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th grade, 33=5th or 6th grade, 34=7th or 8th grade, 35=9th grade, 36=10th grade, 37=11th grade, 38=12th grade – no diploma, 39=High school graduate – diploma or equivalent (GED), 40=Some college but no degree, 41=Associates degree – occupational/vocational, 42=Associate degree – academic program, 43=Bachelor’s degree (BA, AB, BS, etc.), 44=Master’s degree (MA, MS, MEng, Med, MSW, etc.), 45=Professional school degree (MD, DDS, DVM, etc.), 46=Doctoral degree (PhD, EdD, etc.). Years of education for both the respondent and his or her partner was coded 1 if *peeduca*=31, 2.5 if *peeduca*=32, 5.5 if *peeduca*=33, 7.5 if *peeduca*=34, 9 if *peeduca*=35, 10 if *peeduca*=36, 11 if *peeduca*=37, 12 if *peeduca*=38 or 39, 14 if *peeduca*=40, 41, or 42, 16 if *peeduca*=43, 18 if *peeduca*=44, and 22 if *peeduca*=45 or 46. This coding did not yield significant results as respondents and partners are generally educationally homogamous. Coding respondents and partners as either both having less than a high school education or both more than a high school education was used to measure extreme cases of heterogeneity (a respondent having more than college education with a partner with less than a high school education or vice versa).*

Female is constructed using the *tesex* variable in the ATUS Roster File for the respondent. Female respondents are coded 1 and male respondents are coded 0.

Age is constructed using the *teage* variable in the ATUS Roster File for the respondent.

Race is constructed using the *ptdrace* and *pehspnon* variables in the ATUS CPS File. The *ptdrace* variable is coded 1=White only, 2=Black only, 3=American Indian, Alaskan Native only, 4=Asian only, 5=Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only, 6=White-Black, 7=White-American Indian, 8=White-Asian, 9=White-Hawaiian, 10=Black-American Indian, 11=Black-Asian, 12=Black-Hawaiian, 13=American Indian-Asian, 14=Asian-Hawaiian or American Indian-Hawaiian (beginning 5/2012), 15=White-Black-American Indian or Asian-Hawaiian (beginning 5/2012), 16=White-Black-Asian or White-Black-American Indian (beginning 5/2012), 17=White-American Indian-Asian or White-Black-Asian (beginning 5/2012), 18=White-Asian-Hawaiian or White-Black-Hawaiian (beginning 5/2012), 19=White-Black-American Indian-Asian or White-American Indian-Asian (beginning 5/2012), 20=2 or 3 races or White-American Indian-Hawaiian (beginning 5/2012), 21=4 or 5 races or White-Asian-Hawaiian (beginning 5/2012), 22=Black-American Indian-Asian (beginning 5/2012), 22=White-Black-American Indian-Asian (beginning 5/2012), 24=White-American Indian-Asian-Hawaiian (beginning 5/2012), 25=Other 3 race combinations (beginning 5/2012), 26=Other 4 and 5 race combinations (beginning 5/2012). The *pehspnon* variable is coded 1=Hispanic and 2=Non-Hispanic. The race variable is coded white (referent) if *ptdrace*=1 and *pehspnon*=2, black if *ptdrace*=2 and *pehspnon*=2, Hispanic if *pehspnon*=1, Asian if *ptdrace*=4 and *pehspnon*=2 and and if *ptdrace*=5 and *pehspnon*=2, and other if *ptdrace*=3 and *pehspnon*=2 and if *ptdrace*>=6 and *pehspnon*=2.

Foreign Born is constructed using the *penatvty* variable in the CPS ATUS File for the respondent. The *penatvty* variable is coded 57=United States, 66=Guam, 72=Puerto Rico, 73=Puerto Rico, 78=U.S. Virgin Islands, 96=U.S. Outlying Area, 100-554=Foreign country or at

sea, 555=Abroad, country not known. Foreign born is coded 1 if *penatvty*=66, 72, 73, 100-544, or 555. Foreign born is coded 0 if *penatvty*=57, 78, or 96.

Education is constructed using the *peeduca* variable in the ATUS Summary File. The *peeduca* variable is coded 31=Less than 1st grade, 32=1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th grade, 33=5th or 6th grade, 34=7th or 8th grade, 35=9th grade, 36=10th grade, 37=11th grade, 38=12th grade – no diploma, 39=High school graduate – diploma or equivalent (GED), 40=Some college but no degree, 41=Associates degree – occupational/vocational, 42=Associate degree – academic program, 43=Bachelor’s degree (BA, AB, BS, etc.), 44=Master’s degree (MA, MS, MEng, Med, MSW, etc.), 45=Professional school degree (MD, DDS, DVM, etc.), 46=Doctoral degree (PhD, EdD, etc.). The education variable is coded less than high school (referent) if *peeduca*<39, high school if *peeduca*=39, some college if *peeduca*=40, bachelor’s degree if *peeduca*=41, 42, or 43, and graduate degree if *peeduca*=44, 45 or 46.

Household Income is constructed using the *hufaminc* and *hefaminc* variables in the CPS Summary File. Both the *hufaminc* and *hefaminc* (edited) are coded 1=Less than \$5,000, 2=\$5,000 to \$7,499, 3=\$7,500 to \$9,999, 4=\$10,000 to \$12,499, 5=\$12,500 to \$14,999, 6=\$15,000 to \$19,999, 7=\$20,000 to \$24,999, 8=\$25,000 to \$29,999, 9=\$30,000 to \$34,999, 10=\$35,000 to \$39,999, 11=\$40,000 to \$49,999, 12= \$50,000 to \$59,999, 13=\$60,000 to \$74,999, 14=\$75,000 to \$99,999 15=\$100,000 to \$149,999, and 16= \$150,000 and over. The household income variable is coded less than \$20k (referent), \$30k to \$39,999, \$40k to \$59,999, \$60k to \$99,999, and \$100k or more.

APPENDIX B

Method

There has been considerable debate over the appropriate method to use in analyzing time use data. Though time use surveys have very detailed information about individuals' activities, they are usually collected over a short period of time (e.g., a day). The resulting dataset is left with many zero observations for time spent in certain activities. Most studies adopt Tobit because it is specifically developed for data where the dependent variable is truncated at zero or some other cutoff (Souza-Poza, Schmid, & Widmer, 2001; Kalenkoski, Ribar, & Stratton, 2005; Kimmel & Connelly, 2007). However, these zeros serve two entirely different interpretations in time use data. First, is the assumption that these zeros operate on a single process: the individual may indeed never participate in the observed activity. In this current study, it may be a stretch to accept that neither partner ever spends time in leisure, let alone time together. The second, and more likely, interpretation is that the diary day did not capture these activities occurring, in which case, the Tobit method is inappropriate. Instead these zeros may arise from two separate processes: the period the time use survey covered or the decision to participate in the activity.

The Cragg (1971) and iterations of its model (Lin & Schmidt, 1984) have been used to take account of the possibility that zeros are due to separate processes. Another advantage in using the Cragg model is that it nests the Tobit model so a likelihood ratio test can be conducted to determine the best fit. Daunfeldt and Hellstrom (2007) confirmed the two process idea and supported the Cragg model over the Tobit model in their study on time allocation to different household labor activities using cross-sectional Swedish household data. However, Stewart (2000) simulated data to compare the Tobit, Cragg, and OLS methods. The study found Tobit to be biased depending on the amount of zero-value observations, and though the Cragg model did slightly better, OLS in the simulation produced unbiased estimations. Another study by Foster

and Kalenkoski (2010) also favored OLS over Tobit models and found Tobit estimates to be more sensitive to the duration of the diary survey than OLS estimates.

Given the previous research testing the appropriateness of various methods in analyzing time use data, I will be using primarily OLS regression models in this study. Taking into account a number of assumptions about the relationship between covariates in my models and the probability of participating in an activity, OLS estimates would likely be unbiased and more robust than the Tobit estimates. Since the probability of participating in an activity may be a function of one of the covariates in my models, OLS would also be a likely choice over the Cragg method (see Stewart 2009). Of course, selected sensitivity analyses can be employed to test for differences between OLS and Cragg approaches.

APPENDIX C

The Children of Divorced and Never-Married Persons

A number of divorced and never-married married respondents in the sample have dependent children in the household (Table A3.1), which would reduce the time they have to spend alone with others. Thus, co-presence involving children are modeled separately

Table A3.1 Children in the Households of Divorced and Never-Married Respondents (N=47,145)

		Children		No Children		Total
		N	%	N	%	
N-Married	Children	4,495	17.53	21,143	82.47	25,638
	HH	4,201	16.39	21,437	83.61	
	Non-HH	346	1.35	25,292	98.65	
Divorced	Children	6,233	28.98	15,274	71.02	21,507
	HH	5,727	26.63	15,780	73.37	
	Non-HH	615	2.86	20,892	97.14	

(Table A3.2). Analysis reveals that the social world of the previously married is centered on their children –spending more time with family and non-family persons with their children in tow – which suggests that accessing social others may be to compensate some loss of spousal support.

Table A3.2. OLS Coefficients for Divorced (in Minutes) by Children Co-Presence Type (N=47,145)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	Diary Day	+ Time Demands	+ Household Composition	+ Controls	+ Age
Children	31.84***	29.30***	ns.	-3.76**	14.66***
Children and Family	4.65***	3.64***	ns.	ns.	2.44**
Children and Non-Family	3.60***	3.12***	-1.17*	-1.48*	2.02**

Note:

Diary day = weekend, holiday, season.

Time demands = work (minutes), school (minutes).

Household composition = #family, #non-family, #children, youngest child age.

Controls = sex, race, foreign born, education, household income.

ns.= not significant. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001; two-tailed test.

I find evidence that divorcees spend more time with their children than never-married respondents do. In the baseline model (Model 1), compared to never-married respondents, divorced respondents spend 32 more minutes with their children ($p < .001$). These findings hold when work and school minutes are taken into account (Model 2). Controlling for household composition variables (Model 3), there is no significant difference in the time spent alone with children. Time with children is shared with family members when there are more family members (and children) in the household. In Model 4, divorced respondents spend four fewer minutes with their children than never-married respondents do ($p < .001$). However, when age is controlled in Model 5, divorced respondents spend 15 more minutes alone with their children than never-married respondents do. Divorced respondents are older, on average, than never-married respondents and are likely more independent.

Divorced respondents spend five more minutes together with their children and family members than never-married respondents do, controlling only for diary day ($p < .001$). This finding holds in model 2 when time demand variables are added, but significance disappears in model 3. Household composition plays an important role. Although never-married individuals live with more family members in the household than divorcees, they have fewer children, which explains differences in time with children and family. We also see this in Model 4 controlling for socio-demographic variables. However, controlling for age in Model 5, I find divorced respondents spend a marginal two more minutes with children and family members than never-married respondents do ($p < .01$). This is due to age as older never-married respondents are less likely to live or spend time with family.

Divorced respondents and their children spend four more minutes with non-family persons than never-married respondents do in Model 1, controlling only for diary day ($p < .001$). The coefficient holds in Model 2 when time demand variables are added. However, in Model 3, which takes household composition into account, the relationship reverses, albeit the coefficient is small; one fewer minute ($p < .01$). Additional analyses indicate that the difference in time is explained by never-marrieds living with fewer children and more non-family persons in their household than divorcees. When socio-demographic variables are added in Model 4, I find that divorce respondents spend two fewer minutes with their children and non-family than never-married respondents do ($p < .05$). The addition of the age variable in Model 5 reverses the direction of the coefficient to two more minutes ($p < .01$). Again, this is largely due to never-married respondents being younger, on average.

The social world of divorcees appear to orbit around their children. Divorcees spend more time alone with their children, and with children and others, than never-married persons do. Single-parent households that are a result of a divorce may draw in more kin support than households with children born to single-parents. Research has shown that children are more negatively affected by transitions from a two-parent to single-parent household than by just being born in the latter (Amato, 2010), which suggests a need for support. If marriage is a “greedy institution”, marital dissolution may be a distress signal to others in one’s social world and creates more opportunities for outside family members to be involved in the household (Carlson & Furstenberg, 2006). Because non-family networks are bigger than family networks (Cable et al., 2012), friends might also be called upon for assistance.