

Bowling Green State University
The Center for Family and Demographic Research

<http://www.bgsu.edu/organizations/cfdr>

Phone: (419) 372-7279 cfdr@bgsu.edu

Working Paper Series 2009-13

**OFFENDING, SUBSTANCE USE, AND COHABITATION
IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD***

Robert A. Lonardo
Wendy D. Manning
Peggy C. Giordano
Monica A. Longmore

Department of Sociology
and Center for Family and Demographic Research
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403
rlonard@bgsu.edu

*This research was supported by grants from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD036223 and HD044206), the Department of Health and Human Services (5APRPA006009), and by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959-01). An earlier version of this paper was presented as “Delinquency, Substance Use, and Cohabitation Experience in Young Adulthood: Unraveling Selection and Influence Processes” at the 2009 annual meeting of the Population Association of America. Direct correspondence should be addressed to Robert A. Lonardo, Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403 (rlonard@bgsu.edu).

Offending, Substance Use, and Cohabitation in Young Adulthood

Abstract

Over half of young adults have cohabited, but relatively little is known about the role delinquency and substance use play in youths' odds of cohabiting as well as the implications of cohabitation for early adult offending and substance use. This study focuses on the reciprocal relationship between cohabitation during late adolescence and young adulthood and self-reported offending and substance use. Using longitudinal data, we find that net of traditional predictors delinquency involvement leads to increased odds of cohabitation and cohabiting at younger ages while substance use is not related to cohabiting during early adulthood. Further analyses indicate a "good cohabitation effect" in that cohabitation is associated with lower reports of substance use. However, cohabitation is not associated with self-reported offending. The results help to unravel the effect of deviant behaviors on the likelihood of cohabitation experience from cohabitation's influence processes among young adults.

Keywords: offending, substance use, juvenile delinquency, cohabitation

Offending, Substance Use, and Cohabitation in Young Adulthood

Cohabitation has become a normative experience for many young adults; for example, two-fifths of young women have cohabited and nearly two-thirds of recent first marriages were preceded by cohabitation (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008). As cohabitation has become more common, the median age at first marriage has increased to 25 for women and 27 for men (Goodwin, McGill, & Chandra, 2009). While such changes in union formation have been occurring, research on crime in adulthood continues to examine marriage as an important turning point in the life course, often referred to as the “good marriage effect” (Laub & Sampson, 2003). Few studies have specifically examined the possible “good cohabitation effect,” or the role of cohabitation in changes in offending and substance use.

Drawing on longitudinal data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS), we investigate the extent to which delinquency and substance use are related to cohabitation experience. We address two key questions: (1) does delinquency and substance use predict who is likely to cohabit; and (2) like marriage, does cohabitation have a prosocial effect resulting in lower levels of offending and substance use? This work contributes to both the family and delinquency literatures in at least two ways. First, prior studies have rarely considered the effects of early offending and substance use on subsequent cohabitation. Thus, a better understanding of who is likely to select into cohabitation may help to interpret the connection between cohabitation and well-being. Second, previous research on changes in offending and substance use in adulthood has focused almost exclusively on the prosocial effects of marriage when in fact cohabitation is the more common dyadic union among economically and socially disadvantaged men and women (Smock & Manning, 1997). Although a “good marriage effect”

appears to exist, to date it seems unresolved whether cohabitation offers any of the same benefits as marriage in terms of desisting from crime or substance use in young adulthood.

Background

Cherlin (2004) has argued that marriage has become “deinstitutionalized” in American society, citing the increasing prevalence of cohabiting unions as evidence. Early work by Bumpass (1998) documented a shift in what may be viewed as the conventional progression of courtship behaviors: dating, engagement, and marriage. Young adults are increasingly more likely to cohabit before getting married (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008), with some of these unions being marriage-like and others appearing to be extensions of dating (Brown & Booth, 1996). These differences in the nature and meaning of cohabitation reflect the disparity in motives underlying cohabitation (Smock, Huang, Manning, & Bergstrom, 2006). Additionally, some young adults “slide” into cohabitation while others experience a more deliberate decision on the path to marriage (Smock, Manning, & Porter, 2005; Stanley, Rhoades, & Markman, 2006). Consequently, cohabitation is not an indicator of strong, continuous commitment for all couples (Stanley, Whitton, & Markman, 2004). Our understanding of cohabitation will be expanded by further examining the characteristics of individuals who cohabit.

This paper draws on the union formation and adolescent risk behavior literatures to better understand young adults’ transition into cohabitation and the subsequent effects of cohabitation on well-being. Much literature has focused on how cohabitation influences the success of subsequent marriages, with premarital cohabitation often associated with low marital stability (Phillips & Sweeney, 2005; Smock, 2000; Stanley et al., 2006; Teachman, 2003). This is largely explained through selection arguments; that is, individuals who cohabit typically possess characteristics that are related to whether they cohabit, but these are the same characteristics that

are linked to higher divorce rates. For example, Woods and Emery (2002) found that the negative effect of premarital cohabitation on marital stability is explained by several factors, including severe delinquency involvement.

Few empirical studies have accounted for the potentially important influence of delinquency as a risk factor that may affect the experience and timing of cohabitation. As noted by Manning, Longmore, and Giordano (2007), delinquent youths were more likely to expect to cohabit than follow the traditional path toward marriage. Additionally, Yamaguchi and Kandel (1985) found that the use of marijuana and other illegal drugs was linked to a higher probability of premarital cohabitation. The majority of prior studies show the connection between economic disadvantage and cohabitation (Clarkberg, 1999; Smock et al., 2005), but to date no recent studies have examined whether delinquency and substance use influence cohabitation net of socioeconomic status.

At the same time, criminological studies treat romantic relationships (primarily marriage) during the transition to adulthood as an important factor related to adult desistance from crime. Laub and Sampson (2003) argued that a quality marriage increases informal social control as individuals enter adulthood and is associated with significant decreases in offending, that is, the “good marriage effect.” Although Laub and Sampson’s oft-cited results supported their hypothesis that marriage reduces crime, some have argued that the finding may be spurious insofar as there is differential selection into marriage and cohabitation (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; see also Siennick & Osgood, 2008). Also, their earlier work focuses exclusively on marriage, but does not examine the effect of cohabitation on later involvement in crime.

A significant limitation of Laub and Sampson’s analyses is that they focused on a cohort of men who matured into adulthood during the 1940s. Cohabitation was relatively quite rare

during that era. For example, Sampson, Laub, and Wimer (2006) indicated that cohabitation was reported in only 3% of the approximately 2,500 person-years of data collected retrospectively from 52 men (nearly 50 years of data per person) and found that cohabitation was related to decreased crime in adulthood. It is important, however, to continue this investigation with data obtained from a recent cohort, examining both men and women, and focusing on more contemporary union formation patterns.

Other studies utilizing more recently collected data have examined the implications of cohabitation on crime and substance use. While marriage had prosocial effects, cohabitation actually was related to increases in crime (Horney, Osgood, & Marshall, 1995; Piquero, MacDonald, & Parker, 2002). However, these samples were quite select and limited to only incarcerated offenders (Horney et al., 1995) or parolees (Piquero et al., 2002). For substance use, research has shown that declines in alcohol, marijuana, and other illicit drugs followed (and in some cases preceded) the formation of cohabiting relationships (Duncan, Wilkerson, & England, 2006; Yamaguchi & Kandel, 1985). These studies are informative, but there are limitations. For example, some use data collected at a time (e.g., 1970s) when cohabitation was less normative (Yamaguchi & Kandel, 1985), and others relied on a time window of “change” that is quite long (11 years) (Duncan et al., 2006).

Current family trends, such as the rising age at first marriage and the high prevalence of premarital and nonmarital cohabitation (Kennedy & Bumpass, 2008), highlight the importance of investigating predictors of cohabitation and the timing of cohabitation using recently collected data. We move beyond prior work by addressing whether problem behaviors (such as offending and substance use) in adolescence are factors associated with entering into cohabiting unions while including traditional covariates which may be related to union formation such as family

background, socioeconomic status, and religiosity (Axinn & Thornton, 1996; Clarkberg, 1999). Furthermore, owing to the mixed findings in the literature, we assess whether a “good cohabitation effect” indeed exists. Our work also incorporates controls for friends’ behavior (Warr, 2002) and lack of self-control (Pratt & Cullen, 2000), which are key social and personal factors related to involvement in crime.

Methods

Data

The sample for this study is drawn from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS) that was derived from the enrollment records of students registered for the 7th, 9th, and 11th grades in Lucas County, Ohio, which is mostly composed of the city of Toledo. Devised by the National Opinion Research Center, a stratified random sample, that includes over-samples of African-American and Hispanic youths, was drawn from the records of 62 schools over seven school districts. Interviews were conducted at home with the help of laptop computers programmed with the survey questionnaire. The TARS data currently consist of four waves, following the same group of adolescents since 2001. Data collection occurred in 2001-2002 ($n = 1,321$), 2002-2003 ($n = 1,177$), 2004-2005 ($n = 1,114$), and 2006-2007 ($n = 1,092$). At the fourth wave, age ranges from 17 to 24 with a mean of 20 years. U.S. Census data indicate that our initial sample mirrors the characteristics of the Toledo, Ohio, MSA and the socio-demographic characteristics of the Toledo area closely parallel those of the nation in terms of education (80% in the Toledo MSA vs. 84% in the U.S. are high school graduates), median family income (\$50,046 vs. \$50,287), marital status (73.5% vs. 75.9% married two-parent households), and race (13% vs. 12% African-American).

The TARS data are well-suited for the current investigation and may be preferable over other data sources. For example, the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) asked respondents at the third wave, when respondents ranged in age from 18 to 28, to retrospectively report if they have “ever lived with someone in a *marriage-like* relationship for one month or more” (emphasis added). Work by Manning and Smock (2005) suggests that this wording may not capture the full range of meanings attributed to living with another of the opposite sex, thereby underestimating cohabitation experience. The TARS data refer to cohabiting relationships as “[living] with a boy/girlfriend (not as a roommate) without being married” and most likely captures a more complete group of cohabitators. Additionally, the TARS sample at the fourth wave has a maximum age of 24 years, compared to 28 in Add Health, possibly reducing reporting error, particularly with the date of the start of one’s first cohabiting union. Last, school attendance was not a requirement for inclusion in the TARS sample. This is important when considering delinquency and substance use because samples administered in schools may miss the most delinquent of youths (Cernkovich, Giordano, & Pugh, 1985).

The analytic sample draws on 1,028 respondents who were re-interviewed at each of the interview waves. The sample further excludes adolescent and young adults who are or have been married ($n = 60$) and who began cohabiting prior to the second interview ($n = 34$). We also omit 20 additional adolescents who were in the “other” race/ethnicity category. These omissions result in a final sample of 914 respondents.

Measures

Dependent variables. All dependent variables are measured at the final wave, and descriptive statistics (including scale reliability measured with Cronbach’s alpha) are reported in Table 1. Cohabitation experience is constructed from answers to the question: “Have you ever

lived with a boy/girlfriend (not as a roommate) without being married?” Responses are coded 1 for *yes* and 0 for *no*. Age at first cohabitation is measured in years and was constructed by subtracting the century month of the respondent’s birth from the century month corresponding to the start of their first cohabiting relationship; this value was then divided by 12.

Offending is measured using a 7-item scale composed of the mean of reported frequencies of the following behaviors: “stolen (or tried to steal) things worth \$5 or less”; “carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife”; “damaged or destroyed property on purpose”; “stolen (or tried to steal) things worth more than \$50”; “attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting him/her”; “sold drugs”; and “broken into a building or vehicle (or tried to break in) to steal something or just to look around.” Substance use is a scale of the mean frequency of alcohol use, public drunkenness, and drug use. Possible responses for each offending and substance use variable range from *never* (coded 0) to *more than once a day* (8). The behaviors included in the two measures are selected from the longer self-report scale by Elliott and Ageton (1980).

Independent variables. Delinquency involvement and substance use, measured at the second wave (mean age = 16) are constructed from scales identical to those comprising the offending and substance use measures discussed above. We also create a variable current cohabitation indicating whether the respondent was cohabiting at the time of the wave 4 interview.

Controls. The following variables with the exception of age are constructed from data gathered at the initial interview. Age at the final wave is measured in years, gender is coded 1 for *female* and 0 for *male*, and race/ethnicity is composed of three dummy variables for *White* (reference category), *African-American*, and *Hispanic*. Parental income is in thousands of

dollars, calculated by taking the sum of parents' response to their own as well as their partners' income. We also include mother's education with three dummy variables representing less than *12 years of education*, *12 years* (reference category), and *more than 12 years*. Family type is a series of dummy variables indicating the following types: *married*, *biological parents* (reference category), *single parent*, *cohabiting parent*, *step-parent*, and *other*.

The next several control variables were measured at the second wave. Adolescent's income is the sum of responses to the following question: "In a typical week, how much money do you make from working?" and "How much money do you get from your parents?" Religiosity is a scale constructed from the mean of two standardized items: "How important is religion in your life?" (0 for *not at all important* to 4 for *very important*) and "In the past 12 months, how often did you attend religious services?" (0 for *never* to 3 for *once a week or more*).

Data from the third wave are used to construct the remaining control variables. Currently in school is coded 1 if respondents are currently attending an educational institution (or if interviewed during the summer, attended during the previous academic year) and 0 otherwise. Employment status consists of three dummy variables: *unemployed*, *part-time* (reference category), and *full-time*. A pregnancy measure is constructed from the question: "How many times have you gotten pregnant?" (male respondents were asked, "How many times have you gotten someone pregnant?"). All responses greater than or equal to one (responses ranged from 1 to 6 pregnancies) are coded as 1 and otherwise coded 0. Low self-control is measured using the mean response (0 for *strongly disagree* to 4 for *strongly agree*) to the following 6 statements concerning impulsivity, risk-taking, and self-centeredness (see Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990): "When making a decision, I go with my 'gut feeling' and don't think much about the consequences of each alternative"; "I like to take risks"; "I live my life without much thought for

the future”; “When nothing is happening I usually start looking for something exciting”; “I like it when people can do whatever they want, without strict rules and regulations”; and “Sometimes I think I am too self-centered.” Friends’ delinquency and friends’ substance use are obtained by asking the respondents about their friendship group’s delinquency involvement and substance use behaviors (e.g., “In the last 12 months, how often have your friends drunk alcohol?”). The scales include mean responses for the same behaviors as in self-reported offending, delinquency, and substance use.

Analytic Strategy

The first set of analyses predict the odds of cohabiting using binary logistic regression models for the full analytic sample ($n = 914$). Models are estimated separately for self-reported delinquency involvement and substance use as the focal predictors. Coefficients greater than one indicate greater odds of experiencing the dependent variable and those less than one indicate lower odds. The odds ratio (*OR*) is computed by taking the exponential value of the coefficient. Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression is used to predict the age at first cohabitation, among adolescents with a history of cohabitation experience ($n = 301$). The second set of analyses focus on the effect of cohabitation on offending and substance use using ordinary least squares regression models. All OLS coefficients presented are standardized. Because we wish to determine whether cohabitation has a dampening effect on deviant behavior, these analyses are limited to respondents with a high level of early involvement, and we assess whether cohabitation is associated with lower reported offending and substance use. Thus, those who reported above average adolescent delinquency ($n = 146$) or substance use ($n = 297$) (second wave reports) were included in the analyses. Also, the extent to which these associations vary

for male and female respondents is assessed by adding to each full model a multiplicative interaction term.

Results

Table 1 shows that 33% ($n = 301$) of the 914 respondents have ever cohabited and 18% ($n = 165$) reported cohabiting at the time of the final interview. Current cohabiting relationships make up 55% of those who have ever cohabited. These cohabitation levels are on par with national estimates for similar age groups. The measures of delinquency and offending are positively skewed with means of 0.14 and 0.15, respectively, indicating that many respondents report rarely engaging in delinquent acts (far less than one or two times per year). Substance use is slightly more frequent at both time points. The means are 0.93 (about once or twice a year) at the second wave and 1.86 (about once every two to three months) at the fourth. These low rates of involvement are not surprising since the TARS is school-based and not a high-risk sample.

Table 1 about Here

Table 2 presents the association between self-reported delinquency involvement and cohabitation experience estimated using binary logistic regression models. At the zero-order the odds ratio for delinquency is 2.35 ($p < 0.001$), indicating that with each unit increase in delinquency respondents have 135% higher odds of cohabiting. After adding controls for demographic characteristics, socioeconomic indicators, religiosity, and pregnancy, delinquency remains significantly related to cohabitation experience ($OR = 2.61$; $p < 0.001$). The odds of cohabiting increase 161% with each additional unit of delinquency involvement.

Table 2 about Here

Consistent with prior studies, the full model also indicates that older adolescents, female adolescents, and those respondents with parents reporting lower incomes are more likely to

cohabit. Race/ethnicity in the full model is not significant and the zero order effect is fully explained by family structure. The variance explained by mother's education at the zero order is accounted for by parent's income, family structure, and being in school in the full model. Family structure is associated with cohabitation with respondents raised outside of two biological parent families having higher odds of cohabiting in early adulthood. It is notable that having lived in a cohabitating parent family as an adolescent is highly associated with experiencing cohabitation in early adulthood. Respondents' socioeconomic circumstances matter as well. Those who are in school or employed full-time (compared to part-time) have higher odds of cohabitation. However, in the full model full-time employment is not significantly tied to cohabitation. Becoming pregnant or getting someone pregnant is significantly and positively related to the odds of cohabiting at the zero order and in the full model. The interaction of gender and delinquency is not statistically significant indicating that delinquency has a similar effect on the odds of cohabitation for males and females (results not shown).

The next set of models show that delinquency involvement is significantly associated with younger ages at first cohabitation. As delinquency levels increases, the age at first cohabitation decreases by 0.15 ($p < 0.01$) in the zero-order model and by 0.12 ($p < 0.05$) in the full model with control variables. In addition, a gender and offending interaction term is not statistically significant, suggesting that delinquency affects the age of cohabitation similarly for male and female respondents (results not shown). The covariates significantly associated with age at cohabitation include race and ethnicity, mother's education, family income, and employment status.

Table 3 presents the results of models focusing on the effects of substance use on cohabitation experience and age at first cohabitation. At the zero-order, substance use is

significantly related to higher odds of cohabiting ($OR = 1.15; p < 0.01$). Each unit of substance use is associated with a 15% increase in the odds of cohabiting. However, the effect of substance use ($OR = 0.97$) is no longer significant with the inclusion of several controls, specifically gender and age. Older teens are more likely to cohabit and are also more frequently involved in substance use. Also, there is a gendered pattern of substance use with males reporting higher use, but we find that substance use has a similar effect on cohabitation for males and females (results not shown). The covariates predicting cohabitation are similar in this model as Table 2 with the exception that religiosity is negatively associated and full-time employment (compared to part-time) is positively associated with cohabitation in the full model.

Table 3 about Here

The next two columns show how substance use is related to the age at first cohabitation. These models indicate that substance use is not significantly related to age at cohabitation in the zero-order ($B = 0.08$) or in the full model ($B = 0.08$). A gender and substance use interaction term was included in the model and is not significant indicating that substance use has a similar effect on the age at cohabitation among males and females (results not shown). The control variables have a similar effect as reported in Table 2.

Next we investigate the role cohabitation plays in young adult offending among those adolescents who reported above average delinquency at the second wave. Among delinquent respondents one-quarter (24%) were cohabiting at the time of interview. Table 4 presents the regression estimation for self-reported offending as the dependent variable. Both at the zero order ($B = -0.01$) and with controls added ($B = -0.03$), respondents who are cohabiting share similar levels of offending as those who are not currently cohabiting. The interaction of gender and cohabitation indicates that cohabitation has a similar effect for males and females (results not

shown). The primary factors associated with offending in the full model include friends' delinquency and level of self-control.

Table 4 about Here

Table 4 also shows the effect of cohabitation on substance use among respondents who reported above average use at the second interview wave. Among adolescents who reported above average substance use, 25% are currently in a cohabiting relationship. At the zero-order, respondents who are cohabiting report significantly lower substance use ($B = -0.18; p < 0.01$) than those who are not cohabiting. The cohabitation effect remains statistically significant in the full model ($B = -0.13; p < 0.05$). This finding is notable given that the model includes key covariates such as self-control and friends' substance use. In the full-model gender and friends' substance use are significantly associated with substance use. Further analyses indicate that cohabitation has a similar negative effect on substance use for males and females (results not shown). For substance use, a "good cohabitation effect" is found; that is, young adults in cohabiting relationships have lower substance use than their peers who are not cohabiting, but this is not the case for offending behavior.

Discussion

Higher levels of delinquency, in contrast to substance use, are related to greater odds of cohabiting and doing so at younger ages, suggesting that delinquent behaviors explain unique variation in cohabitation experience beyond that of traditional demographic and socioeconomic factors. Individuals who cohabit are selective in terms of higher levels of delinquency and may establish unions at earlier ages. Moreover, such unions may be linked with poorer economic well-being. Some may argue that delinquency is an attempt to be adult-like while at the same time being denied access to an adult status. In other words, cohabitation may represent attempts

to develop autonomy from one's parents and live independently, but without some of the resources necessary to ensure stable relationships. Certainly, a subgroup of cohabiting young adults is not the most prosocial and may be important to consider when assessing the effects of cohabitation on adult well-being.

We also assess whether a "good cohabitation effect" exists. Among teens involved in high levels of substance use, cohabitation is associated with declines in substance use. Therefore, it seems that a "good cohabitation effect" exists for substance use even after adding controls for low self-control and friends' substance use, important social and personal factors. These findings are similar to those reported by Duncan et al. (2006) although the time window in our analyses is 4 years in contrast to 11 years in their work. The same pattern of results is not found for self-reported offending, however. The null finding regarding offending behaviors may be an artifact of being enmeshed in deviant social networks (Haynie, 2002; Lonardo, Giordano, Longmore, & Manning, 2009). Highly delinquent youth may require more prosocial influence than merely the "turning point" of cohabitation. Unlike prior studies of parolees or adult incarcerated offenders that find cohabitation is tied to increases in offending, our work on a more general population of young adults suggests that cohabitation does not have a negative influence on offending. It is possible that the cohabiting partner's offending and substance use behaviors matter as well; that is, cohabiting with someone who is not involved in offending would influence desistance. A quality cohabiting union (high attachment, high commitment) may also be of greater importance than cohabitation status alone. Future research investigating these two hypotheses is justified.

It is important to note that our sample is limited to respondents in one metropolitan area. While the characteristics are similar to national estimates, further analyses in other communities

are warranted. The TARS sample is limited to respondents who were 17-24 so it reflects the experiences of a relatively young sample. The median age of first cohabitation for similarly aged women according to national data (National Survey of Family Growth) is 19 years. It is possible that the effect of delinquency on cohabitation may dampen with an older sample when cohabitation is more normative and perhaps more akin to marriage. Another issue is that our sample focuses on a single cohabitation experience. More disadvantaged adults experience serial cohabitation (multiple stints of cohabiting relationships) (Cohen & Manning, 2009), and this should be incorporated in analyses with larger samples. Further research could delve into the implications of cohabitation among delinquents in terms of quality and duration of the relationship.

The findings we have presented represent an attempt to unravel the selection and influence processes associated with cohabitation and indicate that the relationship among union formation, delinquency, offending, and substance use is complex. Traditionally family scholars focusing on cohabitation distinguish types of cohabitators based on marriage plans (Brown, 2000; Guzzo, 2009; Manning & Smock, 2005), but our work and that of others (Woods & Emery, 2002) indicate it may be important to distinguish cohabitators based on risk factors such as offending and substance use. One route into cohabitation is potentially less prosocial with adolescent delinquents choosing early cohabitation and perhaps prematurely assuming adult roles. The implications of cohabitation for children and adults most likely depend on the level of disadvantage and characteristics of individuals forming cohabiting unions. Finally, studies of crime and deviance among young adults should incorporate cohabitation into their studies and consider the importance of cohabitation in the desistance process.

References

- Axinn, W. G., & Thornton, A. (1996). The influence of parents' marital dissolutions on children's attitudes toward family formation. *Demography*, *33*, 66-81.
- Brown, S. L. (2000). Union transitions among cohabitators: The significance of relationship assessments and expectations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 833-846.
- Brown, S. L., & Booth, A. (1996). Cohabitation versus marriage: A comparison of relationship quality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *58*, 668-678.
- Bumpass, L. L. (1998). The changing significance of marriage in the united states. In K. O. Mason, N. Nilsuya, & M. Choe (Eds.), *The changing family in comparative perspective: Asia and the United States* (pp. 63-79). Honolulu, HI: East-West Center.
- Cernkovich, S. A., Giordano, P. C., & Pugh, M. D. (1985). Chronic offenders: The missing cases in self-report delinquency research. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *76*, 705-732.
- Cherlin, A. J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*, 848-861.
- Clarkberg, M. (1999). The price of partnering: The role of economic well-being in young adults' first union experiences. *Social Forces*, *77*, 945-968.
- Cohen, J. A., & Manning, W. D. (2009). Estimates and correlates of serial cohabitation. Working paper, no. 2009-04. Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.
- Duncan, G. J., Wilkerson, B., & England, P. (2006). Cleaning up their act: The effects of marriage and cohabitation on licit and illicit drug use. *Demography*, *43*, 691-710.

- Elliott, D. S., & Ageton, S. S. (1980). Reconciling race and class differences in self-reported and official estimates of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *45*, 95-110.
- Goodwin, P., McGill, B., & Chandra, A. (2009). Who marries and when? Age at first marriage in the United States, 2002. NCHS data brief, no. 19. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics.
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Guzzo, K. B. (2009). Marital intentions and the stability of first cohabitations. *Journal of Family Issues*, *30*, 179-205.
- Haynie, D. L. (2002). Friendship networks and delinquency: The relative nature of peer delinquency. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *18*, 99-134.
- Horney, J., Osgood, D. W., & Marshall, I. H. (1995). Criminal careers in the short-term: Intra-individual variability in crime and its relation to local life circumstances. *American Sociological Review*, *60*, 655-673.
- Kennedy, S., & Bumpass, L. L. (2008). Cohabitation and children's living arrangements: New estimates from the United States. *Demographic Research*, *19*, 1663-1692.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2003). *Shared beginnings, divergent lives: Delinquent boys to age 70*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Lonardo, R. A., Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2009). Parents, friends, and romantic partners: Enmeshment in deviant networks and adolescent delinquency involvement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*, 367-383.

- Manning, W. D., Longmore, M. A., & Giordano, P. C. (2007). The changing institution of marriage: Adolescents' expectations to cohabit and marry. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69, 559-575.
- Manning, W. D., & Smock, P. J. (2005). Measuring and modeling cohabitation: New perspectives from qualitative data. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 989-1002.
- Phillips, J. A., & Sweeney, M. M. (2005). Premarital cohabitation and marital disruption among White, Black, and Mexican American Women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 295-313.
- Piquero, A. R., MacDonald, J. M., & Parker, K. F. (2002). Race, local life circumstances, and criminal activity. *Social Science Quarterly*, 83, 654-670.
- Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F. T. (2000). The empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime: A meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 38, 931-964.
- Sampson, R. J., Laub, J. H., & Wimer, C. (2006). Does marriage reduce crime? A counterfactual approach to within-individual causal effects. *Criminology*, 44, 465-508.
- Siennick, S. E., & Osgood, D. W. (2008). A review of research on the impact on crime of transitions to adult roles. In A. M. Liberman (Ed.), *The long view of crime: A synthesis of longitudinal research* (pp. 161-187). New York: Springer.
- Smock, P. J. (2000). Cohabitation in the United States: An appraisal of research themes, findings, and implications. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 1-20.
- Smock, P. J., Huang, P., Manning, W. D., & Bergstrom, C. A. (2006). Heterosexual cohabitation in the United States: Motives for living together among young men and women. Working paper, no. 2006-10. Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

- Smock, P. J., & Manning, W. D. (1997). Cohabiting partners' economic circumstances and marriage. *Demography*, *34*, 331-341.
- Smock, P. J., Manning, W. D., & Porter, M. J. (2005). Everything's there except money: How economic factors shape the decision to marry among cohabiting couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *67*, 680-696.
- Stanley, S. M., Rhoades, G. K., & Markman, H. J. (2006). Sliding versus deciding: Inertia and the premarital cohabitation effect. *Family Relations*, *55*, 499-509.
- Stanley, S. M., Whitton, S. W., & Markman, H. J. (2004). Maybe I do: Interpersonal commitment and premarital or nonmarital cohabitation. *Journal of Family Issues*, *25*, 496-519.
- Teachman, J. (2003). Premarital sex, premarital cohabitation, and the rise of subsequent marital dissolution among women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *65*, 444-455.
- Warr, M. (2002). *Companions in crime: The social aspects of criminal conduct*. New York: Cambridge University.
- Woods, L. N., & Emery, R. E. (2002). The cohabitation effect on divorce: Causation or selection? *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, *37*, 101-122.
- Yamaguchi, K., & Kandel, D. B. (1985). Dynamic relationships between premarital cohabitation and illicit drug use: An event-history analysis of role selection and role socialization. *American Sociological Review*, *50*, 530-546.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (n=914)

	Mean	SD	Range
Cohabitation Experience (W4)	.33	—	0–1
Current Cohabitation (W4)	.18	—	0–1
Age at First Cohabitation (W4) (n = 301)	19.08	1.68	14–23
Delinquency (W2) ($\alpha = .77$)	.14	.42	0–5.43
Offending (W4) ($\alpha = .71$)	.15	.45	0–4.57
Substance Use (W2) ($\alpha = .79$)	0.93	1.41	0–7.00
Substance Use (W4) ($\alpha = .69$)	1.86	1.68	0–7.33
Age (W4)	20.17	1.74	17–24
Female (W1)	.52	—	0–1
Race/Ethnicity (W1)			
White	.66	—	0–1
African-American	.24	—	0–1
Hispanic	.10	—	0–1
Parents' Income (in thousands) (W1)	61.16	35.70	0–160
Mother's Education (W1)			
Less than 12 years	.10	—	0–1
12 years	.35	—	0–1
More than 12 years	.54	—	0–1
Family Type (W1)			
Married, biological parents	.54	—	0–1
Cohabiting parent	.04	—	0–1
Step parent	.12	—	0–1
Single parent	.23	—	0–1
Other	.08	—	0–1
Currently in School (W3)	.79	—	0–1
Employment Status (W3)			
Unemployed	.50	—	0–1
Part-time	.34	—	0–1
Full-time	.17	—	0–1
Adolescent's Income (W2)	69.99	149.82	0–2500
Religiosity (W2) ($\alpha = .72$)	.00	.88	-1.50–1.37
Been Pregnant/Gotten Someone Pregnant (W3)	.12	—	0–1
Low Self-Control (W3) ($\alpha = .70$)	1.88	.62	0–4
Friends' Delinquency (W3) ($\alpha = .85$)	.50	.96	0–7.14
Friends' Substance Use (W3) ($\alpha = .77$)	2.34	1.96	0–8

Table 2. Regression of Cohabitation Experience and Age at First Cohabitation on Delinquency and Controls

	Cohabitation Experience (n=914)		Age at First Cohabitation (n=301)	
	Zero Orders	Full Model	Zero Orders	Full Model
	OR	OR	B	B
Delinquency ^a	2.35***	2.61***	-.15**	-.12*
Age ^a	1.44***	1.33***	—	—
Female (reference=Male)	1.87***	2.45***	-.02	-.05
Race/Ethnicity (reference=White)				
African-American	1.75***	1.06	.11	.15*
Hispanic	2.04***	1.09	-.03	-.00
Parents' Income ^a	.99***	.99*	.10	.12
Mother's Education (reference=12 years)				
Less than 12 years	1.77*	1.16	.09	.15*
More than 12 years	.57**	.76	.13*	.10
Family Type (reference=Married, biological parents)				
Single parent	2.65***	1.59*	-.02	.02
Cohabiting parent	6.06***	4.03**	-.09	-.06
Step parent	2.39***	2.09**	-.09	-.15*
Other parent	4.47***	1.97*	-.08	-.09
Currently in School (reference=Not currently)	4.57***	1.85**	.04	.08
Employment Status (reference=Part-time)				
Unemployed	.97	.94	-.29***	-.34***
Full-time	2.38***	1.60	-.09	-.11
Adolescents' Income ^a	1.00***	1.00	.09	.07
Religiosity ^a	.76***	.83	.07	.02
Been Pregnant/Gotten Someone Pregnant (reference=Never)	7.15***	2.90***	.02	.01

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

^a Variable is centered around its mean

Table 3. Regression of Cohabitation Experience and Age at First Cohabitation on Substance Use and Controls

	Cohabitation Experience (n=914)		Age at First Cohabitation (n=301)	
	<i>Zero Orders</i>	<i>Full Model</i>	<i>Zero Orders</i>	<i>Full Model</i>
	<i>OR</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>
Substance Use ^a	1.15**	.97	.08	.08
Age ^a	1.44***	1.33***	—	—
Female (reference=Male)	1.87***	2.18***	-.02	-.03
Race/Ethnicity (reference=White)				
African-American	1.75***	1.06	.11	.16*
Hispanic	2.04***	1.17	-.03	-.01
Parents' Income ^a	.99***	.99*	.10	.12
Mother's Education (reference=12 years)				
Less than 12 years	1.77*	1.12	.09	.17*
More than 12 years	.57**	.77	.13*	.11
Family Type (reference=Married, biological parents)				
Single parent	2.65***	1.63*	-.02	.02
Cohabiting parent	6.06***	3.74**	-.09	-.05
Step parent	2.39***	2.01**	-.09	-.13*
Other parent	4.47***	2.07*	-.08	-.09
Currently in School (reference=Not currently)	4.57***	1.86**	.04	.08
Employment Status (reference=Part-time)				
Unemployed	.97	.97	-.29***	-.34***
Full-time	2.38***	1.64*	-.09	-.10
Adolescents' Income ^a	1.00***	1.00	.09	.09
Religiosity ^a	.76***	.80*	.07	.05
Been Pregnant/Gotten Someone Pregnant (reference=Never)	7.15***	2.94***	.02	.01

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

^a Variable is centered around its mean

Table 4. Regression of Offending and Substance Use on Intact Cohabitation and Controls

	Offending (n=146)		Substance Use (n=297)	
	<i>Zero Orders</i>	<i>Full Model</i>	<i>Zero Orders</i>	<i>Full Model</i>
	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>B</i>
Current Cohabitation (reference=Not current)	-.01	-.03	-.18**	-.13*
Age ^a	.11	.06	.15*	.11
Female (reference=Male)	-.19*	-.11	-.23***	-.15**
Race/Ethnicity (reference=White)				
African-American	.17*	.13	-.09	-.07
Hispanic	.08	.09	.02	.06
Mother's Education (reference=12 years)				
Less than 12 years	.01	-.01	-.05	-.02
More than 12 years	-.03	.03	.07	-.00
Currently in School (reference=Not currently)	.22**	.12	-.02	-.08
Employment Status (reference=Part-time)				
Unemployed	.09	-.04	-.05	-.03
Full-time	.07	.04	.03	-.01
Low Self-Control ^a	.23**	.15*	.13*	.10
Friends' Delinquency ^a	.49***	.45***	—	—
Friends' Substance Use ^a	—	—	.37***	.31***

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

^a Variable is centered around its mean