



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

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

**Bowling Green State University**

*Working Paper Series 06-05*

**Links between Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Quality, Stability, and Divorce: A Comparison of Covenant versus Standard Marriages\***

Susan L. Brown and Laura Ann Sanchez  
Bowling Green State University

Steven L. Nock  
University of Virginia

James D. Wright  
Central Florida University

\*\*\*\*\*FORTHCOMING IN *SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH* (2006)\*\*\*\*\*

Links between Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Quality, Stability, and Divorce:  
A Comparison of Covenant versus Standard Marriages\*

Susan L. Brown and Laura Ann Sanchez  
Bowling Green State University

Steven L. Nock  
University of Virginia

James D. Wright  
Central Florida University

\*Direct correspondence to the first author at Department of Sociology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403 or [browns1@bgnet.bgsu.edu](mailto:browns1@bgnet.bgsu.edu). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Philadelphia, PA, April 2, 2005. This research was funded by the National Science Foundation (xxxx) and a private foundation award. The research analyses were supported in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R21-HD042831).

## Links between Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Quality, Stability, and Divorce:

### A Comparison of Covenant versus Standard Marriages

#### Abstract

We extend prior research on the association between premarital cohabitation and marital outcomes by investigating whether covenant marriage, which entails more stringent requirements for divorce, minimizes the deleterious effects of cohabitation on subsequent marital quality and stability. Using a unique longitudinal data set of covenant and standard newlywed couples in Louisiana, we found that covenant marriage does not modify the effects of premarital cohabitation on marital instability, happiness, dependency, or divorce for either wives or husbands. In fact, once we controlled for sociodemographic characteristics, premarital relationship factors, and marital factors, the relationships between premarital cohabitation and marital outcomes reduced to nonsignificance, suggesting that selection factors largely account for the deleterious effects of premarital cohabitation on marital success.

Links between Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Quality, Stability, and Divorce:  
A Comparison of Covenant versus Standard Marriages

Social welfare advocates and policymakers are placing great emphasis on developing public programs and legal reforms intended to encourage marriage formation, strengthen unions, and discourage divorce (Bogenschneider 2000; Galston 1996; Popenoe 1999). The past few years witnessed the federal Defense of Marriage Act (DoMA), revisions of welfare laws to promote marriage as a route out of poverty (Besharov and Sullivan 1996), and many state and local initiatives to offer marriage communication education as a part of school curricula and marriage license application procedures (Bogenschneider 2000; Hawkins et al, 2002). And, some states, including Louisiana, have adopted covenant marriage laws designed to strengthen marriage and deter divorce.

These policy efforts come at a time when Americans are spending fewer years—both absolutely and proportionately—in the married state than at any other point in U. S. history (Espenshade 1985). Age at first marriage is at an all-time high, divorce rates remain stable and high, and fewer persons remarry in the event of divorce (Casper and Bianchi 2002; Cherlin 1992). The corresponding increase in cohabitation is largely responsible for the delay in first marriage entry and more than compensates for the decline in remarriage (Bumpass and Lu 2000; Bumpass, Sweet, and Cherlin 1991).

Nonetheless, cohabitation is often linked to marriage as nearly one-half of cohabiting unions are formalized through marriage and cohabitation is the modal path of entry into marriage (Bumpass and Lu 2000; Bumpass et al. 1991). Moreover, the evidence is remarkably consistent that premarital cohabitation is associated with poorer marital quality and higher levels of marital

instability and divorce (e.g., Booth and Johnson 1988; Dush, Cohan, and Amato 2003; Lillard, Brien, and Waite 1995; Smock 2000; Teachman 2003; Thomson and Colella 1992).

Using a unique longitudinal data set that is representative of marriages contracted in the state of Louisiana during 1998-2000, we extend this line of inquiry by investigating whether a *covenant* marriage, which requires a stricter commitment to maintaining the marriage and involves substantial barriers to obtaining a divorce, ameliorates the negative effects of premarital cohabitation on marital quality and stability, and reduces the likelihood of divorce. That is, are negative marital outcomes associated with the tentative beginnings of a relationship through premarital cohabitation nullified by a couple's decision to form a covenant versus standard marriage? After providing a brief history of covenant marriage, we turn to research on premarital cohabitation, marital quality, and divorce to formulate our expectations about how premarital cohabitation will have differential effects on the marital outcomes of covenant versus standard married couples.

#### A Brief History of Covenant Marriage

Covenant marriage grows out of a large national covenant marriage movement, consisting of religious, political, and family counseling organizations (Covenant Marriage Movement webpage, 2001). In August 1997, Louisiana became the first state to pass this legislation and Arizona and Arkansas followed suit soon after. In 1998 alone, more than 17 states considered similar covenant marriage bills (Nichols 1998). In total, 20-30 states either considered or are considering similar covenant marriage bills (Divorce Reform 2001). Covenant marriage proponents argue that no-fault divorce substantially reduces commitment to marriage and weakens the legal and social protections available to family members under a more stringent marriage regime (Brinig 1998; Spaht 1998; Loconte 1998; Sanchez et al. 2001).

Covenant marriage created a two-tier marriage regime. For the first time in history, citizens have the option between two sets of laws to govern their marriages. There are several features that distinguish covenant marriage. First, couples who choose this option face stricter limits on entering and exiting marriage. Second, couples who want to covenant marry must undertake premarital counseling. Third, the couple and their counselor must attest, with a notarized affidavit, that the counseling covered topics about the seriousness of a covenant marriage, the lifetime permanence of marriage, and the obligation of the couple to seek marital counseling, if problems arise later in the marriage. Finally, the couple must also sign a “Declaration of Intent” that affirms the following: a marriage is an agreement to live together as a husband and wife forever; the partners chose each other carefully and disclosed to each other everything about their personal histories that might hurt the marriage; the couple received premarital counseling from a priest, minister, rabbi, or state-recognized marriage counselor; and that the partners agree to take all reasonable efforts to preserve their marriage.

Covenant married couples who want to divorce must make “all reasonable efforts” to preserve the marriage, including marital counseling, and either prove fault in the traditional sense of that term (i.e., court-substantiated infidelity, physical or sexual abuse of a spouse or child, a felony life- or death-penalty conviction, or abandonment of at least one year) or live separate and apart for two years. Irreconcilable differences are not grounds for divorce.

The intent of covenant marriage is to encourage couples to enter marriage with a spirit of serious, undiluted commitment. Legislators want newly-marrying couples to stop and answer to each other whether they will work on their marriages or will want an “easy out” when their marriages run into trouble. As Spaht (1998a:xx) states, “covenant marriage strengthens the institution of marriage by restoring legal efficacy to the marital vows.” Legal advocates believe



that covenant marriage gives couples security in their “investment” in marriage, which allows them to behave in ways that build the stability of the union rather than “hedge their bets” by pursuing their own self-interests without regard to the costs of the union (Brinig 1998). Brinig (2000) further suggests that covenant marriage reinvigorates marriage by moving couples away from a contractual mentality toward their marriages to a belief in marriage’s covenant, exalted permanent status. Spaht (1999:1) believes that covenant marriage can help “Americans rebuild a marriage culture from the ashes of a ‘divorce culture.’” Recent studies suggest that newly-marrying covenant couples and currently married covenant “upgraders” agree with this view and feel that the covenant distinction is not only symbolically important to themselves in their own unions, but also stands as a political and moral statement to their communities and to a political and social culture they see as poisonous to enduring marriage (Loconte 1998; Rosier and Feld 2000; Sanchez, Nock, Wright and Gager 2001).

Whether covenant marriage is associated with higher marital quality and lower odds of divorce is the subject of ongoing research (Nock, Sanchez, and Wright 2002; Sanchez, Nock, Deines, and Wright 2003). Comparisons of changes in the marital quality of covenants and standards using growth curve models shows that those in covenant marriage experience larger increases in marital fairness over the first five year of marriage than standard couples, although the two groups do not differ in their changes in global marital quality (operationalized using the dyadic adjustment scale) (Nocket al. 2002). Also, covenants are about half as likely to divorce as standards during the first few years of marriage, although this lower risk of divorce reduces to nonsignificance once wife’s religiosity is controlled (Sanchez et al. 2003). No research has examined whether premarital cohabitation operates differently for the marital outcomes of covenants and standards. The purpose of our paper is to evaluate whether covenant marriage

minimizes the negative effects of cohabitation on subsequent marital quality, stability, and divorce.

### Premarital Cohabitation and Marital Outcomes

Cohabitation has increased dramatically in the U.S., rising from 500,000 couples in 1970 to nearly 5 million in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 2001). Among persons in their twenties and thirties, more than one-half have experienced cohabitation, suggesting that cohabitation is now a normative stage in the family life course (Brown 2005; Bumpass and Lu 2000; Smock 2000).

Cohabitation most often serves as a prelude to marriage as about 75 percent of cohabitators report plans to marry their partners and the chief reason why cohabitators report living together is to test the relationship's viability for marriage (Bumpass et al. 1991).

Despite the popular, seemingly intuitive notion that cohabitation is a worthwhile testing ground for marriage that will help couples avoid divorce, research has consistently documented that premarital cohabitation is associated with lower levels of marital quality and higher levels of marital instability and divorce (e.g., Bennett, Blanc, and Bloom 1988; Booth and Johnson 1988; DeMaris and Leslie 1984; DeMaris and MacDonald 1993; DeMaris and Rao 1992; Dush et al. 2003; Lillard et al. 1995; Teachman 2003; Thomson and Colella 1992). Premarital cohabitation is positively related to marital disagreement, conflict, and instability as well as negatively associated with marital interaction, satisfaction, communication, and commitment (Booth and Johnson; DeMaris and Leslie; DeMaris and MacDonald; DeMaris and Rao; Dush et al.; Thomson and Colella). Its association with marital happiness is unclear; two studies show a negative association (Dush et al.; Nock 1995) whereas two others find none (Booth and Johnson; Thomson and Colella). In addition to its negative associations with marital quality and stability, premarital cohabitation is also positively related to divorce (Bennett et al.; Booth and Johnson;

DeMaris and Rao; Dush et al.; Teachman). Early research suggested this effect may attenuate among younger cohorts (Schoen 1992), but a more recent study indicates there has been no attenuation effect between two marriage cohorts (Dush et al.).

Less clear is the mechanism(s) linking premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital outcomes. There are two primary explanations, typically referred to as (1) selection and (2) causation. According to the selection explanation, cohabitation is selective of people who are less traditional in their family-related attitudes (Axinn and Thornton 1992; Clarkberg, Stoltzenberg, and Waite 1995) or are poor marriage material (Booth and Johnson 1988). The same people who are more likely to cohabit premaritally also are more likely to opt for divorce in the event of an unsatisfactory marriage. Several studies have identified multiple risk factors associated with both premarital cohabitation and divorce, including weaker commitment to marriage, greater acceptance of divorce, and poorer interpersonal relationship skills, supporting the selection argument (Axinn and Thornton 1992; Booth and Johnson 1988; Dush et al. 2003; Thomson and Colella 1992). Additionally, Lillard et al. (1995) used econometric techniques to model the endogeneity of cohabitation before marriage to demonstrate that statistically correcting for selection reduces to nonsignificance the effect of premarital cohabitation on divorce.

The causation explanation is that the experience of premarital cohabitation itself actually decreases marital quality and heightens instability and the likelihood of divorce. Rather than poor marital outcomes being a function of preexisting differences between cohabitators and noncohabitators (as posited by the selection argument), the logic here is that cohabitation somehow changes people, whether by affirming the ability to maintain intimate relationships outside of marriage or by weakening commitment to marriage as a lifelong institution, that undermines

marital success (Axinn and Thornton 1992; Bennett et al. 1988; Booth and Johnson 1988). For instance, Axinn and Thornton found that the experience of cohabitation is associated with increases in young adults' acceptance of divorce, net of their levels of acceptance prior to cohabitation. Amato (1996) showed that marrieds' level of acceptance of divorce is positively associated with divorce, net of the number of perceived marital problems. Taken together, this pattern of findings is consistent with the causation argument.

Both explanations have received empirical support, although the causation argument, which is more difficult to test, has been supported by comparatively fewer studies (Dush et al. 2003; Smock 2000; Teachman 2003). Importantly, it is possible that both selection and causation may be at work (Booth and Johnson 1988). Recent research suggests cohabitation per se is not associated with increased odds of divorce since having premarital sex and premarital cohabitation only with one's husband is not significantly related to divorce (Teachman 2003). Rather, it is involvement in either or both of these activities with a previous partner (who is not the current spouse) that is positively associated with divorce among women, leading Teachman to conclude that premarital sex and cohabitation that is limited to one's spouse is a normative feature of marital formation.

### The Present Study

Our goal is to evaluate whether covenant marriage provides a social context for couples to attain greater marital quality and stability, despite their cohabitation experiences. The lawmakers who created covenant marriage believe that a covenant is a way for couples with “knocks against them” to wipe the slate clean at the start of marriage and provide a risk-reducing bond to survive the turmoil often experienced during the early years of marriage. A covenant marriage

presumably helps couples weather any destabilizing effects of the characteristics they share that undermine marriage, as they assume their spousal responsibilities.

Given that premarital cohabitation is associated with poorer relationship quality and stability as well as increased odds of divorce, does a covenant (versus standard) marriage weaken or even eradicate these effects? We hypothesize that among covenant marrieds, the negative repercussions of premarital cohabitation for subsequent marital success will be significantly smaller than those observed for couples in standard marriages. A competing hypothesis is that the detrimental effects of premarital cohabitation on marital outcomes, whether due to selection factors, causation, or some combination thereof, cannot be “erased” or minimized through covenant marriage. The persistence of a premarital cohabitation effect regardless of covenant status would suggest that the ostensibly higher level of commitment to and confidence in the relationship manifested by choosing covenant marriage does not negate premarital risk factors, such as cohabitation. To test these hypotheses, we use data from a three-wave study of the early years of marriage, the time when marriages are most vulnerable to dissolution. We evaluate whether premarital cohabitation and covenant marriage status interact in their effects on marital quality, stability, and divorce, net of sociodemographic characteristics, premarital relationship factors, and marital factors that are associated with premarital cohabitation and marital success.

#### Data

The data are from the three waves of a 5-year study of newlywed couples who married in Louisiana in 1998-2000 (Marriage Matters, University of Virginia, 2001). The first wave was administered, on average, 3 to 6 months after the wedding, the second wave was administered approximately 18 months thereafter, and the third and final wave, 18 to 24 months after the second wave. The sample selection criteria consisted of two steps. First, 17 of 60 parishes were

selected randomly and proportionate to size. Second, from these 17 parishes, all covenant marriage licenses and standard marriage licenses filed next to the covenant licenses were drawn. Of the 1,714 licenses that were validly part of our sampling frame, we eventually confirmed 1,310 couples for a confirmation rate of 76.4%. Our response rate for the first wave was 57% for covenant couples and 44% for standard couples. The combined second wave response rate was 92%, excluding the couples who divorced or separated between waves who were not administered the full survey instrument. The third wave response rate was 85% with the same latter exclusion. For this project, we use a sub-sample in which both spouses completed interviews at the first and third waves (N=389).

#### *Dependent Variables*

We examine three measures of marital outcomes measured at wave three. First, *marital instability* is measured on a 10-point scale with higher values reflecting greater perceived chance of divorce. Second, *marital happiness* measures the respondent's happiness with where her or his marriage stands at the present time, with values ranging from 1 (worst my marriage could possibly be) to 10 (best my marriage could possibly be). Third, *marital dependency* measures the respondent's perceived dependence on the marriage with a summed index of reports about domains of the respondent's life that would be "worse" or "much worse" if the marriage ended in divorce. The domains include standard of living, social life, career opportunities, overall happiness, and sex life. Marital instability, marital happiness, and marital dependency are measured separately for wives and husbands. The third couple-level measure is the hazard of *divorce* or whether the couple actually separated or divorced between the first and third waves.

#### *Focal Independent Variables*

The focal independent variables are *premarital cohabitation experience* and *marital type*.

Premarital cohabitation is coded 1 for those couples who report having lived together before marriage and 0 otherwise.<sup>1</sup> We measure marital type as a dummy variable with covenant as the included and standard as the excluded category.

### *Control Variables*

We control for three sets of factors that are related to either selection into premarital cohabitation or marital quality and stability: sociodemographic characteristics, premarital relationship factors, and marital relationship factors. Some of our measures are ascertained at the couple level, whereas others are measured separately for wives and husbands.

*Sociodemographic characteristics.* Our measures of sociodemographic characteristics are obtained at the initial interview. *Education* is measured separately for wives and husbands and coded into dummy categories: less than high school and high school degree (reference), some college or vocational school, and college or more. We measure both the level and distribution of economic resources in the marriage. *Husband's income* reflects the income bracket reported by the husband and ranges from (1) \$0-\$5,000 to (8) \$60,000+. The *relative income* contribution of husbands and wives is gauged using the following dummy categories: wife earned more than husband; husband earned more than wife; or wife and husband reported same income bracket

---

<sup>1</sup> Initially, we used three mutually exclusive and exhaustive dummy variables to measure premarital cohabitation: couples who cohabited together prior to marriage (*premarital cohabitation*), couples who did not cohabit together prior to marriage but in which at least one spouse has a cohabitation experience with another (*other cohabitation*), and couples in which neither spouse has any cohabitation experience (*no cohabitation*, reference). This coding strategy allowed us to appraise whether any cohabitation experience is negatively associated with marital outcomes or if only premarital cohabitation with one's spouse is consequential. Consistent with Teachman's (2003) finding that wife's cohabitation with another but not with her spouse is *not* associated with an increased likelihood of divorce, we found that those in the other cohabitation category were not statistically different from those who never cohabited in terms of marital quality, stability, or divorce. Thus we rely on the simpler dichotomous measure of premarital cohabitation described in the text.

(reference). The wife's and husband's *previous marriage experience* represents whether the current marriage is a remarriage for the respondent (1=yes, 0=no). *Parental divorce* indicates whether both partners experienced the separation or divorce of their parents during childhood (1=yes, 0=no). *Wife's age* and *husband's age* are coded in years. *Race* is dummy coded with to distinguish among couples in which both spouses are white (reference), both spouses are black, and others.

*Premarital relationship factors.* We measure *husband's financial troubles* before marriage using an index that counts whether he reported himself as having no job; no car; no savings of more than \$1,000; no homeownership; a criminal record; a drinking or drug problem; more than \$500 in credit card debt; other significant debt; a personal bankruptcy; or a medical health problem. In theory, the index could range from 0 to 10, but the actual range was 0 to 6. *Premarital risk* is a couple-level variable constructed from the wife's and husband's reports of problems they experienced during courtship. *Premarital risk* is an index that counts the number of times either the husband or wife reported that while they were dating: s/he did not get a good picture of his/her spouse; the spouse did not get a good picture of the respondent; the respondent was sexually or romantically involved with someone else; the respondent perceived the spouse as having been sexually or romantically involved with someone; they broke up more than once; or, they experienced a lot of conflict. *Met in church* is coded 1 if either the husband or wife report having met each other at a place of worship and 0 otherwise. *Family and peer approval* is a retrospective report obtained separately for wives and husbands of their perceptions of the approval of their relationship by their own and their spouse's respective family members and friends at the time of the engagement announcement with values ranging from 0 low to 8 high.

*Marital relationship factors.* We include a couple-level measure of *marital heterogamy*, coded as 1 if any one or more of the following conditions are met: the spouses do not share the same race/ethnicity; the spouses do not share the same religious denomination or affiliation; the spouses are 6 years or more apart in age; or the spouses are 4 or more years apart in total schooling. Measures of religiosity are obtained separately for wives and husbands. *Religiosity* gauges the respondent's views on the importance of religious faith, with those characterizing it as extremely important for a good life coded 1 and others coded 0. *Child at marriage start* is a dummy variable that measures whether at least one biological, adopted, or step child was present in the household at the time of marriage. *Child since marriage* is a dummy variable measuring whether the partners bore or adopted at least one child since marriage.

#### *Analytic Strategy*

We begin by examining mean differences in the variables used in the analyses separately by marriage type and premarital cohabitation experience. Then, we estimate seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) models predicting marital instability, marital happiness, and marital dependency. SUR models are appropriate when regressions are expected to have highly correlated error terms. Here, the assumption is that similar omitted variables affect the marital quality of both wives and husbands. SUR models assume inter-correlated error terms. Initial models include the focal independent variables, premarital cohabitation and covenant marriage. A second set of models adds the control variables to determine the extent to which the effects of cohabitation and covenant status are artifacts of other factors (e.g., selection processes) and a third set incorporates interaction terms for premarital cohabitation and covenant status to test whether cohabitation is less strongly associated with poor marital outcomes for those in covenant versus standard marriages. All models predicting marital quality include only those who remain

in intact marriages at wave three and for whom there are valid data for the three measures of marital quality for both wives and husbands (N=389). Finally, we estimate a series of Cox regression models predicting the likelihood of divorce during the first five years of marriage, including reduced, full, and interactive models as described above (N=599). Since divorce is a couple-level outcome, the covariates in these models are distinct from those used in the marital quality models. To maximize our analytic sample size, we include all cases for which there is a response from the wife (wives are more likely to respond at follow-up than husbands, especially in the event of separation or divorce). Consequently, the measures used in the divorce analyses are derived from wives' reports.

## Results

### *Descriptive Results*

Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations (or percentages, as appropriate) for all of the variables used in the analyses by covenant status and premarital cohabitation experience, separately for wives and husbands. As expected, covenant married couples are far less likely to have cohabited than standard married couples. Whereas 66% (191/288) of standard couples lived together before marriage, just 29% (70/245) of covenant couples cohabited. Among covenant marrieds, those who premaritally cohabited report levels of marital instability which are more than twice as high as those who did not cohabit. Among standard marrieds, average levels of marital instability are similar regardless of premarital cohabitation experience. Similarly, reports of marital happiness are uniformly high, although among covenant wives those who did not cohabit are happier than those who did. Marital dependency differs only among covenant wives such that those who did not premaritally cohabit report higher average levels of dependence than those who cohabited prior to marriage. Nearly 20% of standard couples

experience divorce, regardless of premarital cohabitation experience. Among covenant marrieds, about 20% of those who premaritally cohabited get divorced, whereas less than 10% of those who did not live together before marriage get divorced. Thus, it seems that premarital cohabitation is only related to the likelihood of divorce among covenant married couples, not standard marrieds. Moreover, covenant marriage does not seem to buffer the negative effect of cohabitation on a couple's risk of divorce as the percentages that divorce are essentially the same for covenants who premaritally cohabited (18%) as well as standard marrieds (18% among those who cohabited; 20% among those who did not cohabit).

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Premarital cohabitation is related to several sociodemographic characteristics, but not always in the same pattern for covenants and standards. Premarital cohabitation is associated with lower average levels of education for wives and husbands regardless of covenant status. Husband's income does not appear to vary either by covenant status or premarital cohabitation experience. In contrast, the likelihood that the wife earns more is much greater in those marriages preceded by cohabitation for standard couples only. Premarital cohabitation is also positively related to prior marital experience for both wives and husbands but only among standard couples. Among both covenant and standard couples, more than 20% of those who cohabited before marriage report that both sets of parents divorced versus around 13% of those without cohabitation experience. Among covenant marrieds, those who did not cohabit premaritally are disproportionately white, whereas among standards, the race distribution does not significantly differ by premarital cohabitation.

Premarital cohabitation experience differentiates among covenants and standards alike in terms of other premarital relationship factors as well as marital factors. Standard couples who

cohabited before marriage score higher on the husband's financial troubles measure. Premarital cohabitation is positively associated with premarital risk factors for both covenant and standard couples. Those couples who met in church were much less likely to have lived together before marriage. Family and peer approval of the marriage was higher among noncohabitators than cohabitators for covenant couples, but no differences are observed for standard couples.

Premarital cohabitation is associated with lower levels of religiosity for all groups. Among both covenants and standards, premarital cohabitation is positively associated with the presence of children at the start of the marriage, but is positively related to having a child since marriage among covenants only.

#### *Multivariate Results*

As shown in Model 1 of Table 2, premarital cohabitation is associated positively and covenant marriage negatively with marital instability among both wives and husbands. Among wives, this pattern of findings persists with the inclusion of controls for sociodemographic characteristics, premarital relationship factors, and marital relationship factors (Model 2). Black wives report more instability, on average, than white wives. Premarital risks also link positively to marital instability whereas family and peer approval of the marriage is associated negatively with instability. Religiosity is related negatively to marital instability whereas having a child since marriage is associated positively with marital instability among wives.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

For husbands, a different picture emerges. In the full model (Model 2), the coefficients for both premarital cohabitation and covenant marriage are reduced to nonsignificance. Black husbands report higher levels of instability than white husbands, on average. Premarital risk is associated positively with husbands' perceived marital instability. Higher levels of family and

peer approval are associated with lower reports of marital instability among husbands.

Husband's religiosity is associated with perceptions of higher marital stability. As shown in Model 3, the inclusion of an interaction term for premarital cohabitation and covenant marriage is significant for neither wives nor husbands, meaning that the association between premarital cohabitation and marital instability operates similarly regardless of marriage type.

Turning now to the models predicting marital happiness, neither premarital cohabitation experience nor covenant marriage is significantly related to either wives' or husbands' marital happiness (see Model 1 in Table 3). The full model (Model 2) reveals that premarital risk is associated negatively with marital happiness whereas religiosity and age are associated positively among both wives and husbands. Among wives (Model 2), blacks report less marital happiness whereas others report more marital happiness than whites, on average. Having a child since marriage is related to lower levels of marital happiness among wives but not husbands. The greater the husband's financial troubles prior to marriage, the lower his report of marital happiness. Family approval of the marriage is associated positively with husbands' marital happiness. The interaction terms in Model 3 are not significant, which is not surprising given that neither premarital cohabitation nor covenant status is associated with marital happiness.

[TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Marital dependency models are depicted in Table 4. Model 1 shows that covenants report greater costs to exiting their marriage than do standards. Premarital cohabitation is negatively associated with dependency among wives only, but this association reduces to nonsignificance in the full model (Model 2). Prior marital experience is associated positively with marital dependency among both wives and husbands. Younger wives and husbands report fewer costs to exiting marriage, on average, than do older wives and husbands. A similar pattern

obtains for Black versus white married couples, with the former group reporting lower levels of marital dependence. Among wives, husband's income is related positively to dependency, as is family and peer approval. Premarital risk factors reduce marital dependency among wives. For husbands, religiosity heightens marital dependency. Model 3 reveals that premarital cohabitation and covenant marriage status do not significantly interact in their effects on marital dependency.

[TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Finally, Table 5 presents the odds ratios from Cox proportional hazard models predicting the likelihood of divorce or separation for married couples. Contrary to our expectations, premarital cohabitation is not significantly associated with divorce (although the coefficient is in the expected direction). Covenant couples' odds of divorce are 34% lower than those of standard couples. But once the various sets of controls are accounted for, this effect reduces to nonsignificance. Covenants and standards have similar risks of divorce, even though covenant marriages are supposed to be more difficult to terminate. Other factors are associated with the likelihood of divorce in the expected directions. For instance, education and religiosity are negatively related to the odds of divorce. Parental divorce increases the odds of divorce. And, Blacks are more likely to divorce than Whites. The final model (Model 3) tests whether premarital cohabitation and covenant marriage interact in their effects on divorce. The interaction term does not achieve significance, meaning that the influence of premarital cohabitation on divorce is similar for covenant and standard married couples. Again, this is reasonable since neither premarital cohabitation experience nor covenant status was significant in Model 2.

[TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

Conclusion

We used data from a unique, longitudinal couple-level data set comprised of covenant and standard married wives and husbands from Louisiana to examine whether covenant marriage buffers the detrimental effects of premarital cohabitation experience on marital outcomes. As expected we found that premarital cohabitation is associated with marital instability, but this relationship attenuated once we accounted for factors associated with premarital cohabitation, including sociodemographic characteristics such as education and race, as well as other premarital relationship risk factors, suggesting that the mechanism underlying the association is selection. We noted early in the paper that findings about the relationship between premarital cohabitation and marital happiness are decidedly mixed, with some studies documenting a negative association and others showing no effect. Here, we found no association between cohabitation and marital happiness. Surprisingly, we also did not find a linkage between cohabitation and divorce, which may be an artifact of our restrictive analytic sample (we include only those with *couple-level* data at *both* waves one and three). Our descriptive statistics are especially illuminating in this regard as the proportions experiencing divorce were similar among standard marrieds (regardless of cohabitation experience) and covenants that premaritally cohabited. Those in covenant marriages who did not cohabit were only half as likely to divorce. Covenant marriage was associated with less marital instability among wives, but was not related to marital happiness or divorce in our full models. To evaluate whether covenant marriage weakens the impact of premarital cohabitation on marital success, we tested for interactions between covenant marriage and cohabitation. None of these terms was significant. Thus, our findings indicate that covenant marriage does not seem to stabilize marriages for those who have cohabitation experience.

The influence of premarital cohabitation on subsequent marital outcomes is not sensitive to marriage type (i.e., covenant versus standard). Indeed, the effects of premarital cohabitation are few. Living together is associated with reports of higher marital instability among wives but not husbands. And cohabitation is not related to either marital happiness or divorce. The absence of significant effects may reflect the diminishing importance of premarital cohabitation for subsequent marital outcomes as an increasing share of the population cohabits before marriage making it a normative experience. Alternatively, we may lack sufficient statistical power in our models (again, we used rather restrictive sample criteria).

Nonetheless, our results suggest that when cohabitation is linked to marital outcomes, as it is for marital instability, its effects are reduced, often to nonsignificance, by controlling for sociodemographic and relationship factors associated with cohabitation, which is consistent with the selection explanation. Granted, some of our controls pertain to the marital relationship, but excluding these measures yields the same substantive conclusions, supporting the notion that cohabitation is selective of persons who, given that they marry, tend to experience more marital instability. Cohabitation is selective of certain kinds of people, perhaps those who are poor marriage material or are less likely to view marriage as a lifelong institution. Forming a covenant marriage does not offer protective benefits, although covenant wives report less marital instability, on average, than standard wives. Still, premarital cohabitation has similar effects on marital outcomes regardless of covenant status.

The potential policy implications are that marriage law reforms and marriage education programs that propose to strengthen marriage through covenant-like prescriptions may not be able to improve marital stability for people who enter marriage with cohabitation experiences. Moreover, the consistent effects of the disruptiveness of the courtship experience (i.e., the

premarital risk measure) coupled with the importance of the approval of family and friends for marital outcomes, suggests that perhaps the law reform of creating covenant marriage is not as useful a social policy as the more general aims of initiating premarital counseling and education requirements. From our results, it seems that one way to reduce divorce and enhance early marital quality is to teach young adults how to navigate intimate relationships with respect and careful communication. Additionally, a larger policy point is that most marriage education programs are aimed at couples when in fact a wider policy campaign to encourage support of the marriages around us (whether in our family or our peer networks) might also promote marital success in the aggregate.

## References

- Amato, Paul R. 1996. "Explaining the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58:628\_40.
- Axinn, William G. and Arland Thornton. 1992. "The Relationship between Cohabitation and Divorce: Selectivity or Causal Influence?" *Demography* 29: 357-374.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2000. "The Consequences of Divorce for Adults and Children." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1269\_87.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Joan G. Gilbreth. 1999. "Nonresident Fathers and Children's Well-Being: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:557\_73.
- Besharov, Douglas J. and Timothy S. Sullivan. 1996. "Welfare Reform and Marriage." *Public Interest* 125:81-94.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., Lekha Subaiya, and Joan R. Kahn. 1999. "The Gender Gap in the Economic Well\_Being of Nonresident Fathers and Custodial Mothers." *Demography* 36:195-203.
- Bogensneider, Karen. 2000. "Has Family Policy Come of Age? A Decade Review of the State of U.S. Family Policy in the 1990s." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1136-59.
- Booth, Alan and David Johnson. 1988. "Premarital Cohabitation and Marital Success." *Journal of Family Issues* 9: 255-272.
- Brinig, Margaret F. 1998. "Economics, Law and Covenant Marriage." *Gender Issues* 16: 4-33.
- Brown, Susan L. and Alan Booth. 1996. "Cohabitation versus Marriage: A Comparison of Relationship Quality." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 58: 668-678.
- Bumpass, Larry L. and Hsien-Hen Lu. 2000. "Trends in Cohabitation and Implications for Children's Family Contexts in the United States." *Population Studies* 54:29-41.

- Bumpass, Larry L., James A. Sweet, and Andrew Cherlin. 1991. "The Role of Cohabitation in Declining Rates of Marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53:913-927.
- Clarkberg, Marin, Ross M. Stolzenberg, and Linda J. Waite. 1995. "Attitudes, Values, and Entrance into Cohabitation versus Marital Unions." *Social Forces* 74:609-632.
- Casper, Lynne M. and Suzanne Bianchi. 2002. *Continuity and Change in American Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cherlin, Andrew J. 1992. *Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DeMaris, Alfred and Gerald R. Leslie. 1984. "Cohabitation with the Future Spouse: Its Influence upon Marital Satisfaction and Communication." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46:77-84.
- DeMaris, Alfred and William MacDonald. 1993. "Premarital Cohabitation and Marital Instability: A Test of the Unconventionality Hypothesis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:399-407.
- DeMaris, Alfred and K. Vaninadha Rao. 1992. "Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Stability in the United States: A Reassessment." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:178-190.
- Dush, Claire M. Kamp, Catherine L. Cohan, and Paul R. Amato. 2003. "The Relationship between Cohabitation and Marital Quality and Stability: Change across Cohorts?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 65:539-549.
- Espenshade, Thomas J. 1985. "Marriage Trends in America: Estimates, Implications, and Underlying Causes." *Population and Development Review* 9:193-245.

- Funder, Kate and Simon Kinsella. 1991. "Divorce, Change and Children: Effects of Changing Family Structure and Income on Children." *Family Matters* 30:20-23.
- Furstenberg, Frank F., Saul D. Hoffman, and Laura Shrestha. 1995. "The Effect of Divorce on Intergenerational Transfers: New Evidence." *Demography* 32:319-33.
- Galston, William A. 1996. "The Reinstitutionalization of Marriage: Political Theory and Public Policy." Pp. 271\_90 in *Promises to Keep: Decline and Renewal of Marriage in America*, edited by David Popenoe, Jean Bethke Elstain and David Blankenhorn. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gottman, John Mordecai. 1994. *What Predicts Divorce? The Relationship between Marital Processes and Marital Outcomes*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hawkins, Alan J., Steven L. Nock, Julia C. Wilson, Laura Sanchez, James D. Wright. 2002. "Attitudes about Divorce Reform and Covenant Marriage Legislation: Policy Implications from a Three-State Comparison." *Family Relations* 51:166-175.
- Holden, Karen C. and Pamela J. Smock. 1991. "The Economic Costs of Marital Dissolution: Why Do Women Bear a Disproportionate Cost?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 17:51-78.
- Kurz, Demie. 1995. *For Richer, For Poorer: Mothers Confront Divorce*. New York: Routledge Press.
- Lichter, Daniel T., Deborah Roempke Graefe, and J. Brian Brown. 2003. "Is Marriage a Panacea? Union Formation among Economically Disadvantaged Unwed Mothers." *Social Problems* 50:60-86.
- Lillard, Lee A., Michael Brien, and Linda J. Waite. 1995. "Premarital Cohabitation and Subsequent Marital Dissolution: Is it self-selection?" *Demography* 32:437-458.

- Loconte, Joe. 1998. "I'll Stand Bayou: Louisiana Couples Choose a More Muscular Marriage Contract." *Policy Review* 30:30-34.
- Morgan, Leslie A., Gay C. Kitson, and James T. Kitson. 1992. "The Economic Fallout from Divorce: Issues for the 1990s." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 13:435-43.
- Morrison, Donna Ruane and Mary Jo Coiro. 1999. "Parental Conflict and Marital Disruption: Do Children Benefit When High-Conflict Marriages Are Dissolved?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61:626-37.
- Nichols, Joel A. 1998. "Louisiana's Covenant Marriage Law: A First Step Toward a More Robust Pluralism in Marriage and Divorce Law." *Emory Law Journal* 47: 929.
- Nock, Steven L. 1995. "A Comparison of Marital and Nonmarital Households." *Journal of Family Issues* 16:53-76.
- Nock, Steven L., Laura A. Sanchez, and James D. Wright. 2002. "Intimate Equity." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, Minneapolis, MN.
- Okin, Susan Moller. 1989. *Justice, Gender and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Popenoe, David. 1993. "American Family Decline, 1960-1990." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55:527-55.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. "Can the Nuclear Family Be Revived?" *Society* 36:28-30.
- Rogers, Stacy J. and Paul R. Amato. 1997. "Is Marital Quality Declining? The Evidence from Two Generations." *Social Forces* 75:1089-100.
- Rosier, Katherine Brown and Scott L. Feld. 2000. "Covenant Marriage: A New Alternative for Traditional Families." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 31:385-94.

- Sanchez, Laura, Steven L. Nock, James D. Wright, and Constance T. Gager. 2002. "Setting the Clock Forward or Back? Covenant Marriage and the 'Divorce Revolution'" *Journal of Family Issues* 23:91-120.
- Sanchez, Laura, A., Steven L. Nock, Jill A. Deines, and James D. Wright. 2003. "Can Covenant Marriage Foster Marital Stability among Low-Income, Fragile Newlyweds?" Paper presented at the National Poverty Conference on Marriage and Family Formation among Low Income Couples: What Do We Know from Research?
- Seltzer, Judith A. and Suzanne M. Bianchi. 1988. "Children's Contact with Absent Parents." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 50:663-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Irwin Garfinkel. 1990. "Inequality in Divorce Settlements: An Investigation of Property Settlements and Child Support Awards." *Social Science Research* 19:82-111.
- Smock, Pamela J. 2000. "Cohabitation in the United States: An Appraisal of Research Themes, Findings, and Implications." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 1-20.
- Smock, Pamela J. 1993. "The Economic Costs of Marital Disruption for Young Women Over the Past Two Decades." *Demography* 30:353-71.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Wendy D. Manning, and Sanjiv Gupta. 1999. "The Effect of Marriage and Divorce on Women's Economic Well-Being." *American Sociological Review* 64:794-812.
- Solot, Dorian and Marshall Miller. 2002. "*Let Them Eat Wedding Rings: The Role of Marriage Promotion in Welfare Reform.*" Alternatives to Marriage Project, Boston, MA.
- Spaht, Katherine Shaw. 1998. "Louisiana's Covenant Marriage: Social Analysis and Legal Implications." *Louisiana Law Review* 59: 63-130.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 1998. "Why Covenant Marriage? A Change in Culture for the Sake of the Children." *Louisiana Bar Journal* 46: 116-119.

- \_\_\_\_\_, and Symeon C. Symeonides. 1999. "Covenant Marriage and the Law of Conflicts of Laws." *Creighton Law Review*: 32.
- Spaht, Katherine Shaw. 1999. "Marriage: Why a Second Tier Called Covenant Marriage?" *Regent University Law Review* 12:1-7.
- Teachman, Jay. 2003. "Premarital Sex, Premarital Cohabitation, and the Risk of Subsequent Marital Dissolution among Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65:444-455.
- Teachman, Jay D., Lucky M. Tedrow, and Kyle D. Crowder. 2000. "The Changing Demography of America's Families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62:1234-46.
- Thomson, Elizabeth and Ugo Colella. 1992. "Cohabitation and Marital Stability: Quality or Commitment?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 54:259-267.
- Waite, Linda J. and Maggie Gallagher. 2000. *The Case for Marriage: Why Married People Are Happier, Healthier, and Better Off Financially*. New York: Doubleday.

Table 1. Premarital Cohabitation Experience by Marriage Type

	Marriage Type	
	Covenant N=243	Standard N=255
<i>Premarital Cohabitation Experience</i>		
Neither Ever Cohabited	47.7%	24.7%
Premarital Cohabitation	30.9	62.7
Cohabitation with Other Only	21.4	12.5
<i>Total</i>	100	100

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics (Means and SE or Percentages) for Variables Used in the Analyses.

	Covenant				Standard			
	Wife		Husband		Wife		Husband	
	Cohab	No Cohab	Cohab	No Cohab	Cohab	No Cohab	Cohab	No Cohab
<i>Dependent Variables</i>								
Marital Instability	1.3 (1.8)	.5*** (1.1)	1.2 (1.6)	.6** (1.3)	1.5 (2.1)	1.3 (1.7)	1.5 (2.2)	1.0 (1.5)
Marital Happiness	7.3 (1.5)	7.8* (1.4)	7.8 (1.4)	7.8 (1.4)	7.8 (1.6)	7.7 (1.8)	7.8 (1.6)	8.0 (1.5)
Marital Dissolution	21.3%	9.5%**			23.1%	24.2%		
<i>Sociodemographic Characteristics</i>								
Less than High School	9.3%	1.2%**	16.0%	6.0%**	6.9%	1.1%*	15.6%	11.6%
High School	32.0%	27.4%	40.0%	28.6%	38.8%	38.9%	41.9%	27.4%*
Some College or Voc. Tech.	26.7%	26.8%	22.7%	22.6%	25.6%	17.9%	18.1%	17.9%
College	32.0%	44.6%*	21.3%	42.9%***	28.8%	42.1%*	24.4%	43.2%**
Husband's Income	3.9 (1.7)	4.1 (1.7)			4.2 (2.1)	4.2 (2.1)		
Wife Earns More	18.7%	16.7%			18.8%	12.6%		
Husband Earns More	54.7%	59.5%			61.3%	52.6%		
Previous Marriage	29.3%	22.0%	32.0%	22.6%	40.0%	24.2%**	38.8%	22.1%**
Partners' Parental Divorce	21.3%	11.9%*			23.1%	10.5%**		
Age	27.8 (7.0)	28.0 (7.8)	29.8 (7.6)	29.9 (8.2)	30.6 (8.6)	29.6 (9.4)	33.1 (9.2)	31.5 (10.1)
Both White	65.3%	82.1%**			73.1%	69.5%		
Both Black	14.7%	7.1%			11.9%	10.5%		
Other Race/Ethnic Combinations	20.0%	10.7%*			15.0%	20.0%		
<i>Premarital Relationship Factors</i>								
Husband's Financial Troubles	2.4 (1.5)	2.1 (1.4)			2.7 (1.6)	2.0*** (1.4)		
Premarital Risk	48.0%	27.4%**			39.4%	37.9%		
Met in Church	4.0%	27.4%***	5.3%	28.6%***	1.3%	12.6%***	1.3%	13.7%***
Family and Peer Approval	1.9 (1.5)	2.4** (1.5)	1.8 (1.6)	2.3* (1.6)	2.0 (1.6)	1.9 (1.6)	1.7 (1.6)	1.9 (1.7)
<i>Marital Relationship Factors</i>								
Husband's Financial Setbacks	18.7%	20.2%			18.8%	12.6%		
Religiosity	84.0%	96.4%***	76.0%	89.9%**	71.3%	78.9%	53.8%	68.4%*
Fundamentalist	12.0%	20.8%	13.3%	17.3%	2.5%	8.4%*	2.5%	9.5%**
Child at Marriage Start	33.3%	19.0%**			47.5%	30.5%**		
Child Since Marriage	44.0%	37.5%			38.8%	35.8%		
<i>N</i>	75	168			95	160		

Significant differences between those who premaritally cohabited and those who did not. \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ . When values are given under wife column only, these are actually couple-level measures.

Table 3. SUR Models Predicting Marital Instability at Time 3.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Wife	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Husband
Intercept	1.10 ***	.98 ***	.78	1.18 *	.84	1.19 ***
<i>Focal Independent Variables</i>						
Premarital Cohabitation	.51 **	.58 ***	.38 *	.26	.25	.23
Covenant Marriage	-.51 **	-.38 *	-.41 **	-.17	-.54 *	-.20
<i>Sociodemographic Characteristics</i>						
Some College or Voc. Tech.			-.21	-.34	-.20	-.34
College			.08	-.07	.07	-.07
Husband's Income			-.05	-.05	-.05	-.05
Wife Earns More			.29	.26	.30	.26
Husband Earns More			.42	.14	.42	.15
Previous Marriage			-.31	-.20	-.30	-.20
Partners' Parental Divorce			-.49 *	.21	-.48 *	.21
Age			.01	.01	.01	.01
Both Black			.92 ***	1.04 ***	.91 ***	1.04 ***
Other Race/Ethnic Combinations			-.29	.19	-.32	.19
<i>Premarital Relationship Factors</i>						
Husband's Financial Troubles			.08	.04	.08	.04
Premarital Risk			.49 **	.48 **	.48 **	.47 **
Met in Church			-.19	-.22	-.17	-.22
Family and Peer Approval			-.21 ***	-.09 *	-.20 ***	-.09 *
<i>Marital Relationship Factors</i>						
Husband's Financial Setbacks			.04	.20	.05	.20
Religiosity			-.03	-.48 **	-.02	-.47 **
Fundamentalist			-.15	-.40	-.15	-.40
Child at Marriage Start			.02	-.10	.02	-.10
Child since Marriage			.20	.12	.20	.12
Covenant*Premarital Cohabitation					.28	.05
Adjusted R-Squared	.05	.05	.14	.14	.14	.14

N=417. \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001.

Table 4. SUR Models Predicting Marital Happiness at Time 3.

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Wife	Husband	Wife	Husband	Wife	Husband
Intercept	7.82 ***	7.91 ***	7.71 ***	7.20 ***	7.62 ***	7.26 ***
<i>Focal Independent Variables</i>						
Premarital Cohabitation	-.16	-.11	-.07	-.04	.17	-.14
Covenant Marriage	-.14	-.09	-.14	-.06	.10	-.15
<i>Sociodemographic Characteristics</i>						
Some College or Voc. Tech.			-.17	.35 *	-.19	.34 *
College			-.37 *	.02	-.36 *	.02
Husband's Income			.07	-.04	.07	-.04
Wife Earns More			-.04	-.08	-.05	-.07
Husband Earns More			-.10	.17	-.11	.18
Previous Marriage			-.01	.11	-.04	.11
Partners' Parental Divorce			.26	-.05	.26	-.04
Age			.01	.02 *	.01	.02 *
Both Black			-.45	-.06	-.43	-.06
Other Race/Ethnic Combinations			.55 *	-.13	.60 *	-.15
<i>Premarital Relationship Factors</i>						
Husband's Financial Troubles			-.04	-.10 *	-.05	-.10 *
Premarital Risk			-.49 **	-.44 **	-.47 **	-.45 **
Met in Church			.19	-.24	.16	-.23
Family and Peer Approval			.04	.17 ***	.02	.17 ***
<i>Marital Relationship Factors</i>						
Husband's Financial Setbacks			-.13	-.01	-.14	-.01
Religiosity			-.08	-.00	-.10	-.01
Fundamentalist			.19	.20	.19	.18
Child at Marriage Start			-.10	.19	-.09	.19
Child since Marriage			-.33 *	-.11	-.32 *	-.12
Covenant*Premarital Cohabitation					-.51	.22
Adjusted R-Squared	.00	.00	.05	.08	.05	.08

N=417. \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.02, \*\*\*p<0.001.

Table 5. Cox Regression Models Predicting Divorce (Odds Ratios)

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
<i>Focal Independent Variables</i>			
Premarital Cohabitation	1.31	.92	.79
Covenant Marriage	.58 *	.67	.54
<i>Sociodemographic Characteristics</i>			
Some College or Voc. Tech.		.94	.94
College		.59	.58
Husband's Income		.81 **	.81 **
Wife's Previous Marriage		1.33	1.34
Partners' Parental Divorce		1.24	1.23
Wife's Age		.99	.99
Both Black		2.03 *	1.96 *
Other Race/Ethnic Combinations		2.73 ***	2.66 ***
<i>Premarital Relationship Factors</i>			
Husband's Financial Troubles		.96	.97
Premarital Risk		.96	.96
Met in Church, Wife Report		.61	.63
Husband's Family and Peer Approval		.76 ***	.76 ***
<i>Marital Relationship Factors</i>			
Wife's Religiosity		.47 **	.48 **
Wife Fundamentalist		1.23	1.20
Child at Marriage Start		1.08	1.08
Covenant*Premarital Cohabitation			1.50
-2 log L ( $\chi^2$ ,df)	1096.87 (10.25, 2)	1001.22 (125.98, 17)	1000.44 (126.32, 18)

N=498. \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01, \*\*\*p<0.001.