

Commitment and the changing sequence of cohabitation, childbearing and marriage: insights from qualitative research in the UK

Ann Berrington¹, Brienna Perelli-Harris¹ and Paulina Trevena²

¹ University of Southampton, ² University of Glasgow

Forthcoming in *Demographic Research* <http://www.demographic-research.org/>

Abstract

BACKGROUND

In the UK standard, traditional sequences of family events have been replaced by a de-standardized life course; marriage is postponed and no longer necessary for childbearing; unmarried cohabitation has increased. New sequencing raises questions about the meaning of cohabitation and marriage in peoples' lives.

OBJECTIVE

We ask whether, and to what extent, the new sequencing of life events implies a shift in the level of commitment in cohabitation, potentially giving rise to new expressions of commitment and understandings of cohabitation.

METHODS

Data from eight focus groups conducted in Southampton were analysed, firstly deductively following major themes outlined in the cross-national focus group guidelines, and subsequently inductively using themes raised by the respondents themselves.

RESULTS

Personal commitment is similar in cohabiting and marital relationships, although marriage is perceived to embody greater moral and structural commitment. Since marriage is no longer required as a public display of commitment, the wedding has become more important as a symbolic event. Public displays of commitment are increasingly occurring in other ways, such as childbearing and joint mortgages, demonstrating that cohabiting couples can be as committed as married couples. Although couples discussed how commitment could grow over time, this progression was not necessarily talked about in relation to the timing of childbearing. High educated groups seem to have a greater expectation than low educated groups that childbearing will follow marriage.

CONCLUSIONS

Commitment levels are no longer ascribed solely by union type, but rather by other life events and the couple's own perceived level of commitment.

Author contact: Prof. Ann Berrington, ESRC Centre for Population Change, University of Southampton, SO17 1BJ. E: a.berrington@soton.ac.uk T: 02380594549

1. Introduction

In the UK, the standard, traditional sequence of family events has become far less dominant, to be replaced by a complex and de-standardized lifecourse (Berrington, 2003; Elzinga and Liefbroer, 2007; Billari and Liefbroer, 2010; Perelli-Harris and Lyons-Amos, 2013). Marriage is no longer necessary for childbearing, childbearing is being postponed, unmarried cohabitation is becoming more prevalent before marriage and as a setting for childrearing, and more partnerships, even with children, often end in dissolution (Berrington, 2001; Kiernan and Smith, 2003; Beaujouan & Ni Bhrolchain, 2011). These complicated sequences raise questions about the meaning of cohabitation and marriage in peoples' lives: do people consider cohabitation and marriage to be similar or are they still distinct types of relationships? It also raises questions about the role of commitment in relationships. Investigating the role of commitment is important for understanding interdependencies within relationships, joint investments in relationships, as well as long-term union stability (Brines and Joyner, 1999, Burgoyne et al., 2010). Previously, marriage signalled that a couple was committed to a life-long relationship, at least on the day of the wedding. Today, however, cohabiting relationships can also entail high levels of commitment, especially because cohabitation has begun to take on many other functions of marriage – such as maintaining a home, childbearing and childrearing. Thus, as the sequencing of family events has become more complex and cohabitation has become a standard part of relationship formation, it is important to investigate how processes of union formation and childbearing decision-making are now interrelated, and the role of commitment in shaping these processes.

Commitment has been a central theme in demographic and sociological studies of family life. Quantitative studies in the U.S. and Scandinavia have studied how commitment differs between cohabiting and married people, finding for example, that cohabitators have lower levels of commitment and relationship quality than married people (Brown, 2004; Wiik et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2014), although cohabitators with plans to marry have similar levels of commitment to those who are already married (Wiik et al., 2009). The quantitative research has emphasized that cohabitators are a heterogeneous group; for example one study in the Netherlands found a variety of different levels of legal and interpersonal commitment (Poortman and Mills, 2012). Quantitative survey research has also revealed differences in opinions about the level of commitment in cohabitation and marriage; for example, nearly two-thirds of British respondents thought that living with a partner showed the same level of commitment as marriage (Duncan and Philips 2008). In addition, qualitative research from the UK has emphasized the role of commitment in relationships, especially in contrast to increased individualization (Lewis, 2001; Carter 2012). Thus, studying commitment has been an important way to better understand the emergence and meaning of cohabitation.

Nonetheless, these studies have not explicitly engaged with the social norms associated with cohabitation in relation to the new complexity of family formation. Since the early 2000s, when the majority of qualitative studies in the UK were conducted, entrance into cohabitation rather than direct marriage has become majority practice, and partnerships have become more unstable (Beaujouan and Ni Bhrolchain, 2011); childbearing in cohabitation has rapidly increased (ONS, 2014a); and the normative context of family life has changed (Park & Rhead, 2013). Hence, it is important to re-examine the relationship between commitment and cohabitation paying particular attention to these new

developments. In this paper, we examine commitment and cohabitation using a methodology that is explicitly oriented towards exploring social norms: focus group research. Focus groups allow participants to express their general social perspectives while interacting with others. We conducted a series of focus groups in Southampton, a socially diverse, medium-sized city in the South of England. This research was conducted as part of a larger international research project aimed at comparing social norms about cohabitation and marriage (see Perelli-Harris et al., 2014), and allows us to place the UK in cross-national perspective.

The aim of the focus groups was to ask participants about the meaning of cohabitation and marriage. Commitment emerged repeatedly as a theme in all focus group discussions in all countries, even though the focus group guideline did not explicitly ask about commitment (Perelli-Harris et al., 2014). In this paper, we delve deeper into the theme of commitment, because it was one of the most salient topics to emerge in our UK focus groups and provides specific insights into the variety of ways commitment is discussed. We ask: to what extent does the new ordering of life events imply a shift in the level of commitment in cohabitation, potentially giving rise to new expressions of commitment and understandings of cohabitation?

Drawing on previous conceptualizations of commitment, we investigate whether people think of relationships as a “journey of commitment” that implies a natural progression from cohabitation to marriage. We also discuss whether participants express particular ideals for sequencing life events and the role of alternative forms of commitment, such as children and buying a home together. Finally, because our focus groups were stratified by gender and education, we can see the different ways in which social norms are

expressed by men and women from different educational backgrounds. Taken as a whole, this study provides substantive details into new processes of union formation in the UK, but also provides general insights into how the meaning of commitment is shifting as cohabitation becomes a normative part of the life course.

2. Changes in family formation and attitudes in the UK

In the UK, the new sequencing of family life events has primarily been driven by the delay in marriage and childbearing, increase in cohabitation, and increase in divorce. Entry into partnership and parenthood are being postponed due to the expansion of higher education, increased economic uncertainty, and rising housing costs (Berrington & Stone, 2014).

Traditionally in the UK, there has been an emphasis on home ownership as an important precursor to family formation but as housing has become increasingly unaffordable, the sequencing of these life events has become more diverse (McKee, 2010). Since the 1970s, the prevalence and duration of cohabitation has increased in all socio-economic groups. Today, 84% of newlyweds live together before marriage (ONS, 2014b), usually for around four years before marriage (Beaujouan & Ni Bhrolchain, 2011). Long-term cohabitation is less common; only around 10% of cohabiting couples remain cohabiting after ten years, with around half marrying each other and 40% separating (Beaujouan & Ni Bhrolchain, 2011). The timing of childbearing is also being postponed and is no longer necessarily linked to marriage. Around half of births occur outside of marriage, although almost one third occur to unmarried couples living at the same address (ONS, 2014a), and many couples marry after the birth. Finally, divorce levels increased significantly during the 1970s and 1980s,

stabilizing during the 1990s, before falling recently (probably as a result of the increased selection of couples into marriage who have greater stability). At current rates, about 43% of marriages will end in divorce (ONS, 2014c). The dissolution risks of cohabitation remains high (Beaujouan & Ni Bhrolchain, 2011). The ability to end relationships contributes to the destandardization of the lifecourse. The UK has one of the more heterogeneous patterns of union formation in Europe (Perelli-Harris & Lyons-Amos 2013).

These behavioural changes are mirrored by large shifts in attitudes. Of those born in the 1940s, 62% thought people should marry before having children, compared to 34% among those born in the 1960s, and only 28% born in the 1980s (Park & Rhead, 2013). The majority of the UK population see little difference socially between being married and living together (Duncan & Philips, 2008). This perception may be spurred by a 'common law marriage myth,' or the perception that people who live together for a period of time have the same rights as married couples. Nearly half of the population believe this myth, despite cohabitation not being recognized in law to the same degree as marriage, especially with respect to inheritance and separation (Barlow, 2006). Nonetheless, the acceptance of new behaviors does not necessarily suggest that individuals prefer or adopt these behaviours for themselves. In particular, educational level or social class may be important for shaping social norms. For example, individuals in professional occupations are more likely to prefer a traditional ordering of marriage before childbearing (Duncan & Smith, 2006; Duncan & Phillips, 2008), and the highly educated are more likely to have a birth within marriage than those who are less educated (Berrington, 2001, 2003; Kiernan & Smith, 2003; Perelli-Harris et al., 2010). Thus, while the UK population may becoming more accepting of new sequences of family life events, the practice of new sequences may not be occurring by all.

3. Commitment in cohabitation and marriage

The decline in life-long marriage coupled with the changing nature of intimate relationships has led several scholars to contend that individuals have become more focused on their own needs and self-development, at the expense of obligation and long-term commitment (Giddens, 1992, Beck & Beck Gernsheim, 1995). According to Giddens (1992), 'pure relationships' are "entered into for their own sake, for what can be derived by each person from a sustained association with another; and which is continued only in so far as it is thought by both parties to deliver enough satisfactions for each individual to stay within it" (Giddens, 1992, p.35). Beck & Beck Gernsheim (1995) also emphasise flexibility, negotiation and contingency in intimate relationships suggesting that "biographies are removed from the traditional precepts and certainties, from external control and general moral laws, becoming open and dependent upon decision making, and are assigned as a task for each individual" (Beck & Beck Gernsheim, 1995, p.5).

This focus on the individual, however, generally negates the need for relationships that are bound by commitment. In the UK, both quantitative and qualitative research has contested the individualisation thesis (Lewis, 2001; Jamieson et al., 2002; Duncan et al., 2005; Duncan & Smith, 2006; Carter, 2012), arguing that "commitment cannot be abandoned so quickly to individualisation" (Carter, 2012, p. 138). By examining commitment in intimate relationships, UK scholars have defined and deepened the understanding of how individuals understand commitment in marriage and cohabitation and fundamentally challenged the idea that commitment in relationships has declined (Lewis, 2001; Jamieson et al., 2002; Carter, 2012). Cohabiting couples can be committed to their partners, but the expressions of commitment are multi-dimensional and depend on circumstances (Jamieson

et al., 2002). Here we draw on these studies to better understand how commitment has been previously conceptualized and expressed in the UK, and in order to see whether they resonate in our focus group research.

3.1 Conceptualizations of Commitment

Carter (2012) summarized previous conceptualizations of commitment, which capture different dimensions and perspectives of the concept. The discrete model of commitment, originally developed by Johnson (1991) and adopted by Lewis (2001) and Duncan et al. (2005), delineates three dimensions: personal commitment; moral commitment; and structural commitment. Personal commitment is based on how attracted a person is to the partner (expressed often in terms of romantic love), or to the social identity which is conferred by being in this partnership. Moral commitment reflects the notion that the individual should stay in the partnership, through moral obligation to the partner or the partnership. Structural commitment expresses whether individuals feel they have to stay in a partnership, due to fear of the social, financial, and emotional costs of ending the relationship.

Smart and Stevens (2000, p. 14) suggest a continuum of relationships; from those at one end engaging in 'contingent commitment' (in which the decision to live together is based on "taking a chance" or "seizing an opportunity when faced with significant life events" including unplanned pregnancy) to those at the other end relying on 'mutual commitment' (in which couples jointly define the nature of their relationship, monitor its progress and plan for future contingencies). Finally, the process model of commitment sees commitment changing and increasing over different lines of activity; people do not

necessarily make commitments consciously and may only become aware of commitments with changing circumstances (Carter, 2012, Smart, 2007).

These different definitions of commitment have implications for our understanding of relationships. In general, the UK studies have emphasized heterogeneity in expressions of commitment – and how it can change across the life course and over the course of relationships (Smart and Stevens, 2000, Jamieson et al., 2002). Duncan et al. (2005) found that the majority of their cohabiting respondents discussed a personal dimension of commitment -- they wanted the relationship to continue. However, some respondents did not express this type of commitment, especially following an unexpected pregnancy, and instead relied on the moral-normative or structural commitment types of commitment to keep their relationships intact, especially if the relationship was weak. Smart and Stevens (2000) only interviewed men and women whose previous cohabiting relationships had dissolved, but they still found examples from across the commitment continuum. Mutual commitment couples tended to presume that the relationship would last, whereas for those contingently committed this was only a hope. After interviewing her informants, Carter (2012) found that the concept of commitment went beyond Smart and Steven's (2000) two-dimensional continuum scale and was closer to Smart (2007)'s view of commitment as a process that ebbs and flows. Jamieson et al (2002) also found that her in-depth interviews allowed respondents to talk about the process of commitment, and how it can grow or falter over time.

3.2 Expressions of commitment

In addition to defining commitment, previous UK research has also explored the different ways in which commitment is expressed. One of the strongest distinctions to emerge is between public and private commitment. Several studies have found that marriage

continues to act as a *public* statement of commitment, while cohabitation entails *private* commitment (Jamison et al., 2002; Lewis, 2001). Private commitment is personal, between the partners, with no need to demonstrate their love in public, to the State, Church, or community (Lewis, 2001). This type of commitment is bolstered by a shared history of “acts,” events, and decisions (Smart 2007). In addition, private commitment entails trust, fidelity, and support for each other, all of which can be present in a relationship regardless of marriage (Burgoyne et al., 2010). In several studies, cohabitators explicitly emphasized their personal commitment to each other and stated that they did not want to make a public commitment, especially with a public wedding or service (Lewis 2001). Sometimes the public display of commitment is important for the wider kin group, and past research has shown the continued importance of the family in “lived lives” (Morgan, 1996; Lewis, 2001; Finch, 2007).

Previous UK qualitative research found that cohabitators often express and value commitment according to different definitions. Children can be a sign of commitment, both in terms of public commitment - others may perceive of children as a sign of a close relationship - and as private commitment, since children can create deep bonds between parents (Lewis, 2001). Children require an investment in the relationship and a future-orientation, since partners desire a relationship that will last (Carter, 2012), although commitment might be more contingent in the case of unplanned pregnancy (Smart & Stevens, 2000).

In addition, past research based on in-depth interviews has discussed the role of children in relationships in terms of pregnancy triggering entry into cohabitation (Smart & Stevens, 2000; Lewis, 2002), and decisions as to which surname to use for children within

cohabiting families (Duncan et al., 2005). Nonetheless, it is less clear how these themes are expressed with respect to general social norms about cohabitation, and what types of conclusions we can draw based on differences in cohabitation and marriage more generally. In particular, understanding social norms is important for perceiving the ordering of cohabitation, marriage, and childbearing, especially given high rates of separation and divorce. Hence, below we explore focus group discussions to better understand whether there are social norms about commitment in marriage and cohabitation and if so, how the new ordering of family events shapes these norms.

4. Data and Methods

Data collection followed the research design developed by the Focus on Partnership team, whereby a standardized focus group guideline directed the focus group discussions¹. Four all male, and four all female focus groups (FG) were carried out with individuals aged 25 to 40 who held British citizenship. Within each gender we recruited two lower educated groups and two higher educated groups (Table 1) (defined as below and above Advanced Levels, primarily with university education). Participants had a variety of relationship statuses and histories; just under half had married, four had divorced, nine were currently cohabiting, and the remainder were not currently in a co-residential partnership. Within all the partnership groups, some were parents, others were childless. Given the complexity of past relationships, we are unable to specifically use partnership status in our analysis of general focus group discourses.

¹ For further information on this project, please see Perelli-Harris et al. (2014) or www.nonmarital.org.

Table 1: Focus Group Participants According to Gender and Education

Focus Group Sample	FG1	FG2	FG3	FG4	FG5	FG6	FG7	FG8
Men			9	7			7	6
Women	10	8			4	8		
High educated	10	8		7			7	
Low educated			9		4	8		6
Total number of participants	10	8	9	7	4	8	7	6

The FGs were conducted in Southampton, a medium-sized port city on the southern coast of the UK (population around 236,000 individuals). According to 2011 Census data, almost one quarter of employees in Southampton are in public sector jobs – slightly higher than the average for England, reflecting the presence of two large universities in the city. Recruitment and fieldwork were carried out in 2012 in two socio-economically diverse areas of Southampton. The first is ethnically diverse and characterised by an above average education profile, youthful age structure and large private rental sector. The second is more ethnically homogenous White, with a higher proportion living in state-subsidized social housing. The recruitment strategy included: leafleting; putting up posters on community noticeboards and other public places; advertisements in a local newspaper, on local community websites and through social media. Focus groups were moderated by author3 and observed by author 1.

In the FG interviews, we asked the participants their views on why cohabitation is becoming increasingly popular, the advantages and disadvantages of cohabitation and marriage, why people decide to get married, whether people should marry if they have

children, and whether the institution of marriage will survive (Perelli-Harris et al., 2014). Audiotapes of the groups were transcribed and analysed within NVivo software. Author 1 and author 3 coded the transcripts separately and then agreed upon a single set of coding, initially following a deductive approach. First we coded major themes that were outlined in the focus group guidelines. Subsequently we coded themes raised by the respondents' themselves (such as the importance of tradition and socialisation in childhood) and sub-themes relating to views and experiences that kept on recurring in the data (such as the "correct" ordering of life events). This iterative method allowed us to draw out the most salient themes of the FG discussions.

5. Findings

5.1 Commitment in Cohabitation and Marriage

As found in other qualitative research in the UK, the concept of commitment was essential for understanding perceptions of cohabitation. However, participants in our focus groups did not necessarily discuss commitment in the same way as in previous work. In fact, we found that the way in which participants discuss commitment points to overlapping frameworks. For example, Jamieson et al (2002) make a distinction between private and public commitment, but in our FGs, it is not always clear whether participants would make this distinction, especially when thinking about the personal commitment that reflects their commitment to each other. Johnson's (1991) framework, which explores personal, moral and structural commitment, does not explicitly focus on the expression of commitment, especially to those outside of the couple, which we found to be an important theme in our FGs. Finally, previous UK work rarely discusses the importance of family and tradition in expressions of commitment, themes which emerged repeatedly in our FGs. Hence, here we

provide an alternative framework for our results that reflects the main themes emerging from the FGs. First we explore a perceived hierarchy of general commitment which tends to suggest that marriage is the ultimate commitment. We then explore different dimensions of commitment– personal, moral and structural, which may be expressed simultaneously within one statement. Finally, we look at how commitment is manifested in marriage and cohabitation and how commitment is judged by others external to the couple, particularly with respect to family and tradition.

While almost all participants agreed that couples in any type of relationship can demonstrate commitment, they had a range of opinions as to whether marriage usually signalled *more* commitment than cohabitation. On the whole, however, participants, not only made a distinction between cohabitation and marriage, they implied that there was a hierarchy in perceived levels of commitment. They referred to marriage as ‘the ultimate commitment,’ or the “next level in their relationship journey,” suggesting that marriage was superior to cohabitation. This hierarchy also emerged when they contrasted “being married” to “just living together.” Sue, in this quote, expressed the opinion that marriage has higher levels of commitment than cohabitation:

“Well it [marriage] is a real statement. It’s a statement to everybody that we are together and we’re committing to be together, whereas you’re not doing that if you’re just living together.” (Sue, high educated)

While most participants referred to marriage as taking the next step in a relationship, cohabitation was often seen as “not such a serious step.” Natasha argued that marriage is associated with “wholly committing” oneself to someone rather than “just cohabiting.” She wondered whether some of her peers may have been put off marriage by the experience of parental separation:

“I would like to get married...and to make that commitment to somebody, whereas friends who have come from broken homes themselves sort of don’t see the point and would rather have the freedom to be able to just live with somebody rather than commit wholly to them through marriage.” (Natasha, high educated)

Many FG participants held on to a romanticized view of marriage where the wedding is a declaration that ‘this is the one.’ In addition, participants referred to marriage as a “promise,” that entailed an expectation of permanency.

“I think there’s a lot of hope attached to marriage, it’s like “From here on in” and there’s something quite lovely about that.” (Natasha, high educated)

Most of the way that commitment has been expressed so far can be conceptualized as “personal commitment,” or the extent to which individuals want to stay in the partnership (Johnson, 1991). Personal commitment can also relate to feelings of psychological security, and some (more often female) FG participants argued that being proposed to and getting married provides important emotional or psychological security. George likens marriage to becoming part of a team which is expected to remain intact providing mutual support:

“I think there's probably a psychological security that one gets from being married, that it's like an eternal commitment and that you always have that union; that team there for life.” (George, high educated)

Nonetheless, most FG participants endorsed the view that couples can personally commit to one another in cohabitation, or “without a piece of paper.” The discussion below between Holly (a single mum) and Megan (a cohabiting mum) is typical and reflects the general acceptance in the UK of cohabitation as a relationship that involves a high level of commitment, but may not be preferred by all. Holly supports cohabitation as a partnership form, despite indicating that she personally would prefer to marry. Holly’s response is very typical of the highly educated men and women in our focus groups – a theme to which we will return in section 5.4.

Holly: *"I think you can commit [in cohabitation]. I mean, personally I would like to get married but I can see the flipside that you can commit without the piece of paper."*

Megan: *"It [marriage] doesn't change anything."*

Holly: *"It doesn't change anything at all. And I can totally understand where couples are coming from that say, 'We're going to be together regardless...I'm proving my commitment by living my life with them and sharing everything I have with them, we don't feel the need to get married.'" (FG2 high educated)*

Some participants even argued that cohabitation entails a larger commitment than marriage, since whether or not you remain together is an 'expression of free choice' rather than based on promises made within wedding vows:

"If you are together and you're not married it almost says more, doesn't it, because you're not together because of that bit of paper, you're together because you're together." (Mark, low educated)

Thus, participants generally agreed that personal commitment is very similar in cohabiting and marital relationships, although some argued that cohabiting couples are more committed, because they do not need the piece of paper to prove their love, while others thought that marriage was the ultimate sign of commitment. When we explore moral and structural conceptualisations of commitment, however, we begin to see greater differences in the way in which FG participants talk about marriage and cohabitation. For example, a common theme to emerge among both the male and female FGs was that couples would work harder to save a marriage than a cohabiting partnership. Almost all FGs thought that couples would strive harder to save a marriage either because of a stronger moral obligation to their spouse (or to the relationship), or because of structural constraints, such as financial and practical considerations.

One of the ways in which the moral conceptualization of commitment emerged was with respect to promises and vows. Richard emphasises the promise made when taking

wedding vows and the moral obligation to continue within a marriage. This promise is made not only to his partner but to the wider community, and the ring is a symbol of that promise.

"Maybe [you] would work harder if you've got a ring on your finger and, you know, there's something, again maybe just psychological, something saying well, I've promised to spend the rest of my life with this person, I best really try." (Richard, high educated)

Julie and Monica also agree that couples would work harder at a marriage, because it is a greater moral and structural commitment. In this instance Julie emphasises the moral and social obligations which arise from the expense of an elaborate wedding, for which she paid most of the costs.

Julie: *"I think you're more inclined to go [if cohabiting], I have got married, so I've got to deal with this. That's me anyway."*

Monica: *"It's more of a commitment."*

Julie: *"I've bothered to get married and it cost me a lot of money, so I'm going to sort it out, whereas if you're not married and they really do get on your nerves, you could more easily get out of it." (FG6, low educated)*

Structural commitment was also perceived by most FG participants as stronger in marriage, especially the perceived difficulty of ending a marriage – as mentioned by Julie at the end of the previous quote. Many participants, both high and low educated, suggested that the financial costs of divorce are higher because of the need to involve lawyers and the courts. Natasha suggests that in comparison to separating from a cohabiting partner, divorce is more painful and expensive.

"Financially if you were then living with somebody and then you realised the gambling habit or the fact that you just really couldn't get on you don't have to go through the painful and very expensive process of divorce." (Natasha, high educated)

In addition, the social cost of divorce may be greater than for the separation of a cohabiting partnership due to the stigma attached to divorce. The failure of a marriage and

having to admit to having been divorced was viewed more negatively than having ended a cohabitation partnership.

In summary, while FG participants did not consider personal commitment to be exclusive to marriage, they did perceive differences in the moral obligation cohabitators and married couples feel towards their relationships. Once couples marry, they are more likely to work at their relationships in order to stay together. In addition, the structural commitment between marriage and cohabitation clearly differs, since informants perceived marriage to be harder to get out of due to the financial costs, the involvement of courts and lawyers, and the stigma, which has not completely disappeared in the UK.

Nevertheless, it is important to note that some participants still expressed a fundamental scepticism with the institution of marriage and argued that cohabitation was in fact a greater sign of commitment. High divorce rates contributed to this scepticism, leading some to question whether marriage is really the “ultimate commitment.” Emily’s contribution is typical:

“I don’t think people have got as much faith in marriage either anymore... It’s not a forever thing anymore, is it, whereas before it was more of a commitment than nowadays.” (Emily, low educated)

In fact, Anthony suggests that cohabiting couples are more likely to have strong personal commitment precisely because they are not bound by the same level of moral obligation or structural commitment associated with marriage:

“Cohabiting means that you know that you’re there for the right reasons and not purely because a piece of paper you signed ten years ago is requiring you to remain.” (Anthony, high educated)

Thus, despite the overall opinion that marriage represents a greater sense of commitment, especially with respect to moral and social commitment, these particular

responses reflect a fundamental shift in how cohabitation can be perceived not only as a type of relationship which can be committed, but also as a relationship which can transcend marriage, because it is free from the external moral and structural obligations that force two people to remain together.

Men's lack of commitment

The scepticism of marriage also came through when discussing men's lack of commitment.

In both the male and female FGs participants claimed that UK men are often reluctant to commit themselves to marriage. This reluctance was expressed in terms of men being scared of commitment, not seeing the point of marriage, or being less interested in the big wedding day. For example, in response to the first question of the FG guideline "More and more couples are living together without being married... why do you think this is happening?" two participants in FG6 immediately responded:

Laura: "Because men don't want to get married."

Lori: "Afraid of commitment." (FG6, low educated)

In response to the question why couples might cohabit for a long time, Natasha and Susan agree that some couples may be cohabiting because the male partner did not want to marry.

Natasha: "I've noticed with some of my friends it's actually been the men who've resisted and the women of the partnership want to get married. So they will compromise to stay with that man by not marrying."

Susan: "Yeah it's much rarer to have a couple who are both genuinely happy with living together and not getting married I think." (FG1 high educated)

Both high and low educated men admitted that often men do not want to "settle down", or commit to a single relationship. In the following discussion, Mathew discusses his

friend who was happy to live with but not marry his partner. Jonathan suggests that in modern societies we are used to having a wide choice of options and are no longer as committed to one thing. Tim wonders whether men may be afraid of marriage since by committing themselves to one person, they might miss an opportunity to upgrade when a better option comes along:

Mathew: "I guess it's that security of having someone and being committed to a certain level but not wanting to take the plunge."

Jonathan: "I think it may reflect society more broadly in that today in society we have a lot more choice in every area of life, whether it's work, travel, products... We're not as committed to necessarily one thing as we are a multitude of options."

*Tim: "You're always aware that once you commit, you may not be able to upgrade... there will be certain people who are scared of missing out on an opportunity that comes, because we're always being told to seize the moment and go for the biggest and the best."
(FG7, high educated)*

Our findings suggest that in the UK the importance placed on marriage (especially the wedding event) generally differs by gender. FG participants described men as less keen to commit to a single partner for fear of missing out on a better option.

5.2 Expressions of Commitment

The previous sections focused on personal, moral, and structural commitment, which tends to reflect how couples perceive commitment within their own relationships. However, a couple's level of commitment is not always obvious to people outside the relationship. Hence, it is important to examine how couples express their commitment, especially now that marriage is no longer primary.

The wedding

Almost all FG respondents felt that the purpose of the wedding is to make a public declaration of love and commitment. In response to the interviewer's question on whether marriage will disappear within 50 years, Daniel notes the importance of a public promise:

*"Whatever it turns out to be in the future, our conception of marriage, I think there will still be something like that in the future, some public display of promise."
(Daniel, high educated)*

Many of the discussions reflect Smart's (1997, p. 69) 'future oriented commitment,' which encompasses this idea of a public *promise* "based upon the experience of falling in love and feeling the other person to be the one". Below, Sara reflects on why she decided to marry, despite having seen her dad cohabit happily with his new partner for 25 years following a divorce from her mother.

"At the time it was for the reason that I loved him and I wanted to show that commitment to him, I wanted to show that commitment to my family and to his family...., as a statement of intent to share our lives." (Sara, high educated)

According to FG participants, the wedding symbolizes the aspirational 'fairy tale ending,' which remains pervasive across society. The majority of couples who were married or who were considering marriage wanted to do it 'the proper way' and have a 'proper wedding. As seen in previous research findings for the UK (Jamieson et al., 2002; Carter, 2012), 'proper weddings' were conceptualised as those which are large, ritualised events, and not small affairs at the registry office. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that the desire to marry is not all about a desire to express commitment. FG participants also extensively discussed the wedding itself. They mentioned how socialisation in childhood, in

particular through fairy tales and Disney films, perpetuated marriage as an ideal and the traditional wedding as something aspirational. As Julie notes below, she was socialized in childhood to believe that getting married is what girls do when they grow up.

“Thinking back to when I wasa little girl, you do assume you’re going to get married some day and it’s there in all the fairy stories and on the TV and everything. There was that, kind of assumption from when I was very, very small that that’s just what girls do, basically, when they grow up.” (Julie, high educated)

Hence, getting married and weddings are not only a display of public commitment, but also a reflection of social norms. This popularity of marriage (or a wedding) as a consumer event cautions us against viewing decisions about marriage purely in terms of individuals wanting to make a public declaration of commitment.

Marriage and changes to social identity

Marriage continues to be associated with a number of changes to social identity, for example through the adoption of new surnames, and titles, particularly among women, as well as changing relationship terminology. These markers automatically notify those outside the couple about their legal marital status and convey a public statement about the couple’s commitment. Thus, these markers continue to be one of the ways in which cohabitation and marriage differ in the UK. For example, many, but not all, married women continue to change their surname to their husband’s or create a double-barrelled name. Marriage also changes the terms partners use, which was generally perceived as a positive reason for marriage. For example, Sara notes *“My partner” or “My wife”; it’s kind of different.* Moreover, participants brought up the importance of marriage for legitimising other family

relationships; Amy, currently cohabiting but due to marry in a few months, remarks *“I’m very aware that once we get married I will be an auntie, but at the moment I’m not.”*

In the UK individuals are asked for their title e.g. Mr, Mrs, Miss when undertaking many day to day tasks or filling out forms. Unlike for adult men whose title remains “Mr” whatever their marital status, for women the prefix changes upon formal marriage from Miss to Mrs, and divorced women sometimes use Ms. Thus in everyday life the legality of their partnership status can impact on women’s social identity. Some of the lower educated women agreed that being married conferred a different status and allowed them to take greater control over the household, for example they could talk to utility companies on behalf of the whole family.

Issues surrounding the family name were raised spontaneously in all the FGs. First, a few women discussed surnames in the context of not wanting to relinquish their personal identity upon marriage by taking their husbands’ surname. Second, a shared family surname was frequently cited as an advantage of marriage. Respondents mentioned that uncomfortable situations may arise if children have different surnames from their parents. To many, a common surname strengthens the family unit, as Dawn explains:

“I feel like I’m providing more security in some way, a family unit, with the same name.” (Dawn, high educated)

This importance of having the same family name is intensified by the reaction of others, especially in social situations. Some of the FG participants with children who held different surnames to one of their parents talked about experiences with their children’s schools. Sometimes the different names caused confusion; often assumptions were made by

the school that the couple was married. One cohabiting father said that he was quite happy with cohabiting rather than marrying the mother of his child, since he was able to give his child his surname. Hence, surnames still seem to be important for social identity and in identifying the commitment level of the family.

In summary, marriage acts as a public statement of commitment, not only in terms of the public promise made on the wedding day, but also in the use of common surnames, titles, and terminology. Thus, everyday language distinguishes between those in marital and nonmarital unions and may provide some public display of the level of commitment in a union, although possibly a false one.

Commitment and family tradition

Focus group participants not only saw that marriage was an expression of commitment made publicly, but also an expression of commitment that linked families together, as well as providing a sense of historical continuity. In response to a direct question on whether marriage would still continue in 50 years, the majority of FG participants thought it would, often because they saw it as an important link to tradition. Dawn argues for example that marriage will be around for many years to come since:

“It’s just embedded in so many traditions, family history and religion and... It’s in everything and I think it will take a very long time to work out of that, if it’s going to, longer than fifty years.”, (Dawn, high educated)

As discussed above, the wedding, and especially the church wedding, continues to prevail as one of the enduring images of true commitment. A number of FG participants, particularly in the highly educated group, discussed how they and their friends wanted to marry in a church even though they were not religious. However, some married in church,

because of the family's image of what the big day should look like rather than the couple's.

Megan, who married in a church, recollected:

"I'm not religious at all (...) I said I would never get married in a church, and it was because of the family pressure, even though none of them are religious, it was ridiculous. But there was this family pressure about, 'Ah, well it's the church where Mark was christened'..." (Megan, high educated)

The importance of other family members in decisions about whether and how to marry were very salient. Family traditions can put pressure on couples to perform the wedding in a certain way. Below, Kevin suggests that the parents may be the motivating force in maintaining traditions, such as the symbolic gesture of the father handing the bride to her future husband. Kevin mentions that these traditions put pressure on a couple to have a traditional church wedding even if they are not religious at all:

"[Sometimes] you've got a family tradition, as in the father walking the bride down and ...handing the bride over.... If the parents are quite traditional, and they want to do that thing, if that is still, like, deep rooted within the family's norms or beliefs, even if they're not, like, very religious, that idea can also put some pressure on a couple." (Kevin, low educated)

Interference from other family members, especially mothers and mothers-in-law, in the planning of weddings was a common theme in discussions of how family and peers influence decisions to cohabit and marry. For a few focus group participants, the desire to avoid the big wedding and associated fuss led them to have a wedding overseas (a popular choice in the UK). Hence, despite the overall feeling that it is important for a couple to signal their commitment by paying attention to family and tradition, clearly some are rejecting the need to display their commitment by avoiding a big wedding altogether.

Other expressions of commitment

Despite the discussion surrounding public displays of commitment, such as big weddings and the role of family and tradition, focus group participants also raised other expressions of commitment that could be more important than marriage. The notion that cohabitators can be committed in a variety of ways is shown by the discussion between Lauren and Dawn.

Lauren: "People feel like they commit in other ways, like, say they bought a house or something like that, that feels like a big commitment to people, so it might feel that that would be enough of a commitment maybe."

Dawn: "People just feel they don't need a piece of paper to prove their commitment if they're showing it in other ways, I think". (FG2, high educated)

Some participants suggested that taking on a joint mortgage can indicate a greater commitment than marriage. Right at the start of FG4 when the high educated men were asked why they thought more and more couples are living together without marrying, Joshua responds:

"I don't think marriage is the biggest commitment people can make these days. I think one of the biggest commitments people make is like joint financial projects and the like, mortgages particularly, because that seems harder to get out of.... like with mortgages they're for 30 years which may in fact last a lot longer than marriages." (Joshua, high educated)

Buying a house together was also seen as a key measure of commitment. One highly educated participant described how she had a joint mortgage with her ex-cohabiting partner and how it had been a costly and lengthy process to disentangle things when they broke up. Susan responded: "Well a mortgage is the same sort of seriousness of commitment."

In many of the FGs, the idea that having children together was more of a commitment than marriage arose spontaneously. For example, Bob identified the enduring commitment

related to having children, especially when discussing his brother, who has had two children in a long- term cohabiting union.

“He's committed to his children, he's committed to his partner, but he doesn't feel that he needs that piece of paper...personally I think having children with somebody is more of a commitment, because if we were to have children together and split up, there's always that common thing is the children.” (Bob, low educated)

Nonetheless, some participants still maintain that even though cohabitators may have joint investments including children this still does not equate to the commitment associated with marriage, as the quote from Ally demonstrates:

“Even though they are committed because they might have a mortgage and they've got a child (...), in their head probably feel that they're not committed because they haven't actually got married.” (Ally, low educated)

As these comments show, public displays of commitment are increasingly occurring in other ways, again demonstrating that cohabiting couples can be as committed as married couples. This type of commitment is not purely personal, moral, or structural, but instead embodies several elements of each. These new displays of commitment allow the couple to demonstrate their love in different ways, without marriage and without sequencing their lives in a traditional order. In the next section, we describe focus group participants' discussions about how the sequence of family events is becoming increasingly de-standardized, a process which occurs simultaneously with the development of new public expressions of commitment.

5.3. Interplay between commitment and the new sequence of family events

This topic emerged in part because of a direct question in the FG interview guide which asked whether there was a best time in life to get married, followed by a question asking whether couples should marry if they want or have children. In part however, this theme emerged inductively from the manner in which respondents talked about intrinsic (personal) and extrinsic (e.g. family, peers, work colleagues) expectations for the sequencing of life course events. In particular, we observed differences in the way in which these expectations were discussed in the high and low educated groups as discussed below.

Journey of Commitment

Throughout the FG discussions there was a tendency to refer to “progression” in relationships, similar to how Jamieson et al (2002) and Smart (2007) discussed commitment as a process that ebbs and flows. For many, cohabitation was perceived as the next step following dating, but ending in marriage. Sometimes, cohabitation is seen as a testing relationship prior to marriage, as is the case for Phil:

“It’s a case of relationship, living together, engaged, married - so people see it as a process. It [cohabitation] is almost like a trial run, how are we going to get on when we live together, can we bear each other every day of the week...when talking about progression in a relationship, I think it [cohabitation] is certainly a step up from regularly dating and seeing someone and there’s obviously a stage before committing your life together.” (Joshua high educated)

Participants often talked about marriage as “taking the next step in the relationship”; or “taking the partnership to the next level” as in the following quote from Kenneth who had cohabited for eight years prior to marriage:

“I was with my ex for eight years before we actually married, and then we married because we thought that was the next step in the relationship.” (Kenneth, low educated)

Often this progression was talked about in terms of increased commitment in the relationship, but clearly in the quote above it can also decline, since the couple divorced. We might suggest therefore that individuals' relationships can be viewed as a 'journey of commitment', but can also reverse course as the commitment eventually falters (Jamieson et al., 2002, Smart, 2007).

The ordering of events

Although couples discussed how commitment could grow over time, resulting in a "journey of commitment", this progression was not necessarily talked about in relation to the timing of childbearing. All FGs participants agreed that the quality of a relationship and 'being settled' were more important than life-stage in making the decision to get married.

For some respondents marriage was more of a capstone event as suggested by Cherlin (2004) and Holland (2013). Kenneth talks about being in a position to marry having already achieved parenthood and secure accommodation:

"[I]t's not like the old days where people had to get married if the kid came along. (...) See, we got married because we thought at the time that was the next natural progression in our relationship. We already had kids, we'd got a place, so we thought next thing is we're going to get married." (Kenneth, low educated)

Some respondents felt that a hurried wedding in response to a premarital pregnancy was not likely to last:

"Well I think that ... the reason people get married is because they love each other... it shouldn't be because you've got kids. If people are forced into a situation, it's less likely to work, isn't it?" (Andy, low educated)

A common response, especially among the less educated FGs, was that people should get married whenever it feels right for them and that marriage is no longer a requirement for childbearing.

"It's the reason for getting married as opposed to the timing when they get married that's more important, you know, it should just be for the right reason, not just because you've got a child." (Judith, low educated)

This different ordering of life course events can make cohabitation more difficult to dissolve. Below, Gina's assumption that cohabitation was easier to walk away from compared to marriage is challenged by other participants. Amy and Elizabeth qualify Gina's original statement, highlighting the complicating role of joint investments such as mortgages and children.

Gina: *"Being able to walk out whenever you want without worrying too much about the consequences."*
Amy: *"Unless there's a joint mortgage."*
Gina: *"Yes."*
Elizabeth: *"Or a baby." (FG2, high educated)*

Emily also argues that whether or not cohabitation is easier to walk away from depends on the couple's circumstances, suggesting that cohabitators can be committed in many ways including having pooled income and joint investments.

"I think it depends on your situation. I mean, if you've got a joint mortgage and all your bills are joint and everything, and you've got two incomes coming in, then you've still got to go through everything bar the paperwork of the divorce, really, if you're going to separate. But if you're in rented, perhaps, and, you know, you haven't got so much commitment in that respect as well, then you don't have so much to do when you separate than if you're committed in a lot of other ways as well." (Emily, low educated)

In summary, the FG findings suggest that the increasing diversification of family trajectories, particularly the increase in nonmarital childbearing and divorce, has led to expressions of commitment other than the wedding to become more important. Joint investments such as children and mortgages often require a greater level of commitment over a long period of time, irrespective of what has happened to the partnership.

Preferred sequencing of family events among high and low educated

Although liberal attitudes towards non-traditional sequencing of family events arose in all FGs, we found persistent differences in how high and low educated participants talked about the relationship between commitment, cohabitation and marriage. The importance of marriage as a public statement of commitment appeared to be more important in the high educated FGs, reflecting both a greater personal desire to take the “next step,” but also greater external pressure from family, friends, and wider social circles, as described by George:

“I've been in a relationship for... about seven years. I'm always being asked - when are you getting married? This is from parents, sisters, friends... work colleagues... it comes from all directions and from all generations. What does this say? It says that there is this expectation in people's minds bubbling under the surface that that is the thing you should do.” (George, low educated)

The high educated participants repeatedly discussed expectations from family and peer groups for individuals to follow a more traditional sequencing of family events.

Catherine, a cohabiting mother perceived a judgemental attitude towards her lifestyle choice. She describes the reaction to the news that she was pregnant, contrasting her experience with the more positive reaction that married mums-to-be receive.

“I do think if you tell people that you're pregnant and you're not married, they're much more surprised. So, I think there's generally an expectation – (...) certainly when I told people I was pregnant a lot of them said, 'Oh, was it planned?' (...) I had that a lot from my work colleagues and random people and apparently if you're married people say, 'Oh, congratulations!' And I was very surprised that there was that difference. I've been with my partner for ten years so it's not, like, I only met him last week.” (Catherine, high educated)

It is noteworthy that her work colleagues, among others, questioned her as to whether the pregnancy was planned, even though she had been in a stable partnership for

ten years. This suggests that there is an expectation among those with higher levels of education that childbearing should wait until formal marriage.

In contrast, discussions in the low educated FGs suggested that cohabitation as a type of family form (and not just as a precursor to marriage) was more normative. Below Mark comments on general partnership trends in the UK:

“The meaning of marriage has gone... I mean, if you look at it twenty-thirty years ago, it was – you used to do it. Whereas these days it’s just, the general consensus is that it’s not the norm to get married... people don’t feel the need to get married these days.” (Mark, low educated)

What is most striking about this quote is that Mark actually says that it is not the norm to get married. This sentiment, echoed by others from the low educated FGs, reflects differences by education in the lived experiences of couples, both within our FG sample and in the wider population where childbearing within cohabitation is more common among less educated groups (Berrington, 2001; Kiernan and Smith, 2003; Perelli-Harris et al., 2011). Jenny (aged 28) reflects on the fact that she is unusual among her peer-group to have married. Nevertheless, her cohabiting friends are demonstrating their commitment through buying a house together and through the joint rearing of children.

“Until December last year my husband and I were the only couple out of all of our friends that were actually married. I think all of them were owning their own properties and probably about half of them had kids...” (Jenny, low educated)

Often childbearing is not planned, as discussed by Bob, who notes that the birth of children within cohabitation means that financial and family commitments can take precedence over marriage.

“Accidents happen along the way, you can be cohabiting and before you know it, you've got children that come along. Children take priority, and then getting married tends to take a back seat. It's maybe something that you may wish to do

later on, or after probably 20 years together, and that you think, oh we're right as we are now, so what's the point?" (Bob, low educated)

The low educated participants repeatedly mention that marriage is a low priority relative to other financial and family commitments. In particular, the high costs of housing mean that the traditional ordering of family events is no longer attainable, especially for those on low incomes, as Kenneth explains:

"Where the housing market is so extortionate that a lot of people aren't doing that first step of getting a house first, and then going on to the next step of getting married, then having children. A lot of them are, sort of, having the children, and cohabiting, because obviously they can't afford that first step onto the property ladder before thinking about carrying on with, sort of, the next steps of marriage and family and things like that." (Kenneth, low educated)

In summary, the highly educated groups in the UK seem to maintain a greater expectation that childbearing will follow marriage, reflecting individuals' own preferences, but also family traditions and peer group norms which favour a traditional sequencing of events. The less educated, on the other hand, may want to marry, but consider it a low priority relative to other pressing needs.

6. Conclusion

"Marriage might fade away slightly, but at the end of the day, humans aren't going to stop being humans in terms of our capacity to kind of love and care and that kind of emotional desire for commitment and trust we're not going to be robots..." (Joshua, high educated)

Joshua's reflections on the future of marriage encapsulate our finding that despite the decline in marriage, increase in divorce and the rise of nonmarital cohabitation, people still have a need to show and feel commitment within relationships. Even though individualization may be increasing, commitment in relationships is still important, and most

people have the intention to find and stay with a partner long-term. This finding, consistent with evidence from previous UK cohabitation research (e.g. Lewis, 2001) raises questions about the individualisation thesis of Beck & Beck-Gernsheim (1995) and Giddens (1992). Yet our study goes beyond debates about commitment versus individualization to examine how expressions of commitment have developed in parallel to the increase in cohabitation and the new sequencing of life events. Not only have the order of childbearing, partnership formation and marriage changed, but the broader set of life transitions, such as buying a house (or at least securing long term accommodation), have become more uncertain and postponed to later ages (Berrington and Stone, 2014; McKee, 2012). Thus the traditional sequence of marriage – mortgage - childbearing is no longer relevant to a large segment of the population, and it is important to understand what commitment *vis a vis* cohabitation and marriage means.

Before reflecting on some of the key findings, we note some limitations to the study and methodology. First, readers should be cautious of generalising from our eight focus groups conducted in (albeit mixed) neighbourhoods in Southampton to the rest of the UK. While Southampton is an average city in terms of income, the UK has a variety of important regional differences that could influence union formation. Also, our sample was relatively homogenous in terms of ethnicity; most respondents were of white origin. Second, participants tended to reflect on their own or their friends' and families' experiences, rather than always thinking about broader social norms. This perspective may bias the results towards the experience of those in the focus groups rather than for the UK as a whole. Nevertheless the focus group methodology allows us to describe the range of ways in which people talk about commitment in marriage and cohabitation. While future quantitative

research is needed to establish the degree to which our results are nationally representative, the focus group methodology is essential for revealing social norms, as well as the complex relationship between the new ordering of life events and the nature of commitment.

In our focus groups, all respondents thought that cohabiting couples could be committed, echoing earlier findings for the UK (e.g. Lewis, 2001; Jamieson et al., 2002, Duncan 2011). Nonetheless, most focus group participants described a hierarchy of commitment in relationships, with marriage associated with being “wholly committed,” while cohabitation referred to as “just” living together. Participants spoke about progression in relationships, with the decision to marry representing “taking the next step”, or “making a natural progression.” Men were seen as sometimes reluctant to commit and “to take the plunge” into marriage. Differences with previous findings may relate to the type of commitment examined, whether personal, moral, or structural (Johnson, 1991). We found that cohabiting and married couples were perceived to differ less in terms of personal commitment, and more in terms of the greater moral and structural commitment that marriage entails. The symbolic role of the wedding, the public promise, and the wedding expense, can result in a greater moral obligation to continue in a marriage. Furthermore, participants thought that ending a marriage entails greater emotional, financial and practical difficulty than ending a cohabiting partnership. Therefore, in the UK, it is generally perceived that marriage conveys a greater expectation of permanency than cohabitation, and has higher costs if the relationship dissolves. Nonetheless, despite the hierarchy of commitment, our findings suggest that the relationship between commitment, cohabitation, and marriage has changed over time, so that cohabitation can now reflect a much higher level of

commitment than previously. Even though there may be a “natural progression” through relationships, the traditional markers of commitment (marriage, mortgage, childbearing) have moved and become less standardized. Although marriage is referred to as “the next step” in a relationship by our respondents, this step did not have to come at a particular point in the life course. Thus, ideas regarding ‘natural progression’, or ‘taking the partnership to the next level’ were generally not talked about in relation to the timing of childbearing; instead, childbearing might occur anywhere along this ‘commitment journey’. For example, a number of respondents talked of ‘the natural progression’ to marriage as something which they had done after having had children, or bought a house. Thus increasingly cohabitators are publically expressing their commitment through rearing children and in joint financial investments such as mortgages. As a result, the moral and structural barriers to dissolving a cohabiting partnership have actually increased.

Despite a general trend in increased commitment in cohabitation coupled with a persistent favouring of marriage, it is important to note the heterogeneity in our focus groups. The focus groups provided a range of responses, reminding us that there is no one meaning of cohabitation, and indeed people have different personal views and preferences for their own lives. In addition, the perceived relationship between commitment, cohabitation and marriage can differ by social group. The highly educated participants, while simultaneously holding liberal and accepting attitudes towards non-marital partnerships and non-marital childbearing, tended to prefer a more traditional ordering of family life events for their own (future) families. For lower educated participants, on the other hand, cohabitation and childrearing within cohabitation was often seen as the norm. Lower educated participants believed that nowadays ‘nobody cares’ whether couples are married

or not. Nevertheless, marriage (or at least the wedding) was still perceived as 'an ideal', although one which is often difficult to achieve due to the high costs of a large wedding.

Whilst commitment is no longer organized in the standard ways of the past due to the increasingly complex sequencing of the family life course, it is not the case that partnership behaviour is part of a do-it-yourself biography, removed from traditional precepts and external control (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 1995). Peer groups and family members are very important in prescribing social norms relating to cohabitation and marriage. The FG respondents described how family, friends, and even work colleagues, often made the assumption that a couple will marry, for example questioning the couple as to when the wedding will take place. These external expectations for marriage were discussed more often in the high educated FGs suggesting that those from more socio-economic advantaged backgrounds may favour a traditional ordering of family life events. Differences between social groups can arise through cultural traditions and "family displays" (Smart, 2007; Duncan, 2011). The public expression of commitment, for example in the form of a wedding, is more important for some families, classes, and communities. Individuals differ in their own need and preferences to express commitment, e.g. whether to have a big, fancy wedding, but this need cannot be taken in isolation, because they are raised, socialized, and surrounded by families.

As marriage is increasingly no longer *required* as a public display of commitment, the wedding becomes more important as a symbolic event (Cherlin, 2004). The FG discussions clearly showed that the romantic ideal of marriage, and the symbolic role of the wedding, is still very salient, reinforced in childhood through the continued portrayal of marriage as the happy ending in films and fairytales (Boden, 2001). Yet paradoxically, as the aspirations for a

“proper wedding” are quite high and the financial costs of a wedding have increased (Boden, 2001), the “public” expression of commitment is now more difficult to achieve. At the same time, commitment is increasingly being expressed in cohabitation through childbearing and other joint investments, with less need to show commitment through marriage. This results in a feedback loop: the “private” commitment of cohabitation has become stronger because the wedding has become more difficult to achieve. Weddings can especially become a low priority for low income couples when in competition with other commitments such as the costs of caring for a young family, or the need to save for rental or mortgage payments.

In conclusion, our findings suggest that several social processes have been occurring simultaneously. First, with the increase in cohabitation and de-standardization of the lifecourse, the role of marriage has become less salient in peoples’ lives early in relationship formation, although it still may be important as the relationship progresses. At the same time, commitment has become more broadly defined, with cohabitators able to commit as strongly as married couples. Although this commitment tends to be personal, rather than moral and structural, other markers such as childbearing and mortgages, have created moral and structural commitment. Hence, as behaviour has shifted, so too have conceptualizations of commitment. These conceptualizations of commitment are important to our understanding of the meaning of cohabitation and marriage: commitment levels are no longer ascribed solely by union type, but rather by other life events and the couple’s own perceived level of commitment. Given the level of cohabitation and heterogeneous pattern of relationship formation in the UK, these insights are especially valuable in this setting.

7. Acknowledgements

This research was funded by xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx. We thank the Focus on Partnership Team members, especially Laura Bernardi and Monika Mynarska, for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of the paper.

References

- Barlow, A. (2006). Cohabitation Law Reform – Messages From Research. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 14(2): 167-180.
- Beaujouan, E. and Ni Bhrolchain, M. (2011). Cohabitation and marriage in Britain since the 1970s. *Population Trends*, 145: 35-59.
- Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995). *The Normal Chaos of Love*. London: Polity.
- Berrington, A. (2001). Entry into parenthood and the outcome of cohabiting partnerships in Britain. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1): 80-96.
- Berrington, A. (2003). *Change and continuity in family formation among young adults in Britain*. Southampton, UK, Southampton Statistical Sciences Research Institute Applications and Policy Working Papers A03/04.
- Berrington, A. and Stone, J. (2014). Young adults' transitions to residential independence in Britain: the role of social and housing policy in L. Antonucci and M. Hamilton (eds.) *Youth Transitions and Social Policy*. Palgrave Publishers.
- Billari, F. C. and Liefbroer, A.C. (2010). Towards a new pattern of transition to adulthood? *Advances in Life Course Research*, 15(2-3): 59-75.
- Boden, S. (2001). 'Superbrides': Wedding Consumer Culture and the Construction of Bridal Identity. *Sociological Research On-Line*, 6(1).
- Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: Principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review*, 64(3): 333-355.

- Brown, S. (2004). Moving from cohabitation to marriage: effects on relationship quality. *Social Science Research*, 33: 1–19.
- Brown, S.L., Manning, W., Payne, K.K. (2014). Relationship Quality among Cohabiting versus Married Couples. National Center for Family & Marriage Research Working Paper Series WP-14-03 July 2014.
- Burgoyne, C. B., Reibstein, J., Edmunds, A. M., & Routh, D. A. (2010). Marital commitment, money and marriage preparation: What changes after the wedding? *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 20(5): 390-403.
- Carter, J. (2012). What is commitment? Women's accounts of intimate attachment. *Families, Relationships and Societies* 1(2): 137-153.
- Cherlin, A.J. (2004). The deinstitutionalization of American marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66(4): 848-861.
- Duncan, S. (2011). Personal life, pragmatism and bricolage. *Sociological Research Online* 16(4): 13.
- Duncan, S., Barlow, A., & James, G. (2005). Why Don't They Marry-Cohabitation, Commitment and DIY Marriage. *Child and Family Law Quarterly*, 17: 383-398.
- Duncan, S. and Phillips, M. (2008). New families? Tradition and change in modern relationships. In: Park, A. et al. (eds.) *British Social Attitudes: the 24th Report*. London: Sage.
- Duncan, S. and Smith, D. (2006). Individualisation versus the geography of 'new' families. *Twenty-First Century Society*, 1(2): 167-189.

- Elzinga, C. and Liefbroer, A.C. (2007). De-standardization of family-life trajectories of young adults: a cross-national comparison using sequence analysis. *European Journal of Population*, 23: 225-250.
- Finch, J. (2007). Displaying families. *Sociology* 41(1): 65-81.
- Giddens, A. (1992). *The transformation of intimacy: sexuality, eroticism and love in modern societies*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Holland, J. A. (2013). Love, marriage, then the baby carriage? Marriage timing and childbearing in Sweden. *Demographic Research*, 29.
- Jamieson, L., Anderson, M., McCrone, D., Bechhofer, F., Stewart, R., and Li, Y. (2002). Cohabitation and commitment: Partnership plans of young men and women. *The Sociological Review* 50(3): 356-377.
- Johnson, M. (1991). Commitment to personal relationships. Pp 117-143 in W. Jones and D. Periman (eds) *Advances in Personal Relationships*, vol 3. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Kiernan, K. and Smith, K. (2003). Unmarried parenthood: new insights from the Millennium Cohort Study. *Population Trends*, 114: 26-33.
- Lewis, J. (2001). *The end of marriage? Individualism and intimate relations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- McKee, K. (2012). Young people, homeownership and future welfare. *Housing Studies*, 27 (6): 853-862.
- Morgan, D.H.J. (1996). *Family Connections: An Introduction to Family Studies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Office for National Statistics (2013). Trends in civil and religious marriages, 1966-2011.

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/vsob1/marriages-in-england-and-wales--provisional-/2011/sty-marriages.html>

Office for National Statistics (2014a). Live Births in England and Wales by Characteristics of

Mother, 2013. <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/vsob1/characteristics-of-Mother-1--england-and-wales/2013/stb-characteristics-of-mother-1--2013.html#tab-Partnership-Status-of-Parents>.

Office for National Statistics (2014b) Marriages in England and Wales (Provisional), 2012.

http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_366530.pdf

Office for National Statistics (2014c) Divorces in England and Wales, 2012.

<http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/vsob1/divorces-in-england-and-wales/2012/stb-divorces-2012.html>

Park, A. & Rhead, R. (2013). Changing attitudes towards sex, marriage and parenthood . Pp

1-32 in A. Park, C. Bryson, E. Clery, J. Curtice and M. Phillips. British Social Attitudes 30. http://www.bsa-30.natcen.ac.uk/media/37580/bsa30_full_report_final.pdf

Perelli-Harris, B., Sigle-Rushton, W., Kreyenfeld, M., Lappegård, T., Keizer, R., &

Berghammer, C. (2010). The educational gradient of childbearing within cohabitation in Europe. *Population and Development Review*, 36(4): 775-801.

Perelli-Harris, B. & Lyons-Amos, M. (2013). The Heterogeneity of Relationship Patterns: An

Examination of 15 Countries using Latent Class Growth Model. ESRC Centre for Population Change Working Paper, no. 37. University of Southampton.

- Perelli-Harris, B., Mynarska, M., Berrington, A., Berghammer, C. Evans, A. Isupova, O., Keizer, R., Klaerner, A., Lappegård, T. & Vignoli, D. (2014). Towards a new understanding of cohabitation: Insights from focus group research across Europe and Australia. *Demographic Research*, 31: 1043-1078.
- Poortman, A. R. & Mills, M. (2012). Investments in marriage and cohabitation: The role of legal and interpersonal commitment. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(2): 357-376.
- Smart, C. and Stevens, P. (2000). *Cohabitation breakdown*. London: Family Policy Studies Centre.
- Smart, C. (2007). *Personal life*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Wiik, K. A., Bernhardt, E., & Noack, T. (2009). A study of commitment and relationship quality in Sweden and Norway. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(3): 465-477.