

Analysis of Factors Affecting Unmarried Men's and Women's Attitude Toward Premarital Cohabitation

Meera Park¹, Nam Joo Je^{*2}

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of nursing, Changshin University, 262, Paryong-ro, Masanhoewon-gu, Changwon-si, Gyeongsangnam-do, Korea, KS011

^{*2} Associate Professor, Department of nursing, Changshin University, 262, Paryong-ro, Masanhoewon-gu, Changwon-si, Gyeongsangnam-do, Korea, KS011

minerva32@cs.ac.kr¹, jnj4757@cs.ac.kr^{*2}

Corresponding author*: mobile Phone: +82-010-3329-6243

Abstract

Background/Objectives The purpose of this study was to identify factors affecting unmarried men's and women's attitude toward premarital cohabitation and provide data for programs preventing inappropriate premarital cohabitation.

Methods/Statistical analysis: Data were collected from 182 unmarried men and women during May 15th to June 30th, 2019. Characteristics by gender were checked using frequency and percentage, and homogeneity test by gender was done using χ^2 test. Cohabitation, marriage, and sexual attitudes were compared by t-test, and variable differences in gender and characteristics were checked using χ^2 test or t-test. Effects of gender on cohabitation attitude were analyzed by regression analysis.

Findings: There was no significant difference in men's and women's attitude toward cohabitation ($p>.05$). Sexual attitude based on general characteristics had significant difference in housing type, living expenses, and religion for men, preference for cohabitation and religion for women. The most influential factor on men's attitude toward cohabitation was open marriage value, followed by religion-Christianity and Catholicism and preference for cohabitation. The explanatory power was 50.9%. The most influential factor on women's attitude toward cohabitation was open marriage value, followed by preference for cohabitation, traditional marriage value, religion-Christianity and Catholicism, and equal division of family roles. The explanatory power was 70.9%.

Improvements/Applications: To establish appropriate cohabitation attitude, development of customized programs reflecting individual's marriage view, religion, and preference for cohabitation is necessary. Also, based on the results, follow-up studies are recommended.

Keywords: Unmarried, Premarital Cohabitation, Marriage View, Sexual Attitude, Regression Analysis

1. Introduction

Among the recent social changes, a distinct change related to sex is that discourse on our body, sex, and sexuality is becoming more open[1]. This phenomenon is affecting people's marriage view, attitude toward cohabitation, and sexual attitudes. The number of people who have a positive attitude toward sex is increasing due to these changes, and Lee[2] mentioned the relationship between sexual attitude and marriage view as sexual attitude affecting marriage satisfaction. Woo and Ka[3] reported that 62% of the subjects responded positive to cohabitation in a study on unmarried college students, and the number of couples actually living together is increasing. Also, in a 2009 survey conducted in a part-time job search website A, 84.4% of the 1,167 college students responded that they could seek roommates or housemates and live together if necessary[4], indicating that cohabitation is increasing. Heo[5] stated that the reason the young adults want to live together are 'in love', 'seems okay to live together once', 'lonely', and 'planning on getting married' in that order for male students, and 'in love', 'seems to be of help financially', 'lonely', and 'planning on getting married' in that order for female students, implying differences in attitudes toward cohabitation, sexual attitude, and marriage views according to gender. In order to establish appropriate attitude toward cohabitation, it is necessary to identify the factors affecting cohabitation and provide suitable programs. Therefore, this study was conducted to identify the differences in variables according to gender and provide basic data for developing appropriate educational programs for unmarried men and women.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research design

This study is a descriptive correlation study to understand the influence of unmarried men's and women's attitude toward cohabitation..

2.2. Research subject and data collection

Data were collected from unmarried men and women in their twenties living in C city, from May 15th to June 30th, 2019. Subjects were from cultural center, church, and colleges in C city, understood the purpose, and agreed to participate in this study. The number of samples was determined using the G*power 3.10 program[6] and the regression analysis method of this study. The effect size was .15 (medium), the significance level (α) .05, statistical power ($1-\beta$) .80, and predictor variable 7-9. The calculated minimum number of individuals with and appropriate sample size between each gender was 109, so a number of 218 was selected considering the dropout rate. As for the method of data collection, a questionnaire was distributed only to the subjects who agreed to participate in this study in writing, and the questionnaire was filled out in a self-administered manner. A total of 218 copies were distributed, and 182 copies of the collected data were used for final analysis, excluding 36 copies with poor responses.

2.3. Research instruments

The tools used in this study were used after obtaining approval from both the developer and the modifier. For the characteristics of the subject, 7 questions from previous studies were measured: age, housing type, preference for cohabitation, parents' marital status, living expenses, dating experience, and religion.

Tool for measuring attitude toward cohabitation was developed by Phoades, Stanly, and Markman[7], translated and modified by Kim[8]. There were 28 questions at the time of development, but 13 questions were used excluding those measuring conventions. The tool is a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly disagree' (1 point) to 'strongly agree' (7 point), with higher score meaning more acceptable to cohabitation. Cronbach's α in Kim's study[8] was .73. Cronbach's α in this study was .84.

To measure marriage view, the tool developed by Kim[9] was used. The tool is a 5-point Likert scale consisting of traditional marriage value (5 questions), open marriage value (4 questions), marriage postponement (4 questions), and equal division of family roles (2 questions). For traditional marriage value, high score means the subjects believe in familism, which puts priority to family, and thinks marriage is a necessity. For open marriage value, high score means the subjects regard love more important than the system of marriage itself, meaning that it is possible to have sex or live together even when not married and marry the same sex. For marriage postponement, high score means the subjects believe that the choice of marriage can be postponed due to one's work or study. For equal division of family roles, high score means the subjects believe men and women should equally do housework and support the family. The reliability Cronbach's α of each sub-factor was .61-.65 at the time of tool development. This study's reliability Cronbach's α was .87.

Tool for measuring sexual attitude was developed by referring to Kwon's previous studies[10]. It is a 4-point Likert scale from 'strongly disagree' (1 point) to 'strongly agree' (4 point), with low score meaning distorted, unethical, and open sexual attitude. The reliability Cronbach's α was .54 at the time of tool development. This study's reliability Cronbach's α was .93.

2.4. Data analysis

The collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS WIN/21.0. Characteristics by gender were checked using frequency and percentage, and homogeneity test of the two groups was done using χ^2 test. Cohabitation, marriage, and sexual attitudes by gender were compared using t-test, and variable differences in gender and characteristics were checked using χ^2 test or t-test. Effects of gender on cohabitation attitude were analyzed by regression analysis.

2.5. Limitations of the study

Since this study only investigated subjects living in C city, there are limitations in generalizing the results of the study

3. Results and Discussion

The general characteristics and homogeneity tests of the subjects are shown in Table 1, and the two groups proved homogeneous ($p > .05$). In detail, the subjects were 92 men and 90 women, and the majority of them were over 21 years of age. In housing type, both men and women lived with their families the most, followed by dormitory, and rent or boarding. As for cohabitation, both men and women preferred it. The most in parents' marital status was continuing marriage for both men and women, followed by divorced, and widowed or others. For living expenses, most subjects responded 310,000-500,000won, followed by under 300,000won, 510,000-700,000won, and over 710,000won. Over 70% of both men and women had dating experience. Majority of the subjects had no religion, followed by Christianity and Catholicism, and Buddhism[Table 1].

Table 1 The general characteristics and homogeneity test (N=182)

		Men(n=92)	Women(n=90)	χ^2	p
		n(%)	n(%)		
Age	Under 20	43(46.7)	38(42.2)	0.38	.554
	Over 21	49(53.3)	52(57.8)		
Housing type	Living with family	58(54.1)	49(54.4)	2.28	.321
	Rent or Boarding	6(6.3)	11(12.2)		
	Dormitory	28(30.4)	30(33.3)		
Preference for cohabitation	Prefer	62(67.4)	49(54.4)	3.21	.094
	Do not prefer	30(32.6)	41(45.6)		

Parents' marital status	Continuing marriage	77(83.7)	77(85.6)	0.60	.741
	Divorced	10(10.9)	7(7.8)		
	Widowed or others	5(5.4)	6(6.7)		
Living expenses (or allowance)	Under 300,000won	29(31.5)	39(43.3)	3.48	.324
	310,000 – 500,000won	42(45.7)	37(41.1)		
	510,000 -700,000won	14(15.2)	8(8.9)		
	Over 710,000won	7(7.6)	6(3.7)		
Dating experience	Yes	79(85.9)	70(77.8)	2.01	.181
	None	13(14.1)	20(22.2)		
Religion	Buddism	13(14.1)	17(18.9)	1.05	.591
	Christianity and Catholicism	26(28.3)	21(23.3)		
	None	53(57.6)	52(57.8)		

Cohabitation, marriage view, and sexual attitudes by gender are shown in Table 2. There were no significant differences in attitude toward cohabitation by gender and open marriage value, but traditional marriage value ($t=2.45$, $p=.015$), marriage postponement ($t=-3.30$, $p=.001$), equal division of family roles ($t=-5.94$, $p<.001$), and sexual attitude ($t=-2.79$, $p=.006$) had significant differences by gender[Table 2].

Table 1 Cohabitation, marriage view, and sexual attitudes by gender (N=182)

	Men	Women	t	p
	Mean±SD	Mean±SD		
Attitude toward cohabitation	4.86±1.04	4.91±1.14	-.035	.729
Marriage view				
Traditional marriage value	2.73±0.85	2.43±0.83	2.45	.015
Open marriage value	2.98±0.73	3.13±0.94	-1.22	.225
Marriage postponement	3.66±0.64	3.96±0.68	-3.30	.001
Equal division of family roles	3.88±0.81	4.48±0.53	-5.94	<.001
Sexual attitude	2.47±0.36	2.61±0.31	-2.79	.006

Men's attitude toward cohabitation showed significant difference in housing type ($F=3.36$, $p=.039$), preference for cohabitation ($t=4.21$, $p<.001$), living expenses ($F=3.52$, $p=.018$), and religion ($F=11.70$, $p<.001$). As for housing types, rent or boarding had lower score than dormitory. Sexual attitude did not have a significant difference by general characteristics[Table 3].

Men's marriage view by general characteristics had no significant difference in traditional marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles ($p>.005$), but open marriage value had significant difference in preference for cohabitation ($t=2.16$, $p=.033$) and religion ($F=3.51$, $p=.034$). In detail, Christianity and Catholicism had lower score than no religion in open marriage value [Table 4].

Women's attitude toward cohabitation showed significant difference in preference for cohabitation and religion, and sexual attitude had significant difference in housing type and living expenses[Table 5].

Women's marriage view by general characteristics had no significant difference in traditional marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles ($p>.005$), but open marriage value had significant difference in preference for cohabitation and religion. Also, Christianity and Catholicism had lower score than no religion in open marriage value[Table 6].

Table 3. Men's attitude toward cohabitation and sexual attitude by general characteristics (N=92)

		Attitude toward cohabitation			Sexual attitude		
		Mean±SD	t or F	p	Mean±SD	t or F	p
Age	Under 20	4.78±1.07	-0.79	.432	2.46±0.35	-0.18	.858
	Over 21	4.96±1.00			2.41±0.37		
Housing type	Living with family ^a	4.90±0.95	3.36	.039 b<c	2.45±0.37	2.06	.134

	Rent or Boarding ^b	3.83±1.14			2.27±0.41		
	Dormitory ^c	4.98±1.10			2.56±0.31		
Preference for cohabitation	Prefer	5.15±0.94	4.21	<.001	2.48±0.34	0.26	.797
	Do not prefer	4.26±0.98			2.46±0.40		
Parents' marital status	Continuing marriage	4.83±1.06	0.18	.840	2.48±0.38	0.16	.854
	Divorced	4.93±0.99			2.42±0.20		
	Widowed or others	5.10±1.00			2.44±0.36		
Living expenses (10,000 won)	Under 30	4.42±1.08	3.52	.018	2.40±0.32	0.73	.537
	31 – 50	5.03±0.97			2.51±0.33		
	51 -70	5.35±0.86			2.53±0.28		
	Over 71	4.62±1.03			2.43±0.71		
Dating experience	Yes	4.90±1.07	0.87	.384	2.47±0.34	-.053	.596
	None	4.62±0.82			2.52±0.47		
Religion	Buddism	4.88±0.85	11.70	<.001	2.43±0.35	1.53	.221
	Christianity and Catholicism	4.13±1.06			2.38±0.40		
	None	5.21±0.89			2.53±0.33		

Table 4. Men's marriage view (traditional marriage value, open marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles) by general characteristics (N=92)

		Traditional marriage value			Open marriage value			Marriage postponement			Equal division of family roles		
		Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p
Age	Under 20	2.68±0.89	-	.763	3.02±0.61	0.44	.664	3.58±0.69	-	.277	3.77±0.83	-	.173
	Over 21	2.73±0.82	0.30		2.95±0.86			3.73±0.59	1.10		4.01±0.81	1.38	
Housing type	Living with family	2.86±0.83	1.94	.150	3.01±0.76	1.70	.189	3.64±0.65	0.07	.935	3.83±0.86	0.33	.719
	Rent or Boarding	2.63±0.79			2.46±0.86			3.67±0.83			4.00±1.14		
	Dormitory	2.49±0.88			3.04±0.61			3.70±0.60			3.83±0.86		
Preference for cohabitation	Prefer	2.66±0.81	-1.11	.271	3.09±0.70	2.16	.033	3.68±0.61	0.46	.650	3.94±0.76	1.07	.287
	Do not prefer	2.87±0.92			2.75±0.74			3.61±0.69			3.75±0.92		
Parents' marital status	Continuing marriage	2.75±0.87	0.08	.926	2.96±0.73	0.18	.838	3.69±0.60	0.96	.388	3.88±0.83	0.40	.671
	Divorced	2.66±0.82			3.08±0.82			3.40±0.72			4.00±0.67		
	Widowed or others	2.64±0.62			3.10±0.58			3.75±0.98			3.60±0.96		
Living expenses (10,000 won)	Under 30	2.92±0.92	0.82	.485	2.80±0.70	1.25	.234	3.67±0.46	0.54	.653	3.88±0.84	0.29	.830
	31 – 50	2.62±0.81			3.01±0.65			3.70±0.57			3.94±0.77		
	51 -70	2.61±0.76			3.28±0.71			3.46±0.78			3.82±0.72		
	Over 71	2.86±0.98			2.96±1.19			3.75±1.24			3.64±1.25		
Dating experience	Yes	2.68±0.80	-1.52	.133	2.99±0.73	0.41	.682	3.67±0.61	0.39	.697	3.92±0.81	1.06	.281
	None	3.06±1.10			2.90±0.75			3.60±0.79			3.65±0.85		
Religion	Buddism ^a	2.71±0.70	0.01	.991	2.83±0.55	3.51	.034 b<c	3.42±0.87	1.26	.290	3.54±1.07	1.67	.195
	Christianity and Catholicism ^b	2.75±0.72			2.72±0.78			3.63±0.53			4.04±0.75		

	None ^c	2.73±0.95		3.15±0.70		3.73±0.62		3.89±0.76	
--	-------------------	-----------	--	-----------	--	-----------	--	-----------	--

Table 4. Men's marriage view (traditional marriage value, open marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles) by general characteristics (N=92)

		Traditional marriage value			Open marriage value			Marriage postponement			Equal division of family roles		
		Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p
Age	Under 20	2.68±0.89	-	.763	3.02±0.61	0.44	.664	3.58±0.69	-	.277	3.77±0.83	-	.173
	Over 21	2.73±0.82	0.30		2.95±0.86			3.73±0.59	1.10		4.01±0.81	1.38	
Housing type	Living with family	2.86±0.83	1.94	.150	3.01±0.76	1.70	.189	3.64±0.65	0.07	.935	3.83±0.86	0.33	.719
	Rent or Boarding	2.63±0.79			2.46±0.86			3.67±0.83			4.00±1.14		
	Dormitory	2.49±0.88			3.04±0.61			3.70±0.60			3.83±0.86		
Preference for cohabitation	Prefer	2.66±0.81	-1.11	.271	3.09±0.70	2.16	.033	3.68±0.61	0.46	.650	3.94±0.76	1.07	.287
	Do not prefer	2.87±0.92			2.75±0.74			3.61±0.69			3.75±0.92		
Parents' marital status	Continuing marriage	2.75±0.87	0.08	.926	2.96±0.73	0.18	.838	3.69±0.60	0.96	.388	3.88±0.83	0.40	.671
	Divorced	2.66±0.82			3.08±0.82			3.40±0.72			4.00±0.67		
	Widowed or others	2.64±0.62			3.10±0.58			3.75±0.98			3.60±0.96		
Living expenses (10,000 won)	Under 30	2.92±0.92	0.82	.485	2.80±0.70	1.25	.234	3.67±0.46	0.54	.653	3.88±0.84	0.29	.830
	31 – 50	2.62±0.81			3.01±0.65			3.70±0.57			3.94±0.77		
	51 -70	2.61±0.76			3.28±0.71			3.46±0.78			3.82±0.72		
	Over 71	2.86±0.98			2.96±1.19			3.75±1.24			3.64±1.25		
Dating experience	Yes	2.68±0.80	-1.52	.133	2.99±0.73	0.41	.682	3.67±0.61	0.39	.697	3.92±0.81	1.06	.281
	None	3.06±1.10			2.90±0.75			3.60±0.79			3.65±0.85		
Religion	Buddism ^a	2.71±0.70	0.01	.991	2.83±0.55	3.51	.034 b<c	3.42±0.87	1.26	.290	3.54±1.07	1.67	.195
	Christianity and Catholicism ^b	2.75±0.72			2.72±0.78			3.63±0.53			4.04±0.75		
	None ^c	2.73±0.95			3.15±0.70			3.73±0.62			3.89±0.76		

Table 5. Women's attitude toward cohabitation and sexual attitude by general characteristics (N=90)

		Attitude toward cohabitation			Sexual attitude		
		Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p
Age	Under 20	5.00±0.99	0.76	.452	2.67±0.24	1.51	.135
	Over 21	4.82±1.24			2.57±0.36		
Housing type	Living with family ^a	4.93±1.07	0.01	.987	2.63±0.33	6.30	.003 a,c > b
	Rent or Boarding ^b	4.89±1.32			2.41±0.26		
	Dormitory ^c	4.89±1.20			2.73±0.25		
Preference for cohabitation	Prefer	5.53±0.63	6.99	<.001	2.64±0.29	1.04	.300
	Do not prefer	4.17±1.18			2.58±0.34		
Parents' marital status	Continuing marriage	4.89±1.16	0.92	.403	2.64±0.31	2.92	.059
	Divorced	5.43±1.02			2.49±0.30		
	Widowed or others	4.63±1.06			2.37±0.23		
Living expenses	Under 30	5.09±0.96	1.35	.263	2.54±0.27	3.36	.022

(10,000 won)	31 – 50	4.63±1.34	1.64	.105	2.61±0.29	-1.24	.218
	51 -70	5.23±0.90			2.78±0.29		
	Over 71	5.09±1.01			2.90±0.55		
Dating experience	Yes	5.02±1.07	12.372	<.001	2.59±0.27	1.72	.185
	None	4.55±1.32			2.69±0.44		
Religion	Buddism	5.07±0.61	12.372	<.001	2.62±0.24	1.72	.185
	Christianity and Catholicism	3.95±1.60			2.50±0.27		
	None	5.25±0.80			2.66±0.35		

Table 6. Women's marriage view (traditional marriage value, open marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles) by general characteristics (N=90)

		Traditional marriage value			Open marriage value			Marriage postponement			Equal division of family roles		
		Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p	Mean±SD	t	p
Age	Under 20	2.68±0.89	-0.55	.584	3.21±0.95	0.75	.457	3.88±0.56	-1.05	.297	4.41±0.56	-1.08	.285
	Over 21	2.47±0.83			3.06±0.94			4.00±0.59			4.53±0.50		
Housing type	Living with family	2.51±0.90	0.58	.562	3.12±1.00	0.47	.626	3.92±0.59	0.37	.690	4.55±0.45	2.44	.093
	Rent or Boarding	2.25±0.78			3.39±1.17			4.09±0.71			4.64±0.64		
	Dormitory	2.36±0.72			3.07±0.75			3.97±0.53			4.32±0.58		
Preference for cohabitation	Prefer	2.32±0.87	-1.40	.167	3.47±0.74	4.06	<.001	3.93±0.57	-0.53	.598	4.57±0.53	1.75	.083
	Do not prefer	2.56±0.77			2.73±1.01			3.99±0.60			4.38±0.51		
Parents' marital status	Continuing marriage	2.45±0.84	1.36	.262	3.09±0.96	0.86	.427	3.95±0.58	0.04	.962	4.49±0.51	0.26	.774
	Divorced	1.97±0.65			3.57±0.92			4.00±0.79			4.50±0.77		
	Widowed or others	2.67±0.69			3.21±0.77			4.00±0.42			4.33±0.52		
Living expenses (10,000 won)	Under 30	2.39±0.69	0.70	.555	3.23±0.90	0.89	.452	3.92±0.56	1.14	.336	4.58±0.45	1.33	.270
	31 – 50	2.36±0.80			2.95±1.00			3.95±0.59			4.35±0.60		
	51 -70	2.78±1.20			3.38±0.78			3.88±0.74			4.56±0.50		
	Over 71	2.63±1.27			3.33±1.68			4.38±0.34			4.58±0.53		
Dating experience	Yes	2.37±0.81	-1.24	.219	3.22±0.93	1.60	.113	3.98±0.59	0.51	.613	4.46±0.55	-0.64	.524
	None	2.63±0.87			2.84±0.97			3.90±0.57			4.55±0.42		
Religion	Buddism	2.61±0.82	0.77	.468	3.07±0.97	4.36	.016 b<c	4.18±0.51	1.94	.150	4.59±0.44	0.43	.655
	Christianity and Catholicism	2.50±0.95			2.65±1.25			3.81±0.68			4.48±0.51		
	None	2.34±0.78			3.34±0.71			3.95±0.55			4.45±0.56		

Attitude toward cohabitation, marriage view, and sexual attitude by gender is shown in Table 7. For men, attitude toward cohabitation had negative correlation with traditional marriage value ($r=-.27, p=.010$), and positive correlations with open marriage value ($r=.54, p<.001$), marriage postponement ($r=.30, p=.004$), equal division of family roles ($r=.28, p=.006$), and sexual attitude ($r=.34, p=.001$). In marriage view, traditional marriage value had no correlations with other variables, and open marriage value had positive correlations with marriage postponement ($r=.31, p=.002$), equal division of family roles ($r=.28, p=.008$), and sexual attitude ($r=.39, p<.001$). Marriage postponement had positive correlations with equal division of family roles ($r=.58, p<.001$) and sexual attitude ($r=.43, p<.001$). Equal division of family roles had positive correlation with sexual attitude ($r=.28, p=.007$).

For women, attitude toward cohabitation had negative correlation with traditional marriage value ($r=-.47, p<.001$), and positive

correlations with open marriage value ($r=.65, p<.001$) and equal role of family divisions ($r=.35, p=.001$). In marriage view, traditional marriage value had negative correlation with open marriage value ($r=-.28, p=.007$), open marriage value had positive correlation with marriage postponement ($r=.21, p=.043$), and marriage postponement had positive correlation with equal division of family roles ($r=.38, p<.001$).

Table 7. Attitude toward cohabitation, marriage view, and sexual attitude by gender

Men	Attitude toward cohabitation	Traditional marriage	Open marriage value	Marriage postponement	Equal division of family roles	Sexual attitude
Attitude toward cohabitation	1					
Traditional marriage value	-.27(.010)	1				
Open marriage value	.54(<.001)	-.19(.066)	1			
Marriage postponement	.30(.004)	.05(.673)	.31(.002)	1		
Equal division of family roles	.28(.006)	.01(.957)	.28(.008)	.58(<.001)	1	
Sexual attitude	.37(.001)	-.08(.437)	.39(<.001)	.43(<.001)	.28(.007)	1
Women	Attitude toward cohabitation	Traditional marriage	Open marriage value	Marriage postponement	Equal division of family roles	Sexual attitude
Attitude toward cohabitation	1					
Traditional marriage value	-.47(<.001)	1				
Open marriage value	.65(<.001)	-.28(.007)	1			
Marriage postponement	.17(.110)	-.12(.258)	.21(.043)	1		
Equal division of family roles	.35(.001)	-.16(.129)	.17(.107)	.38(<.001)	1	
Sexual attitude	.74(.486)	.17(.106)	.12(.249)	.15(.165)	.11(.302)	1

To check the factors affecting attitude toward cohabitation of men, ones that had correlations with cohabitation attitude, such as marriage view (traditional marriage value, open marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles), sexual attitude, housing type, preference for cohabitation, and religion, were put in as independent variables. Housing type, preference for cohabitation, and religion were processed as dummy variables.

Multiple regression analysis was conducted in a stepwise manner by putting variables as independent variables. Tolerance and VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) were checked to validate multicollinearity. Tolerance was .88-.04 and VIF was 1.06-1.14, indicating that there is no problem with multicollinearity as tolerance is under 0.1 and VIF is under 10. In addition, in the case of the Durbin-Watson Test, which is a test of independency of standard residuals, it was confirmed no problem as it met the acceptance criteria with $d=1.586$.

The most influential factor affecting men's attitude toward cohabitation was open marriage value ($\beta=.443, p<.001$), followed by religion-Christianity and Catholicism ($\beta=-.381, p<.001$) and preference for cohabitation ($\beta=-.205, p=.029$). The explanatory power was 50.9% ($F=22.75, p<.001$)[Table 8].

Table 8. Factors affecting attitude toward cohabitation of men

	β	t	p	R ²	Adj. R ²	F	p
Open marriage value	.443	4.71	<.001	.532	.509	22.75	<.001
Religion-Christianity and Catholicism	-.381	-4.18	<.001				
Preference for cohabitation	-.205	-2.23	.029				

To check the factors affecting attitude toward cohabitation of women, ones that had correlations with cohabitation attitude, such as traditional marriage value, open marriage value, marriage postponement, and equal division of family roles, preference for cohabitation, and religion, were put in as independent variables. Preference for cohabitation and religion were processed as dummy variables.

Multiple regression analysis was conducted in a stepwise manner by putting variables as independent variables. Tolerance and VIF (Variance Inflation Factor) were checked to validate multicollinearity. Tolerance was .73-.94 and VIF was 1.06-1.37, indicating that there is no problem with multicollinearity as tolerance is under 0.1 and VIF is under 10. In addition, in the case of the Durbin-Watson Test, which is a test of independency of standard residuals, it was confirmed no problem as it met the acceptance criteria with $d=1.835$.

The most influential factor affecting women's attitude toward cohabitation was open marriage value ($\beta=.338$, $p<.001$), followed by preference for cohabitation ($\beta=-.327$, $p<.001$), traditional marriage value ($\beta=-.317$, $p<.001$), religion – Christianity and Catholicism ($\beta=-.246$, $p<.001$), and equal division of family roles ($\beta=.174$, $p=.004$). The explanatory power was 70.9% ($F=44.33$, $p<.001$) [Table 9].

Table 9. Factors affecting attitude toward cohabitation of women

	β	t	p	R ²	Adj. R ²	F	p
Open marriage value	.328	4.90	<.001	.725	.709	44.328	<.001
Preference for cohabitation	-.324	-5.14	<.001				
Traditional marriage value	-.317	-5.21	<.001				
Religion- Christianity and Catholicism	-.246	-3.99	<.001				
Equal division of family roles	.174	2.96	.004				

4. Conclusion

This study was conducted to check the effects of gender on attitude toward cohabitation of unmarried men and women. The most influential factor affecting men's attitude toward cohabitation was open marriage value, followed by religion-Christianity and Catholicism and preference for cohabitation. The most influential factor affecting women's attitude toward cohabitation was open marriage value, followed by preference for cohabitation, traditional marriage value, religion-Christianity and Catholicism, and equal division of family roles. As the perception and attitude toward sex are changing, approaches built on different marriage views are needed to establish appropriate cohabitation attitude. Also, development of customized educational programs reflecting individual's characteristics, such as religion and preference for cohabitation, is necessary. Based on these results, follow-up studies regarding appropriate cohabitation attitude are recommended.

5. Acknowledgment

This research was conducted as a research project of the Korea Research Foundation. (NRF-2018R1C1B5043387).

6. References

1. Wee J. H. (2004). *A Study on Relationship between Psychological Maturity Variables and Sexual Attitude, the Awareness on Sexual Harassment and Assaults*, Master's thesis, Suwon University, Suwon.
2. Lee G. O., Kim. Y. H. (2003). Sexuality and Marital Satisfaction of Married Women, *Family and Environment Research*, 41(7), 39-58. UCI(KEPA): I410-ECN-0102-2009-590-003202914
3. Woo N. S., Ka Y. H. (2005). A Study on the of Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Attitudes and Sexual Behavior in Korean and American College Students, *Korean Journal of Woman Psychology* 10(2), 113-133
4. Today Korea. (2009). *University students 43% "cohabitation, agreement"*. Retrieved October 26, 2009, from <http://www.todaykorea.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=75497>.
5. Heo E. J. (2004). *A study on the relationship between the psychological maturity variables and sexual attitude in university student*. Doctoral dissertation, Inha University, Incheon.
6. Faul F., Erdfelder E., Buchner A., Lang A. G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G* Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses, *Behavior research methods*. 41(4), 1149-1160. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.1149>
7. Rhoades G. K., Stanley S. M., & Markman H. J. (2009). Working with Cohabitation in Relationship Education and Therapy. *Journal of Couple Relationship Therapy*, 8(2), 95-112. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1080/15332690902813794>
8. Kim M. H. (2007). *Experience of unmarried mothers who made a decision to raise a child*. Doctoral dissertation, Kyung Hee University, Seoul
9. Kim Y. N. (2012). *A Study on Middle-school Girls Students' View of Marriage and of Children According to Their Parents-Adolescent communication*. Master's thesis, Ewha Women University, Seoul.
10. Kwon B. M. (2012). *A study on Sexuality Consciousness, Sexuality Attitude and Self-efficacy of Adolescents*. Master's thesis, Hanyang Theological University, Seoul.