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Relationship Quality Among Married and Cohabiting Couples

The number of heterosexual cohabiting couples in the U.S. has rapidly increased since 2000, while the number of married couples has increased only modestly (FP-10-02). With the rise in cohabiting couples, it is unclear whether the relationship quality of cohabiting versus marital unions has shifted in recent years. This profile uses individual-level data (responses from only one partner in a couple) to show the trend over time in relationship quality for married versus cohabiting individuals. Additionally, using newly released *Married and Cohabiting Couples* data (responses from both partners in a couple), this profile also assesses couple agreement on relationship quality for today’s cohabiters versus marrieds and examines the effects of cohabiters’ plans to marry on relationship quality.

### Relationship Happiness/Satisfaction Trends

- **Married individuals** consistently report higher average levels of relationship quality compared to cohabiters (Figure 1).
- Relationship quality is relatively stable for marrieds from 1987/88 to 2010. However, for cohabiters, relationship quality has declined steadily.
- Today, only about 50% of cohabiters report being very satisfied in their relationships compared to nearly 70% of marrieds.

![Relationship Happiness/Satisfaction by Union Type Over Time](chart)

- **Similar proportions of married and cohabiting couples** agree on their level of relationship satisfaction. About one-quarter express disagreement (Figure 2).
  - Married couples more often agree they are very satisfied with their marriage (57%) than cohabiting couples (36%).
  - Cohabiting couples (37%) are twice as likely as married couples (19%) to agree they are not very satisfied.

**Figure 1. Relationship Happiness/Satisfaction by Union Type Over Time**

**Figure 2. Relationship Satisfaction: Married vs. Cohabiting Couples**

Couple Relationship Satisfaction: Different Types of Married and Cohabiting Couples

- Similar proportions of married couples agree on their relationship satisfaction regardless of whether they married directly or cohabited first. About one-quarter disagree in their reports of relationship satisfaction (Figure 3).
  - Couples who married directly agree more often that they are very satisfied with their marriage (61%) than those who premaritally cohabited (53%).
  - Couples who cohabited prior to marriage agree more often that they are not very satisfied (22%) compared to those who married directly (15%).
- Cohabiting couples in which both partners plan on marriage express slightly less agreement about their relationship quality than couples in which only one or neither partner has plans for marriage (71% vs. 77%, respectively).
  - Cohabiting couples who both report plans for marriage agree nearly twice as often that they are very satisfied with their relationship than couples with at least one partner who does not have marriage plans (47% vs. 25%, respectively).
  - Twice as many cohabiting couples in which at least one partner does not have plans for marriage agree they are not very satisfied (52%) in contrast to cohabiting couples with marriage plans (24%).

Figure 3. Couple Relationship Satisfaction by Union Type: Married and Cohabiting Couples Differentiated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Type</th>
<th>Both very satisfied</th>
<th>Male very satisfied, female lower</th>
<th>Female very satisfied, male lower</th>
<th>Neither very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Premarital Cohabitation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premarital Cohabitation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Plans for Marriage</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only One or Neither Plans</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Married and Cohabiting Couples 2010.

Note on Figure 1. The following questions and coding were used for each dataset: NSFH 1987/88 – Married respondents were asked the following question about their marital happiness: “Taking all things together, how would you describe your marriage?” Cohabiting respondents were asked the following question about their marital happiness: “Taking all things together, how would you describe your relationship?” Response categories range from very unhappy (1) to very happy (7). Only respondents who report a 6 or 7 are shown in Figure 1 on page 1. GSS 1996 – Married respondents were asked the following question about their marital happiness: “Taking all things together, how would you describe your marriage? Would you say that your marriage is very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?” Cohabiting respondents were asked the following question about their relationship happiness: “Taking all things together, how would you describe your romantic relationship? Would you say that your relationship is very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?” Only very happy respondents are shown in Figure 1 above. NCFMR Pilot Data 2010 - Married and cohabiting respondents were asked the following question about their relationship satisfaction: “Taking all things together, how satisfied are you with your relationship with your spouse or partner?” Response categories range from very satisfied (1) to very dissatisfied (5). Only very satisfied respondents are shown in Figure 1 on page 1.