

Changes in the stability of coexistence in Mexico. Do new patterns emerge?

Although in Mexico, marriage has been the dominant type of marital union, cohabitation is a historical phenomenon that is a customary manner that has had a presence, especially among people with fewer resources (Solís & Puga, 2009). Additionally, since the 70s, and especially in the 80s, there has been significant growth in its intensity (the data indicate an increase of about 12% between 1975 and 1995-2005). The observed is that the pattern of cohabitation during the twentieth century has had a U-shape, that is, since the 1930s the percentage of cohabitations had a decrease (Quilodrán, 1974) but gradually it has been increasing and since the 1990s it returns to levels similar to those of the beginning of the last century (Esteve et al., 2016).

This return would also lead to important changes in the population structure of those who cohabit and how they do it. It is emphasized that cohabitation has increased at all educational levels including the most educated, although it is recognized that the educational gradient would remain strong since the less educated would still be the ones who cohabit most (Esteve et al., 2016). Also, according to Pérez-Amador (2016) for Mexican women, it is both an alternative to marriage (the least educated) and only one step for this (the most educated).

Therefore, cohabitation in Mexico, in this sense, would be instead and therefore the determinants of such change could be different according to the populations. In this regard, explanatory schemes of the emergence of cohabitation arise from different investigations and theoretical constructs.

On the one hand, there is a hypothesis that it may be the return of traditional cohabitation, on the other, there are two explanatory theories. In the first, it is thought that cohabitation would reflect the historical pattern. In the second, which includes theories of the ideational nature (the Second Demographic Transition and the Idealism of Development) argue that the increase in cohabitation is given by an individualization in the interpersonal sphere and in family relationships, with which modern cohabitations they represent, in front of their counterparts, traditional marriages, more egalitarian and permanent unions, so they would even replace marriages. In the second, they represent the approaches based on the economic uncertainty of Oppenheimer (1988) as well as Mills and Blossfeld (2013) rather see modern cohabitation as an alternative marriage union that is contingent, especially for young people and for those with few resources, in contexts of economic crisis, that is, it is a substitute for marriage that reduces costs in times of greater uncertainty. In this last position, it is worth mentioning that there would be no changes in the "nature" of cohabitations, but that the transformations occur in context.

Therefore, the present investigation seeks to answer the questions. Are the most recent cohabitations in Mexico substitutes for marriages or are they just your prelude? Are there changes between cohorts and educational levels? Is the change in cohabitation linked to value transformations or is it related to economic crisis scenarios?

In order to achieve this, an event history technique analyzes the patterns of cohabitation entry for the cohorts from 1962 to 1990 of women and men using the 2017 Retrospective Demographic Survey. At work it is divided into theoretical and data support, followed by the explanation of the methodology together with the analysis strategy to end with the presentation of results as well as its discussion conclusions.

It was found that context with greater secularization and gender equality has an effect of discouraging marriage although it also increases the risk of separation of cohabitation in both women and men. However, its effect is diminished and disappears when other variables are introduced although not completely in the case of equality.

However, it is found that for the younger cohorts, in this case, the most recent generation 1980-1990 cohabitation reduces its risk of formalization in both women and men, that is, it decreases its characteristic of being a step to marriage. It is striking that the effect is presented until the last cohort since although the growth of cohabitation occurs since the 70s, it would not be the most current cohort of the 80s-90s that is less related to marriage. These results seem to agree both in the theories of individuation and in those of uncertainty, and the younger ones, whether for being more post-materialistic or for facing greater uncertainty, have the most stability in cohabitation. While observing the separation of cohabitation by cohort although in women they would seem to follow the argument of Heuveline & Timberlake (2004) especially in the first cohorts since in them there would be an increased risk of separation which is a symptom that women would be entering cohabitation without the intention of getting married and therefore there would be more separations, however, since it is not significant, it is not possible to assert it. While in men, finding that the risks of separation are being reduced along with the results of marriage departure, it can be inferred that cohabitation would be more stable.

A key factor in checking whether cohabitation is being more an option in the face of marriage is its ability to house procreation. In theories of individuation such as the Second Demographic Transition and the Idealism of Development, as noted above, it is considered a fundamental element in determining whether they are substitutes for marriage. In this case for Mexico, it is shown that having children triggers the formalization of cohabitation and instead reduces the risk of separation, although it is striking that in women this effect is significant until the second child. The latter may in some sense speak for them having a first child does not necessarily force them to formalize, but it is until that amount is exceeded. Which may suggest that the presence of a child may be losing strength for marriage to women. However, when performing the cohort interaction there are certain indications that there is indeed a reduction between cohorts of the effect of the presence of children as a trigger for formalization, especially in men. This would speak of the fact that cohabitation may increasingly be containing to some extent the possession of children without triggering the marriage. However, the trend is not entirely linear and procreation is still a strong trigger for marriage.

At the same time, another argument is that this ability to house children from theories of individuation is that it begins in the most educated and then disseminates. However, with the interactions made by education level, there is no clear trend for men or women. Rather, in both sexes having lower education and having children (especially 1 and 3) increases the risk of formalization, while at higher levels there is a greater risk of entering marriage (especially in men), This would speak that in the country although there are greater tendencies to house children in cohabitation without causing marriage, they would not be led by the poorest or the most educated.

A recurring argument from the position of traditional cohabitation has been that cohabitation in Mexico is a phenomenon mainly of the poorest / least educated and therefore those of higher socioeconomic status tend to formalize it. This research has found that to some extent there is a

risk of moving from cohabitation to marriage in the most educated in both men and women. However, in both cases, the effect is concentrated in people of higher education and while in high school and university the effect is not significant. This would speak of cohabitation not only being the least educated but it would be stable among certain strata that do not belong to the lowest. However, from the theories of individuation, it would be expected that in the newer cohorts this formalization effect will decrease since the cohabitations become more stable, however, it could be verified that this does not happen in the country since the interaction does not have the effect of the cohort with education.

On the other hand, the theories of individuation also postulate that modern cohabitations would be more egalitarian and this is linked to their becoming more durable. Here we tried to approximate the variable of domestic work and age homogamy. On the one hand, that in cohabitation where women do not do domestic work they present less risk of marriage and also that they increase the risk of separation from, it would rather relate to a society in which there is a clear sexual division of traditional labor. , since cohabitations do not go to marriages since men would seek to have their partners do domestic work as a condition for formalization and also dissolve to a greater extent for the same reason. While what is found in men that not performing domestic work reduces the risk of marriage, it would say that women would negatively qualify men who do not and therefore do not opt for cohabitation to be transformed into marriage.

Analyzing the homogamy it was observed that extreme differences (over 6 years) in couples ages are reducing the risk of marriage in both women and men and shorter distances (3 to 5 years) are reducing the risk of separation in the women. Which indicates that both men and women would agree less in conditions of great age differences and therefore do not consolidate them in marriages. Also, those who are discouraging dissolution in women and do not affect men may indicate that cohabitations are still spaces in which age differences in favor of men are tolerated. This, in conjunction with domestic work, would speak of the fact that although there are some ranges of the search for equality, cohabitation in the country is not yet completely egalitarian as the theories of individuation speak, but the gender differences that have been characteristics of traditional marriages.

Turning now to aspects that try to assess the uncertainty through the economic perspective point out that in fact in large part, the best conditions of both the education, employment, experience and education of the father which are supposed to generate economic potential and with it welfare to the future impel to happen the cohabitations to marriage in the women and especially in the men. This would confirm that in a certain way a lower uncertainty in the future makes you seek to consolidate the union by formalizing it as indicated by the positions of uncertainty and the globalization of Oppenheimer and Mills & Blossfeld. It is noteworthy that for women they work in a similar way to men, that is, although for men in their role as providers in the family their economic future was to be expected the key to formalization; in women, although with less force, it is also transcendent. However, the economic potential also makes cohabitations have fewer risks to separate, which suggests that people see better conditions for the future in their partner prefer to keep cohabitation.

When it was sought to know if the years of crisis at the time of the union marked differences in the risks of leaving the cohabitation, it was observed that very little they did so both as a variable by

themselves and in interaction with the elements of economic potential. Where there was a certain effect, it was the one in the work for departure by separation in women where this crisis factor seems to increase the exits compared to the years where there is no crisis, which suggests that cohabitation is those times become less attractive, that does not seem to align with the hypothesis that cohabitation is preferred in these circumstances when the most favorable working conditions are had. In theory, this factor in the crisis as uncertainty increases should intensify the search for a more stable economic future, but it does not work that way. This may be so, given that Mexico is a country that, although periods of crisis are distinguishable, its average economic development and low growth make the crises make little difference.