

## University of Groningen

### Migrant family matters

Rooijackers, Elisabeth Nathanaël

**IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.**

*Document Version*

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Publication date:*

2017

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Rooijackers, E. N. (2017). *Migrant family matters: Comparing patterns of intergenerational solidarity and partner separation in the Netherlands*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. University of Groningen.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

**Take-down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

*Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.*

# CHAPTER 5

## SEPARATION AND RESIDENTIAL RELOCATION

*Currently under review:* Rooyackers, I.N., Das, M., & De Valk, H.A.G. (2017). Separation and residential relocation among women of native and non-Western immigrant origin in the Netherlands.

### 5.1. Introduction

Non-Western immigrants and their descendants form a growing part of the Northwestern European population. Concerned with issues of social cohesion, research has examined the integration of immigrant groups on a range of social-structural characteristics, such as education, employment, health, housing and family formation (Bijl & Verweij 2012). Surprisingly few migration studies have looked into processes of family disruption. Although divorce has become a major topic in international research, barely any work has been done on the dissolution of immigrant couples. More attention has gone out to mixed marriages, highlighting the instability of these partnerships (e.g. Kalmijn, de Graaf & Janssen 2005; Milewski & Kulu 2014; Smith, Maas & van Tubergen 2012). By far most unions, however, are between partners of the same origin, making it relevant to study union dissolution also among different migrant origin groups. Moreover, there are reasons why we would expect union dissolution rates to differ across origin groups. The societies from which immigrants originate vary in important demographic respects from the destination countries in which they settle, including partnership dynamics. Immigrants may behave in ways that reflect the dominant patterns of their origin countries. Furthermore, migration can also affect union stability by the challenges and stress that the process entails (Boyle et al. 2008; Muszynska & Kulu 2007).

In this research, we enhance our understanding of diversity in union dissolution by comparing women of native Dutch and various immigrant origins in the Netherlands. We defined union dissolution by the residential separation of partners, who could either be married or not. In our paper, therefore, the term cohabitation refers to both married and non-married couples. Trends in partnership (dissolution) in the Netherlands have developed in ways comparable to neighboring countries. In combination with a diverse immigration history, the Netherlands thereby offers an illustrative context for understanding partnership dissolution among non-Western immigrants in Northwestern Europe. From a societal viewpoint, immigrants and immigrant women specifically, are crucial groups to focus on. The negative consequences of a union dissolution are often greater for women than men (Boertien 2012) but may be particularly disruptive for immigrant women, who generally have lower levels of income, live in poorer housing conditions and are in worse health than natives and immigrant men (Nielsen, Hempler & Krasnik 2013). Mothers, moreover,

tend to get custody of children and face the various disadvantages that are related to single parenthood (Brown & Moran 1997).

Two main questions guided our analyses. First, we questioned how dissolution rates varied across origin groups and to what extent this variation resulted from sociodemographic characteristics. Immigrants differ from natives in terms of age, socioeconomic status, the commonness of married versus unmarried cohabitation, the number of children and their housing situation (Manley & Van Ham 2011; Odé & Veenman 2003). These are all factors that are known to influence partnership stability. Second, we compared union dissolution rates among women who had migrated themselves and women who were children of immigrants, i.e. the second generation. Unlike their parents, second generation immigrants did not experience the move to another country themselves. Moreover, by virtue of being born and raised in the destination country, the second generation is commonly expected to be more similar to the native population. Empirical research supported this expectation in many demographic respects (Schneider & Crul 2012) but not yet looked at union dissolution.

Our additional objective was to call attention to the interdependence of demographic behaviors. Far from being isolated transitions in people's lives, family processes are closely linked to past and future events. In this paper, we focused on residential relocation, one of the immediate practical consequences of a union dissolution. Moving after a union dissolution can have negative consequences for people's welfare, affecting their housing conditions (Feijten & Mulder 2005; South, Crowder & Trent 1998), psychological wellbeing (Magdol 2002) and the lives of their children as well (Braver et al. 2003). In this sense, the particular disadvantages of immigrant groups may extend to include multiple life-events. We examined how separated women of different origins varied in their likelihood to move and questioned the role of sociodemographic characteristics and immigrant generation in explaining these differences.

Data for the analyses came from the System of Social statistical Datasets (Bakker, van Rooijen & van Toor 2014). Difficulties in obtaining adequate data may be one of the reasons why both union dissolution and relocation have hardly been studied among immigrants. Survey studies usually include a small number of immigrant respondents, still less of those who are separated. Our data are unique in the sense that these offered information about the entire population of native Dutch and

immigrant women in the Netherlands. This allowed us to compare dynamical events such as union dissolution and relocation across various origin groups. We compared native Dutch women to women of the four largest non-Western immigrant groups in the Netherlands: Turks, Moroccans, Surinamese and Antilleans. Taking into account all cohabitations in 2008, including both marital and non-marital unions, we looked at who still lived with their partner a year later and who of the separated women moved. Logistic Regressions were conducted to examine how age, family structure, housing features and immigrant generation explained the variation in union dissolution and residential relocation.

## **5.2. Research context**

### *5.2.1. Immigrants in the Netherlands*

In 2015, almost 3.6 million individuals in the Netherlands were of immigrant descent, amounting to 22% of the Dutch population (Statistics Netherlands 2015). A little over half were of non-Western origin, which according to Dutch statistics means they have at least one parent who was born in Africa, Latin America, Turkey or Asia (excluding Indonesia, the former Dutch East Indies, and Japan). The four largest non-Western groups in the Netherlands originate from Turkey, Morocco, Suriname and the Dutch Antilles, together making up two thirds of the non-Western immigrant population. Currently, a slight majority belongs to the second generation and are children of immigrants rather than immigrants themselves. This second generation is still quite young, however, with average ages of around 20 years (Van der Vliet, Ooijevaar & Wobma 2014). Most migrants arrived in the Netherlands during the 1960s and 1970s (Vermeulen & Penninx 2000). Due to labor shortages, predominantly male, low-skilled workers were recruited from the poorer regions of Turkey and Morocco (central Anatolia and the Rif region respectively). These “guest workers” were envisioned to stay temporarily but many settled in the Netherlands and brought over their families. Immigration flows from the Caribbean region were primarily shaped by (post-)colonial ties. Many Surinamese and Antillean immigrants were therefore already familiar with the Dutch language and culture before migrating. Their main motives were the pursuit of work and education and joining family members in the Netherlands. Since the 1990s, another increasing part of the non-Western immigrant population of the Netherlands is made up by asylum seekers. This is a very diverse

group in terms of countries of origin, timing and motivations for migration, as well as sociodemographic characteristics. In view of the comparatively homogeneous composition of the Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean origin groups and our interest in both immigrants and their descendants, we focused on these four.

### *5.2.2. Union patterns in origin countries*

Quite different family structures prevail in the societies from which Turkish and Moroccan (“Mediterranean”) and Surinamese and Antillean (“Caribbean”) immigrants originate. The majority of Mediterranean immigrants come from more conservative regions which were and are characterized by a prominence of marriage, young ages at marriage and high fertility rates (Morocco: DHS 2005; Turkey: DHS 2009). Around middle age, close to the whole population is married. Non-marital cohabitation happens rarely and also divorce is very uncommon (2% respectively 3% of the marriages in Turkey and Morocco end in divorce). Families are organized along patrilineal lines, meaning that women usually move in with the family of their husbands. In Caribbean societies, marriage is mostly restricted to the higher social classes and some religious minorities (Faith 2000). Instead, non-marital unions are widespread, which tend to be rather unstable (Emery & Golson 2013; Staker 1992). The typical family structure in this region is matrifocal. Single motherhood is relatively common, while fathers and also the father’s family play a less prominent role in the upbringing of children (Distelbrink 2000). The average number of children that women give birth to in Suriname and the Antilles has been higher than in Western countries, although somewhat less outspoken compared to Turkey and Morocco (United Nations 2013).

### *5.2.3. Immigrant households in the Netherlands*

With less than 10% unmarried partnerships, most cohabiting couples of Turkish or Moroccan origin in the Netherlands are married (Huijnk, Gijsberts & Dagevos 2013). By far the majority of these are made up by partners who share the same origin and are either both first generation immigrants or both descendants of immigrants (Huschek, De Valk & Liefbroer 2012). Only about one tenth has a native Dutch partner (Van der Vliet et al. 2012). Inter-marriage with native Dutch is more prevalent among Surinamese and Antilleans, among whom 30-40% of the unions involves a

Dutch partner. Unmarried cohabitation is also more common among these groups, applying to about a third of the couples (Huijnk et al. 2013). Relatively many Surinamese and Antilleans households, moreover, consist of single mothers (Van der Vliet et al. 2014). Fertility rates do not differ much across women of various origins in the Netherlands, due to a rapid convergence over the last years. Whereas the average number of children that women give birth to has decreased among non-Western immigrants, fertility rates have increased among native Dutch. Childlessness, however, remains rare among Turkish and Moroccan women and also happens less frequently among Surinamese and Antillean than Dutch women (Van Huis 2013).

Immigrant households generally live in poorer socioeconomic circumstances than Dutch natives. Overall, immigrants have lower incomes, are underrepresented in higher education and more often unemployed (Van der Vliet et al. 2014). Although these differences hold regardless of origin, they are usually greatest for Turkish and Moroccan and smallest for Surinamese immigrants. An overwhelming majority of the immigrants resides in urban areas, particularly the four largest cities of the Netherlands, where they make use of (cheaper) social housing (Bolt & van Kempen 2003). In many respects, the descendants of immigrants take on a position that lies in between that of their parents and the native population. They fare better than their parents in terms of income, education and homeownership, for example, but remain disadvantaged relative to the native Dutch (Van der Vliet et al. 2014).

### **5.3. Theoretical background**

#### *5.3.1. Separation*

Patterns of partnership and the dissolution thereof changed rapidly in the Netherlands after the 1960s, in ways that are indicative for changes observed in the whole of Northwestern Europe. Propelled by processes of individualization and secularization, traditional family structures gave way to more alternative forms of family organization (Lesthaeghe & Van de Kaa 1986). The number of marriages declined, while single-person households and especially non-marital cohabitation became more common. At the same time, divorce rates rose sharply, quintupling from the mid-60s to the mid-80s. This steep rise in marital dissolutions has been ascribed to changing attitudes towards family and divorce, the improved social-economic position of women and liberalization of divorce laws (Kalmijn et al. 2001). Far from

being restricted to the Netherlands, similar demographic developments occurred in many Western (European) countries around the same time (Van de Kaa 1987). International research has therefore devoted ample attention to the wide range of factors that influence the risks of partnership dissolution

(for an overview see Lyngstad & Jalovaara 2010). Given our interest in how the sociodemographic make-up of origin groups accounted for the diversity in union dissolution rates, we focused on characteristics that prominently differentiate native Dutch and non-Western immigrant groups: age, unmarried versus married cohabitation, the number of children, income, type of housing and urban residence.

First of all, the risks of a union dissolution have been found to vary with age. The relationship between the two is complex, however, as age effects confound with various time-related issues, such as the age at which a union was formed and the duration of a union. Some authors argued that the risk of dissolution particularly decreases up to people's early thirties and starts to slowly rise again afterwards. Despite the lack of clear explanations, empirical research has affirmed such a curvilinear relationship between age and union dissolution (Dronkers 2015; Wolfinger 2003). Dissolution rates are also linked to the prevalence of non-marital partnerships. Although unmarried cohabitation can serve as a precursor to marriage, overall, non-marital unions are relatively unstable compared to married couples (Andersson 2003). Similar as marriage, having children in the household has been seen as a (temporarily) stabilizer of unions by indicating commitment to the relationship (Brines & Joyner 1999). Moreover, possible adverse effects on children can lead parents to at least postpone a union dissolution until they left home (Montenegro 2004). With respect to socioeconomic factors, the relationship with union dissolution is complicated. A higher income can make a union dissolution less attractive from an economical point of view, for instance, as well as facilitate divorce by enabling couples to cover the expenses that are involved. To some degree, people's housing situation is a reflection of their socioeconomic circumstances, but can also be linked to union dissolution in other ways. In so far that tenants are relatively mobile compared to homeowners, for example, a certain housing type can be less of an obstacle to separate (Grinstein-Weiss et al. 2014). Likewise, there may be regional differences in the availability and affordability of housing, which make the practical feasibility of a union dissolution more or less difficult. On the one hand, cities often offer a wider range of housing options than more rural areas. On the other hand, long



waiting lists for social housing also can deter the ease of moving in urban areas.

The exact mechanisms by which age, family structure and housing characteristics affect union dissolution are not yet unequivocally understood. Hardly anything is known, moreover, about how these issues play a role in the dissolution of immigrant couples. Nonetheless, previous research obviously indicated that sociodemographic characteristics contribute in some way to the risks of a union dissolution. Diversity across origin groups would therefore at least partly result from their different compositions. Next to questioning the role of background characteristics, we addressed the issue how union dissolution rates varied between immigrants and the descendants of immigrants. Since second generation women grew up in the destination country, they did not experience migration themselves, a process that can negatively affect the stability of partnerships (Boyle et al. 2008; Muszynska & Kulu 2007). Moreover, the second generation has been found to more similar to the native population in many respects (Schneider & Crul 2012), which has been ascribed to their socialization into the norms of the destination country. Likewise, therefore, second generation women would resemble the native Dutch more in terms of the prevalence of union dissolution.

### *5.3.2. Residential relocation*

The second main question we explored was how women of various origins differed in residential relocation after a union is dissolved. In view of the complexities and novelty of the topic, our research question was mainly explorative. Instead of exposing the underlying processes that drive residential relocation among immigrant ex-couples, we aimed here to first understand how relocation rates vary across origin groups and to what extent this is due to sociodemographic differences. Family events can trigger specific needs and desires that increase or reduce people's incentives to move (Geist & McManus 2008). Geographies of residential relocation that follow upon divorce therefore tend to be different from those of couples who move together as a family or that of singles. Recent studies indicated that relocation after a union dissolution is particularly shaped by social ties, showing that people who separated moved more often to the city (Feijten & Van Ham 2013) and closer to parents (Das, De Valk & Merz 2017). Moreover, local ties to parents, siblings or work were found to make it less likely that ex-partners move further away (Mulder & Malmberg 2011).

Another peculiarity about moving in this situation is that the behaviors of ex-partners are inextricably linked. Since at least one of the ex-couple has to move, the main issue becomes who moves. From this perspective, it has been proposed that characteristics of (ex)partners should be considered in relative terms, such as the share that each partner contributes to the household income (Mulder 2013).

Despite our advancing knowledge about moving behaviors after a union dissolution, results are not yet unambiguous concerning the ways in which various factors contribute to residential decisions. Furthermore, specific mechanisms may underlie the relocation of immigrant ex-partners. Studies indicated that the residential choices of immigrants are influenced by particular motivations and contextual constraints (Boschman & Van Ham 2015; Schaake, Burgers, & Mulder 2014). The same could hold with respect to moving in the context of a union dissolution. In addition, there may be cultural factors at play. The decision of which ex-partner moves might not only be based on practical opportunities but also normative beliefs about the rights and obligations of each (male and female) ex-partner. It is plausible that varying norms and beliefs about this issue would contribute to differences in residential relocation across origin groups.

Although we do not yet exactly know which processes shape the relocation behaviors of immigrant ex-couples, it can be assumed that sociodemographic characteristics will affect the opportunities and restrictions for moving in some way. Whether or not moving is both desirable and feasible, for instance, partly depends on the resources families have available. Likewise, urban or rural residence and the type of housing can make moving more or less complicated. Also family characteristics, such as having children at home or not, will most likely be a factor of concern. In order to compare relocation behaviors across origin groups, therefore, we should take into account their different sociodemographic compositions. Again, we also focused on differences in the relocation of separated women across immigrant generations. Following the same reasoning as with union dissolution, the behaviors of immigrant descendants would indicate an increasing similarity with the native Dutch.

## **5.4. Method**

### *5.4.1. Data and participants*

Data for the analyses came from the System of Social statistical Datasets (SSD;

Bakker et al. 2014). Constructed by Statistics Netherlands, the SSD is a system which interlinks data from many administrative registers, including the Dutch municipal population register, tax registers and registers from the Employee Insurance Agency. This resulted in wide ranging demographic and socioeconomic information on all persons legally residing in the Netherlands. First, we made a selection according to the origin of women, including native Dutch women and women with at least one parent born in Turkey, Morocco, Suriname and the Antilles. The sample thus comprised immigrant and second generation women. Next, we selected women between the age of 15 and 65, those who had a partner and were registered as living at the same address with that partner in January 2008. A small number of women was excluded because of inconsistent information with regard to their partner status, due to minor errors that commonly occur with administration. Women with a same-sex partner were also excluded. Research has suggested that same-sex partnerships are less stable than heterosexual unions (Lau 2012). Moreover, societal attitudes towards homosexuality differ greatly across origin countries. Neither did we include women who had died or migrated during our time window, nor those whose partner had died or migrated. Finally, considering that immigrants are strongly concentrated in cities, we selected women who resided in the 25 largest municipalities of the Netherlands. Applying the selection criteria led to a sample of 717,539 women who were registered as living with their (married or cohabiting) male partner in January 2008. These comprised 602,899 Dutch, 43,836 Turkish, 35,980 Moroccan, 27,766 Surinamese and 7,058 Antillean women. In the second part of the analyses, we examined the likelihood of separated women to move out of the shared residence. Hence, focusing only on women who experienced a union dissolution, the sample for the second part comprised 30,707 women, among whom 19,729 native Dutch, 1098 Turks, 1,023 Moroccans, 1,814 Surinamese and 576 Antilleans.

#### 5.4.2. *Measurements*

Our dependent variables were union dissolution and residential relocation. Women were considered to be *separated* if they lived with a partner at the same address on January 2008 and at a different address than their (ex)partner on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2009, exactly a year from when they had been registered as living at the same address. The measure was coded 1 if women lived without their partner in 2009 and 0 if they were

still living with their partner at that time. *Residential relocation* was indicated by a dichotomous variable, coded 1 for women who were registered at a different address at January 1<sup>st</sup> 2009 and 0 for who were still living at the same address (but without their partner).

All independent variables were measured at the time women were (still) living with their partner (before union dissolution). We firstly constructed a measurement of women's *origin*, based on their mother's country of birth and, in case the mother was born in the Netherlands, that of the father. Five dummy variables distinguished Dutch women from Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean immigrant women (coded 1 if women belonged to the corresponding origin group and 0 if they did not). Dutch women served as reference category. To consider the potential effect of *age*, we included a continuous as well as squared measure of women's years of age.

A first housing characteristic was *homeownership*, measured by three dummy variables that indicated whether the shared place of residence had been owned, rented, or when this information was unavailable (yes coded 1 and no coded 0 for each of the variables). Tenancy was taken as the category of reference. Another dummy variable captured *urban residence*, distinguishing women who lived in the four largest municipalities in the Netherlands (coded 1) from those who lived elsewhere (coded 0).

Characteristics of the family situation that we considered were household income, type of union and the number of children living in the household. *Yearly household income* was included as a continuous variable, taking 1,000 euros as the unit of measurement. *Type of union* was captured by a dummy variable, with (formerly) cohabiting non-married women coded 1 and (formerly) married women coded 0. Married women thus served as the reference category. To take into account the *number of children living in the household*, three dummy variables were constructed. These differentiated between women who had no children, those who had one and three children and those with four or more children at home (yes coded 1 and no coded 0 for each of the variables). Having no children at home was used as the group of reference.

Finally, for women of immigrant descent, we took into account *generation* by distinguishing between those who were born abroad themselves (immigrant women; coded 0) and who were born in the Netherlands (second generation; coded 1). Immigrant women hence served as the reference category. In addition, we

differentiated between women of immigrant descent who had a *native Dutch partner* (coded 1) and those whose partner belonged to the same origin group (coded 0).

#### 5.4.3. Analytical procedure

The analyses comprised four parts, starting with descriptive analyses of the two main dependent variables. Secondly, we examined to what extent diversity in union dissolution across origin groups was accounted for by women's sociodemographic characteristics. We first included women's origin (Model I), then added the measurements of age (Model II) and subsequently added housing and family features in blocks (Model III and IV). In the third part of the analyses, we examined differences in residential relocation among women who had separated. The same stepwise procedure was used for analyzing the effects of sociodemographic characteristics. Finally, in the fourth part, we devoted exclusive attention to immigrants and their descendants. We analyzed how union dissolution and, next, residential relocation rates differed between immigrant and second generation women. In order to assess generation effects above and beyond sociodemographic characteristics, the before mentioned explanatory variables were again included. All predictive analyses involved Logistic Regressions.

### 5.5. Results

#### 5.5.1. Descriptive findings

Descriptive information on our dependent and explanatory variables for all women are shown in Table 5.1. Union dissolution had occurred least often among Turkish and Moroccan women (2.5% respectively 2.8% had separated, compared to 3.3% of the Dutch) and noticeably more often among Surinamese and Antillean women (6.5% respectively 8.2% had separated). The sociodemographic characteristics of the full sample of women were in line with what we know about the position of origin groups in the Netherlands. Compared to the Dutch, immigrant women were on average younger, less often homeowners, more often lived in the largest cities, had lower incomes and more children living in the household. In nearly all respects, the differences with native Dutch were greatest for Turkish and Moroccan women and smallest for Surinamese and Antillean women. Non-marital cohabitation was particularly uncommon among Turkish and Moroccan women and especially common

among Surinamese and Antilleans. Lastly, in terms of generation, most women had immigrated themselves. Less than a quarter in each immigrant group belonged to the second generation.

Table 5.2 gives descriptive statistics on our second main issue of interest, residential relocation, and the sociodemographic characteristics of women who experienced a union dissolution. The Dutch stood out with the highest proportion of women moving after a union dissolution (65%). Residential relocation was lowest among separated Turkish women (49%), followed by Moroccans (54%) and subsequently Surinamese and Antillean women (both 56%). For comparison, we included information on residential relocation among all women at the time when everyone was (still) living with their partner (Table 5.1, final row). As can be expected, moving was rare in general in this situation. Variations between origin groups were less outspoken and also showed a different pattern: although Turkish and Moroccan women were again the least mobile, the proportion of Surinamese and Antillean women who moved now exceeded that of native Dutch.

In terms of sociodemographic characteristics, the sample of separated women was somewhat differently composed than the total sample of women. On average, women who experienced a union dissolution were younger, had had lower incomes, less often been homeowners, more often lived in the largest municipalities, more often been in a non-marital union and had fewer children living at home. The direction of these differences were the same in each origin group. Among separated women of immigrant descent, the proportion belonging to the second generation was generally higher than in the full sample. Only among Antillean separated women, the proportion immigrant and second generation women did not differ from the full sample.

Table 5.1. *Descriptive information of (non)married cohabiting women in the Netherlands, presented per origin group (n=717,539)*

Variable	Origin Group					
	Range	Dutch Mean (SD)	Turks Mean (SD)	Moroccans Mean (SD)	Surinamese Mean (SD)	Antilleans Mean (SD)
<i>Dependent</i>						
Separated (1=yes)	0-1	0.033	0.025	0.028	0.065	0.082
Age (years)	15-65	43 (12)	37 (11)	37 (11)	40 (11)	38 (11)
<i>Housing characteristics</i>						
Housing type						
Owned (1=yes)	0-1	0.66	0.36	0.12	0.53	0.38
Rented (1=yes)	0-1	0.31	0.63	0.78	0.45	0.60
Missing information (1=yes)	0-1	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02
Living in 4 major cities (1=yes)	0-1	0.32	0.57	0.73	0.80	0.55
<i>Family characteristics</i>						
Household income (x1,000E)	-1,000-1,000	27 (19)	17 (10)	16 (7)	23 (14)	23 (15)
Cohabiting (1=yes; 0=married)	0-1	0.31	0.07	0.07	0.40	0.49
Children (number)	0-11	0.9	1.6	2.1	1.1	1.0
<i>Migrant characteristics</i>						
2 <sup>nd</sup> generation (1=yes; 0=first)	0-1	N.A.	0.16	0.12	0.19	0.23
Native Dutch partner (1=yes)	0-1	N.A.	0.02	0.03	0.22	0.33
Moved (1=yes)	0-1	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.13
N		602,899	43,836	35,980	27,766	7,058

Source = SSD, 2008/2009.

Table 5.2. Descriptive information of separated women in the Netherlands, presented per origin group (n=24,240)

Variable	Dutch		Turks	Moroccans	Surinamese	Antilleans
	Range	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
<i>Dependent</i>						
Moved after separation (1=yes)	0-1	0.65	0.49	0.54	0.56	0.56
<i>Individual characteristics</i>						
Age (years)	15-65	34 (11)	32 (8)	31 (9)	35 (11)	31 (11)
<i>(Former)housing characteristics</i>						
Housing type						
Owned (1=yes)	0-1	0.48	0.30	0.12	0.33	0.18
Rented (1=yes)	0-1	0.47	0.68	0.85	0.64	0.78
Missing information (1=yes)	0-1	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.04
Living in 4 major cities (1=yes)	0-1	0.38	0.59	0.72	0.83	0.61
<i>(Former)family characteristics</i>						
Household income (x1,000E)	-1,000-677	23 (18)	18 (16)	17 (9)	20 (11)	17 (10)
Cohabiting (1=yes; 0=married)	0-1	0.73	0.38	0.42	0.79	0.85
Children (number)	0-9	0.6	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.8
<i>Migrant characteristics</i>						
2 <sup>nd</sup> generation (1=yes; 0=first)	0-1	N.A.	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.23
Native Dutch partner (1=yes)	0-1	N.A.	0.06	0.10	0.21	0.25
N		19,729	1,098	1,023	1,814	576

Source = SSD, 2008/2009.



### 5.5.2. Multivariate Analyses

#### *Separation and sociodemographic composition*

Table 5.3 presents the models that estimated the variation in dissolution rates across origin groups, with the independent variables added in blocks. Not corrected for sociodemographic group composition, the likelihood to experience a union dissolution compared to the native Dutch was significantly different for all immigrant groups. Whereas the odds of separating were lower for Turkish and Moroccan than Dutch women (24% respectively 13% lower), the odds for Surinamese and Antillean women were more than twice as high. Adding age, housing and family characteristics in Model II to IV diminished the differences between origin groups, but most noticeably for Turkish and Moroccan women. In the last model, their odds of separating were only 5% respectively 1% lower than for Dutch women and these differences were no longer statistically significant ( $p > .05$ ). For Surinamese and Antillean women, the odds ratios decreased somewhat, but their odds of separating remained 1.7 and 1.5 higher than for Dutch women. These differences also retained their statistical significance ( $p < .001$ ). With the exception of the squared measurement of age, all independent variables had a significant impact on the odds of separating. Most apparent was the effect of the type of union that women had, with the odds for non-married cohabiting unions to dissolve being 3.7 higher than for married unions.

#### *Residential relocation and sociodemographic composition*

We continued by examining the variation in residential relocation among separated women of various origin, before and after controlling for sociodemographic characteristics (see Table 5.4). Irrespective of their origin, women of immigrant descent were less likely to move after a union dissolution than native Dutch women. Without accounting for the different sociodemographic group compositions, the odds of moving were 48% lower among Turkish women, 36% lower for Moroccans and 31% respectively 30% lower for Surinamese and Antillean women. Taking into account age, housing and family characteristics in Model II to IV decreased the differences somewhat, but resulted in a comparable pattern. The difference with native Dutch remained greatest for Turkish women (40% lower odds), followed by Moroccan and Antillean (both 19% lower odds) and finally Surinamese women (11% lower odds). All independent variables, except income, were significantly related to

the likelihood of moving. Most evident were the effects of homeownership and having more than four children living in the household, the first doubling the odds for women to move and the latter cutting them in half.

### *Immigrant generation*

Lastly, we considered each of the four immigrant origin groups separately and examined the differences between immigrant and second generation women. Since adding women's sociodemographic characteristics did not significantly alter the results, only the full models are reported. Table 5.5 presents the results for union dissolution and Table 5.6 for residential relocation. Among Turkish and Moroccan women, second generation women were more likely to experience a union dissolution than immigrant women (odds ratios of 1.3 respectively 1.4). For Surinamese and Antillean women, no significant differences were found. In the case of residential relocation, immigrant and second generation women of Turkish and Moroccan descent did not differ significantly. The odds of moving for Surinamese women, however, were 35% lower among second generation women compared to those for immigrant women. Antilleans showed the opposite pattern, with second generation women having about twice as high odds of moving than immigrant women. In terms of sociodemographic characteristics, the contribution in explaining within-group variation differed across origin groups. In particular, the type of union and number children at home seemed to matter more strongly for Mediterranean than Caribbean women. Unmarried versus married cohabitation, for instance, contributed to a striking degree to higher odds of separating among Turkish and Moroccan women (odds ratios close to 8, compared to odds ratios around 4.5 among Surinamese and Antillean women). Having four or more children in the household, moreover, was of statistical significance for union dissolution and relocation among Mediterranean but not Caribbean women. Similarly, most of the family features had a significant effect on the odds of moving for Turkish and Moroccan women, whereas none did for Surinamese and Antillean women.

Table 5.3 Predictors of separation for all women in a union: odds ratios of Logistic Regressions (n=717,539)

	Model I	Model II	Model III	Model IV
<i>Individual characteristics</i>				
Origin group (ref=Dutch)				
Turkish	0.759*** (.031)	0.542*** (.032)	0.454*** (.032)	0.946† (.034)
Moroccan	0.865*** (.033)	0.618*** (.033)	0.442*** (.034)	0.990 (.036)
Surinamese	2.066*** (.025)	1.839*** (.026)	1.609*** (.027)	1.664*** (.027)
Antillean	2.627*** (.044)	1.798*** (.045)	1.478*** (.046)	1.472*** (.046)
Age		0.842*** (.004)	0.876*** (.004)	0.966*** (.005)
Age <sup>2</sup>		1.001*** (.000)	1.001*** (.000)	1.000† (.000)
<i>(Former)housing characteristics</i>				
Housing type (ref=rented)				
Owner			0.531*** (.014)	0.644*** (.015)
Missing information			1.153*** (.035)	1.147*** (.035)
Living in 4 major cities (ref=elsewhere)			1.145*** (.014)	1.103*** (.014)
<i>(Former)family characteristics</i>				
Household income (x1,000E)				0.988*** (.001)
Cohabit (ref=married)				3.733*** (.018)
Children at home (ref=none)				
1-3				0.774*** (.017)
≥4				0.629*** (.064)
<i>Model R<sup>2</sup></i>	.007	.095	.107	.145

†p<.10; \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001.

Notes. Standard deviation between brackets. Model I includes origin groups only, Model II, III and IV additionally include age, housing and family characteristics respectively as predictors.

Source = SSD, 2008/2009.

Table 5.4 Predictors of residential relocation for separated women: odds ratios of Logistic Regressions (n=24,240)

	Model I	Model II	Model III	Model IV
<i>Individual characteristics</i>				
Origin group (ref=Dutch)				
Turkish	0.517*** (.062)	0.491*** (.063)	0.573*** (.065)	0.601*** (.067)
Moroccan	0.640*** (.064)	0.583*** (.066)	0.775*** (.068)	0.812*** (.070)
Surinamese	0.688*** (.050)	0.720*** (.051)	0.846** (.053)	0.891* (.054)
Antillean	0.698*** (.085)	0.621*** (.087)	0.768** (.089)	0.810* (.090)
Age		0.902*** (.008)	0.870*** (.009)	0.893*** (.010)
Age <sup>2</sup>		1.001*** (.000)	1.001*** (.000)	1.001*** (.000)
<i>(Former)housing characteristics</i>				
Housing type (ref=rented)				
Owner			2.039*** (.030)	2.030*** (.030)
Missing information			1.492*** (.072)	1.469*** (.072)
Living in 4 major cities (ref=elsewhere)			0.909** (.029)	0.894*** (.029)
<i>(Former)family characteristics</i>				
Household income (x 1,000E)				1.000 (.001)
Cohabiting (ref=married)				0.912* (.036)
Children at home (ref=none)				
1-3				0.785*** (.034)
≥4				0.477*** (.130)
<i>Model R<sup>2</sup></i>	.008	.062	.094	.099

†p&lt;.10; \*p&lt;.05; \*\*p&lt;.01; \*\*\*p&lt;.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets. Model I includes origin groups only, Model II, III and IV additionally include age, housing and family characteristics respectively as predictors.

Source SSD, 2008/2009.

Table 5.5 Predictors of separation per immigrant origin group (separate models); odds ratios of Logistic Regressions

	Turks	Moroccans	Surinamese	Antilleans
<i>Individual characteristics</i>				
Age	1.083** (.028)	1.025 (.027)	0.973 (.019)	.917** (.032)
Age <sup>2</sup>	0.998*** (.000)	0.999* (.000)	1.000 (.000)	1.001* (.000)
<i>(Former)housing characteristics</i>				
Housing type (ref=rented)				
Owner	0.968 (.212)	0.541** (.207)	0.995 (.146)	0.845 (.240)
Missing information	0.633* (.216)	0.350** (.227)	0.569*** (.149)	0.518* (.259)
Living in 4 major cities (ref=no)	1.002 (.064)	0.987 (.075)	1.131† (.068)	1.272* (.094)
<i>(Former)family characteristics</i>				
Household income (x1,000E)	1.004 (.003)	0.991† (.004)	0.983*** (.003)	0.972*** (.006)
Cohabiting (ref=married)	7.755*** (.071)	7.491*** (.078)	4.724*** (.063)	4.541*** (.132)
Children at home (ref=none)				
1-3	0.757** (.081)	0.491*** (.081)	0.690*** (.057)	0.917 (.103)
≥4	0.737† (.180)	0.268*** (.156)	1.017 (.173)	0.699 (.367)
<i>Migrant characteristics</i>				
Second generation (ref=first)	1.272** (.081)	1.404*** (.087)	1.098 (.067)	0.863 (.123)
Native Dutch partner (ref=no)	1.010 (.146)	1.018 (.128)	0.814** (.066)	0.943 (.119)
N	43,836	35,980	27,766	7,058
Model R <sup>2</sup>	.130	.177	.157	.162

†p&lt;.10; \*p&lt;.05; \*\*p&lt;.01; \*\*\*p&lt;.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets.

Source = SSD, 2008/2009.

Table 5.6 Predictors of residential relocation for separated women per immigrant origin group (separate models); odds ratios of Logistic Regressions

	Turks	Moroccans	Surinamese	Antilleans
<i>Individual characteristics</i>				
Age	0.785*** (.058)	0.821** (.058)	0.834*** (.037)	0.943 (.062)
Age <sup>2</sup>	1.003** (.001)	1.002* (.001)	1.002*** (.000)	1.000 (.001)
<i>(Former)housing characteristics</i>				
Housing type (ref=rented)				
Owner	0.528 (.435)	2.470*** (.235)	0.606† (.292)	0.868 (.462)
Missing information	1.922 (.445)	2.683* (.459)	1.373 (.300)	2.454† (.518)
Living in 4 major cities (ref=no)	0.833 (.135)	0.743† (.160)	0.694** (.135)	1.367† (.185)
<i>(Former)family characteristics</i>				
Household income (x1000E)	1.001 (.004)	0.991 (.008)	1.006 (.005)	1.004 (.011)
Cohabiting (ref=married)	1.325* (.143)	1.169 (.154)	1.014 (.127)	1.027 (.272)
Children at home (ref=none)				
1-3	0.699* (.159)	0.313*** (.160)	0.832 (.112)	0.767 (.197)
≥4	0.422* (.400)	0.182*** (.355)	0.724 (.333)	0.765 (.713)
<i>Migrant characteristics</i>				
Second generation (ref=first)	0.874 (.174)	0.704† (.184)	0.645** (.136)	2.150** (.242)
N	1,098	1,023	1,814	576
Model R <sup>2</sup>	.205	.252	.140	.138

†p<.10; \*p<.05; \*\*p<.01; \*\*\*p<.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets.

Source = SSD, 2008/2009.

## 5.6. Discussion

In this paper, we examined diversity in union dissolution and residential relocation between women of native Dutch, Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean origin, using a unique dataset that contained information on all legal residents in the Netherlands. Our study, firstly, showed the importance of taking into account sociodemographic group composition. Although Mediterranean women appeared to be less likely to experience a union dissolution than Dutch women, these lower rates of union dissolution resulted among others from their more traditional family structure: being married and having more children at home. Union dissolution rates among Surinamese and Antillean immigrants, in contrast, remained the highest of all origin groups, also after adjusting for age, family and housing characteristics. Our findings regarding immigrant generations, together with the dominant demographic patterns in origin countries, offer an important context from which to interpret these results. Turkish and Moroccan immigrants largely originate from societies where nearly every adult is married and divorce rarely takes place. With this in mind, the dissolution rates that we found among Turkish and Moroccan women were unexpectedly high. It could be that the process of migration raised tensions in the relationship and led to more disruptions in partnerships. However, we also found that second generation Mediterranean women were more likely to experience a union dissolution than women who migrated themselves. Partly, these higher dissolution rates among second generation women may be attributed to migration marriages. Many Turkish and Moroccan migrants, also women, still marry someone from the kinship network in the home country. Such migration marriages would arguably be more problematic among second generation women because of a lack of shared ties to the origin country. However, the proportion of migration marriages has sharply decreased among the descendants of Turkish and Moroccan immigrants over the last years, diminishing from about 50% in 2001 to 10% in 2008 (Sterckx et al., 2014). Alternatively, our findings could also indicate that Mediterranean women are adapting to the institutional and more permissive normative context of the Netherlands. In urbanized areas of Turkey and Morocco, the same developments are taking place, instigated by similar changes that are assumed to have led to higher divorce rates in Western countries, such as social and legal reforms and socioeconomic advancements (Hanafi 2013; Kavas & Ündüz-Hosgör 2011). However

we should note that integration is not a one-dimensional process. In many socio-structural dimensions, like education and labor market position, Turkish and Moroccan immigrants and their descendants are actually rather disadvantaged (Van der Vliet et al. 2014). In this light, the unexpectedly high rates of union dissolution may also point to an especially precarious position of women from these Mediterranean origins, as they have to deal with the consequences of a union dissolution from an already disadvantaged socioeconomic position. Unfortunately, our data do not include information on partnership dynamics at the couple level and the initiation for the separation. Knowing more about the perspective of the partners, how they negotiate their partnership and who is initiating the dissolution is vital for making correct assumptions about the meaning of union dissolution rates for the integration of these women.

Whereas the Dutch social and institutional context is less restrictive towards union dissolutions compared to that of Turkey and Morocco, in Suriname and the Dutch Antilles, union dissolutions are even more common than in the Netherlands. Our findings on Surinamese and Antillean women matched this picture. Moreover, we also found equally high dissolution rates among immigrant and second generation women. Rather than pointing to migration effects, therefore, these findings suggest that demographic patterns of the origin countries are continued among women of Surinamese and Antillean descent. A similar assumption has been made with respect to the prevalence of single mothers, another family characteristic that is common for Caribbean societies as well as Caribbean immigrants in various destination countries (e.g. Thomas 2012). It is not clear how the persistence of such family patterns should be explained. In many respects, Surinamese and Antilleans resemble the Dutch native population more than other immigrant groups. The particular continuance of these family features is therefore intriguing. One possible reason is that in Western, secularized countries like the Netherlands, family life decisions are regarded as individual choices. Thus, although union dissolutions and single motherhood might not be encouraged, neither are they strongly discouraged by social pressure or institutional restrictions. Further study should be devoted to the causes of these family patterns. A union dissolution is a fundamental life-event with profound consequences and especially single motherhood is associated with various socioeconomic risks. Considering the relatively high proportion of both union dissolution and female household heads among Surinamese and Antilleans, Caribbean



women form a disadvantaged group.

A second aim of our paper was to go beyond an exclusive focus on the prevalence of union dissolution and consider the interlinkage between union dissolution and a closely related life-event, namely residential relocation. A clear pattern emerged, showing that immigrant women of all origins were less likely to move than the Dutch, also when correcting for sociodemographic compositions. Our comparisons across two generations, moreover, suggested that this immobility is a more enduring behavior of women of immigrant descent. The only exception were Antilleans, of whom the second generation was more mobile than the first. Since a union dissolution requires at least one ex-partner to move, the relocation of each ex-partner is indirectly informative about the other. Our finding that immigrant women are relatively immobile is interesting in that it implies immigrant men move out comparatively more often than is the case for Dutch couples. One explanation that has been given for the tendency of Dutch women to move out after a union dissolution is homeownership, assuming that men can more often afford the house on their own (Mulder et al. 2012). Yet, since many immigrants already make use of social housing and both partners tend to be eligible for social housing on their own, affordability may be less of a determining factor for them. Indeed, although homeownership had a markedly effect in our study, it could only partly explain the different relocation rates of immigrant and native Dutch women. Another conclusion of studies has been that having more resources relative to one's ex-partner makes a person more likely to stay after a union dissolution (Mulder et al. 2012). Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean women, however, are generally less economically independent, less active on the labor market and lower educated than immigrant men (Keuzenkamp & Merens 2006). Thus, our findings suggest that other, non-monetary, issues play a role in the moving decisions of immigrant ex-couples. Who of the ex-partners moves after a union dissolution may reflect their relative power positions to push through their preferences. Alternatively, it could result from particular interests of immigrant ex-partners. One possibility is that immigrant women have stronger reasons for staying. Several studies showed that, especially in the case of a union dissolution, moving closer to social ties is an essential motivating factor (Das, De Valk & Merz 2017). Considering that women are usually the main providers and receivers of kin support (Gerstel & Gallagher 2001) and living close to (extended) family is particularly important for non-Western immigrants (Hedman 2013), it is plausible that the nearby

presence of relatives raised the incentives of immigrant women to stay. Another possibility is that immigrant men know their way around the Dutch housing market better, by virtue of having settled in the Netherlands before bringing over their family, and more easily find a new place of residence than their ex-partner. Unfortunately, our study does not offer direct evidence for these conjectures. Future studies can shed more light on how moving decisions of immigrant ex-partners are shaped by their relative power positions, needs and preferences. Our results in any case highlight that different mechanisms should be considered for various immigrant groups. We found, for instance, that family features had a stronger impact on dissolution and relocation among Mediterranean than Caribbean women.

In assessing our results, we should consider the time-dimension that is implicated in events like union dissolution and relocation. In our study, we measured union dissolution by comparing women's residential situations in two close, particular points in time. A transversal method of estimating divorce risks has been shown to be comparable to a longitudinal approach, both among native Dutch and non-natives (Van Huis & Steenhof 2003). Nonetheless, in view of the relative sparseness of studies on non-married partnerships, analyzing the dissolution of these unions across multiple time points would be worthwhile. Another valuable addition would be cohort studies which differentiate between unions formed in different time periods or countries. With respect to residential relocation, our timeframe is relatively short for capturing moving behaviors. The need to move after a union dissolution is generally urgent and people can end up moving more than once in the few years thereafter (Das, De Valk & Merz 2017). To get a more comprehensive picture of residential patterns, therefore, we should look across multiple time points and over a longer period. Lastly, indispensable for future research is to include the perspective of male ex-partners. In our paper, we examined union dissolution and residential relocation among women specifically. Yet, these events are obviously the result of a decision making process that concerns both partners.

Union dissolution among immigrant couples is a topic that deserves more attention than it has received in the literature until now. Whereas previous research mainly highlighted the instability of mixed couples, this study indicated that immigrant partners, which by far outnumber the former, also face particularly vulnerabilities. It has been assumed that migration makes unions less stable because of the changes and stress that migration involves (Boyle et al. 2008; Muszynska &

Kulu 2007). Our findings reveal that the consequences for union (in)stability may also have to do with the settling process rather than the experience of immigration itself. This means we should distinguish between relatively recent and more settled immigrant populations. Taking into account the sociodemographic composition of origin groups and comparing immigrants and their descendants is thereby essential. Given that we focused on the Netherlands and origin groups vary in composition across Western European societies, cross-national studies could examine the interplay between contextual influences from the origin and destination country vis-à-vis each other. Our findings regarding residential relocation, furthermore, indicated that growing diversity in partnership dynamics simultaneously implies more variation in residential geographies. Origin groups not only differed in the prevalence of union dissolution but also in how likely women were to move after a union dissolution. Attending to the interdependence between demographic events will thus not only help us understand their effects on people's individual lives, but also how these shape the social-spatial organization of increasingly culturally diverse Western societies.



