Separation and Residential Mobility among Women of Native and Non-Western Immigrant Origin in the Netherlands

Ilse Rooyackers[1], *Marjolijn Das*[2] *and Helga de Valk*[1,3]

This paper explores patterns of union dissolution and residential mobility among women of native Dutch and non-Western immigrant origin in the Netherlands. We analyzed to what extent variations were accounted for by age, family and housing characteristics and how immigrant women differed from the native Dutch as well as the second generation. Unique population data (System of Social statistical Datasets, 2008/2009) provided information on native Dutch, Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean women in a (non)marital cohabiting union (N=717,539). When corrected for socio-demographic characteristics, initial differences in union dissolution rates between Dutch and Mediterranean women were no longer significant, but dissolution rates remained highest among Caribbean women. Mediterranean immigrant women were more likely to separate over generations, whereas Caribbean immigrant and second generation women did not differ. All women of immigrant descent were less likely to move after a union dissolution than native Dutch. Our findings indicate various effects of immigration on partnership (in)stability and demonstrate the importance of considering interlinked life events.

Key-words: Union dissolution, Residential mobility, Immigrants, the Netherlands, Socio-Demographic composition, Immigrant generation

Funding
This research was supported by the European Research Council Starting Grant project (no. 263829) "Families of migrant origin: A life course perspective".

DRAFT - Please do not cite without permission of the authors

[1] Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague/KNAW/UoG, The Netherlands
[2] Statistics Netherlands, The Netherlands
[3] Interface Demography, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussels, Belgium

Non-Western immigrants and their descendants form a growing part of the North-Western 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 paper, we enhance our understanding of diversity in union dissolution by comparing women of native Dutch and various immigrant origins in the Netherlands. 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 North-Western 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 socio-demographic 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 assumed to be more similar to the native population. Empirical research supported this assumption 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 mobility, one of the

immediate practical consequence 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 socio-demographic 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 mobility 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 mobility 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 mobility.

Immigrant Groups of Study

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.

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).

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). Intermarriage 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 socio-economic 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).

Theoretical Background

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 North-western 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 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 for partnerships to dissolve (for an overview see Lyngstad & Jalovaara 2010). Given our interest in how the socio-demographic 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 living area.

First of all, the risks for 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 for 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 socio-demographic characteristics contribute in some way to the risks for 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.

Residential Mobility

The second main question we explored was how women of various origins differed in residential mobility 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 mobility among immigrant ex-couples, we aimed here to first understand how mobility rates vary across origin groups and to what extent this is due to socio-demographic differences. Family events can trigger specific needs and desires that increase or reduce people's incentives to move (Geist & McManus 2008). Geographies of residential mobility 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 showed that people who separated moved over smaller distances (Mulder & Malmberg 2011), more often to the city (Feijten & Van Ham 2013) and closer to parents (Das, De Valk & Merz 2015), indicating that mobility after a union dissolution is particularly motivated by social ties. Another peculiarity about moving in this situation is that the moving 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 mobility 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 mobility across origin groups.

Although we do not yet exactly know which processes shape the mobility behaviors of immigrant ex-couples, it can be assumed that socio-demographic 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, the living area and 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 mobility behaviors across origin groups, therefore, we should take into account their different socio-demographic compositions. Again, we also focused on differences in the mobility 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.

Data, Variables and Analytical Procedure

Data

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.

Variables

Our dependent variables were union dissolution and residential mobility. 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 1st 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 mobility* was indicated by a dichotomous variable, coded 1 for women who were registered at a different address at January 1st 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 women's *living area*¸ distinguishing women who lived in the 4 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 1 and 3 children and those with 4 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).

Analytical Procedure

The analyses consisted of four parts. We started with descriptive analyses of the two main dependent variables. Secondly, it was examined to what extent diversity in union dissolution across origin groups was accounted for by women's socio-demographic 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 mobility among women who had separated. The same stepwise procedure was followed for analyzing the effects of socio-demographic characteristics. Finally, in the fourth part, exclusive attention was devoted to immigrants and their descendants. We analyzed how immigrant and second generation women differed in their likelihood to experience a union dissolution and, next, residential mobility. In order to assess the effects of generation above and beyond socio-demographic characteristics, the before mentioned explanatory variables were again taken into account. All three parts were conducted by means of Logistic Regressions, making use of SPSS version 22.0.

Results

Descriptive Analyses

Descriptive information on our dependent and explanatory variables for all women are shown in Table 1.

<Insert table 1 about here>

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 socio-demographic 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.

<Insert Table 2 about here>

Table 2 gives descriptive statistics on our second main issue of interest, residential mobility, and the average socio-demographic 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 mobility 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 mobility among all women at the time when everyone was (still) living with their partner (Table 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 socio-demographic 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.

Multivariate Analyses

Separation and Socio-Demographic Composition

Table 3 presents the models that estimated the variation in dissolution rates across origin groups, with the independent variables added in blocks. Not corrected for socio-demographic 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 for a union dissolution decreased somewhat, but their odds to separate 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 for a union dissolution. 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.

<Insert Table 3 about here>

Residential Mobility and Socio-Demographic Composition

We continued by examining the variation in residential mobility among separated women of various origin, before and after controlling for socio-demographic characteristics (see Table 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 socio-demographic group compositions, the odds for 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.

<Insert Table 4 about here>

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 socio-demographic characteristics did not significantly alter the results, only the full models are reported. Table 5 presents the results for union dissolution and Table 6 for residential mobility. 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 mobility, 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 for moving than immigrant women. In terms of socio-demographic 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 mobility 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.

<Insert Table 5 about here>
<Insert Table 6 about here>

Discussion

In this paper, we examined diversity in union dissolution and residential mobility 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 socio-demographic 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 development 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 does 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 Netherlands is less restrictive towards union dissolution compared to Turkish and Moroccan societies, it is comparably lenient in Caribbean countries. In fact, union dissolutions are even more common in Suriname and the Dutch Antilles 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 mobility. A clear pattern emerged, showing that immigrant women of all origins were less likely to move than the Dutch, also when correcting for socio-demographic 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 mobility 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 mobility 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 2015). 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 mobility among Mediterranean than Caribbean women.

In assessing our results, we should consider the time-dimension that is implicated in events like union dissolution and mobility. 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 mobility, 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 2015). 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 mobility 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 socio-demographic 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 mobility, 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.

References

Andersson, G. (2003). *Dissolution of unions in Europe: a comparative overview.* MPIDR, Working Paper WP-2003-004. Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research, Rostock.

Bakker, B., van Rooijen, J., & Van Toor, L. (2014). The system of social statistical datasets of Statistics Netherlands: an integral approach to the production of register-based social statistics. *Journal of the International Association for Official Statistics, 30,* 411-424.

Bijl, R., & Verweij, A. (Eds.) (2012). *Measuring and monitoring immigrant integration in Europe. Integration policies and monitoring efforts in 17 European countries.* The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Boertien, D. (2012). Jackpot? Gender difference in the effects of lottery wins on separation. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74* (5), 1038-1053.

Bolt, G., & Van Kempen, R. (2003). Escaping poverty neighbourhoods in the Netherlands. *Housing, Theory and Society, 20* (4), 209-222.

Boschman S., & Van Ham, M. (forthcoming). Neighbourhood selection of non-western ethnic minorities. Testing the own-group effects hypothesis using a conditional logit model. *Environment and Planning A.*

Boyle P. J., Kulu, H., Cooke T. J., Gayle, V., & Mulder, C. (2008). Moving and union dissolution. *Demography, 45* (1), 209-222.

Braver, S. L. Ellman, I. M., & Fabricius, W. V. (2003). Relocation of children after divorce and children's best interests: new evidence and legal considerations. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17* (2), 206-219.

Brines, J., & Joyner, K. (1999). The ties that bind: principles of cohesion in cohabitation and marriage. *American Sociological Review, 64* (3), 333-355.

Brown G. W., & Moran, P. M. (1997). Single mothers, poverty and depression. *Psychological Medicine,* 27 (1), 21-33.

Das, M., De Valk, H. A. G. & Merz, E.-M. (2015). *Mothers' mobility after separation: do grandmothers matter?* Accepted for publication in Population, Space and Place.

DHS (2005). *Morocco Enquête sur la Population et la Santé Familiale 2003/04* [*Survey of Population and Family Health 2003/04*]. Ministère de la Santé, ORC Macro & Ligue des États Arabes. Calverton, Maryland, USA.

DHS (2009). *Turkey Demographic and Health Survey 2008*. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies, Ministry of Health General Directorate of Mother and Child Health and Family Planning, T.R. Prime Ministry Undersecretary of State Planning Organization and TÜBİTAK. Ankara, Turkey.

Distelbrink, M. J. (2000). *Opvoeden zonder man. De opvoeding en ontwikkeling in Creools-Surinaamse een- en tweeoudergezinnen in Nederland.* [*Child rearing without a man: raising and development in Creole-Surinamese one and two parent families in The Netherlands*]. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Dronkers, J. (2015). *An optimal age to marry? Age at marriage and divorce risks in Europe and the US. The Blog of the Institute for Family Studies*. Retrieved from the website of Family Studies, accessed August 08 2015: http://family-studies.org/an-optimal-age-to-marry-age-at-marriage-and-divorce-risk-in-europe-and-the-us/.

Emery R. E., & Golson J. G. (2013). *Cultural Sociology of Divorce: An Encyclopedia.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Faith, D. (2000). *Marriage and family in the Caribbean*. World Family Policy Forum. Accessed August 08 2015: http://www.law2.byu.edu/wfpc/forum/2000/Innerarity.pdf.

Feijten, P., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). Life-course experience and housing quality. *Housing Studies, 20* (4), 571-587.

Feijten, P., & Van Ham, M. (2013). The consequences of divorce and splitting up for spatial mobility in the UK. *Comparative Population Studies, 38* (2), 405-432.

Geist, C., & McManus, P. A. (2008). Geographical mobility over the life course: motivations and implications. *Population, Space and Place, 14* (4), 283-303.

Gerstel, N., & Gallagher, S. (2001). Men's caregiving: gender and the contingent character of care. *Gender & Society, 15* (2), 197-217.

Grinstein-Weiss, M., Manturuk, K., Guo, S., Charles, P., & Key, C. (2014). The impact of homeownership on marriage and divorce: evidence from propensity score matching. *Social Work Research, 38* (2), 73-90.

Hanafi, L. (2013). *The implementation of Morocco's 2004 Family Code Moudawana: stock-taking & recommendations*. The Danish Center for Research and Information on Gender, Equality and Diversity KVINFO. Accessed August 08 2015: http://kvinfo.dk/sites/default/files/studymoudawana.pdf.

Hedman L. (2013). Moving near family: the influence of extended family on neighbourhood choice in an intra-urban context. *Population Space and Place, 19* (1), 32-45.

Huijnk. W., Gijsberts, M., & Dagevos, J. (Eds.) (2013). *Jaarrapport Integratie 2013* [Annual report on integration 2013]. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Huschek, D., De Valk, H. A. G., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2012). Partner choice patterns among the descendants of Turkish immigrants in Europe. *European Journal of Population, 28*, 241-268.

Kalmijn, M., De Graaf, P. M., Broese van Groenou, M. I., & Dykstra, P. (2001). Oorzaken en gevolgen van echtscheiding: een landelijk onderzoek onder gehuwde en gescheiden mensen in Nederland [Causes and consequences of divorce: a national study among married and divorced individuals in the Netherlands]. *Sociale Wetenschappen, 44*, 1-15.

Kalmijn, M., De Graaf, P. M., & Janssen, J. (2005). Intermarriage and the risk of divorce in the Netherlands: the effects of differences in religion and in nationality, 1974-94. *Population Studies: A Journal of Demography, 59* (1), 71-85.

Kavas, S., & Ündüz-Hoşgör, A. (2011). Divorce and family change revisited: professional women's divorce experience in Turkey. *Demografia (English Edition), 53*, 102-126.

Keuzenkamp, S., & A. Merens (Eds.) (2006). *Sociale atlas van vrouwen uit etnische minderheden* [*The social atlas of women from ethnic minorities*]. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Lau, C. Q. (2012). The stability of same-sex cohabitation, different-sex cohabitation, and marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 74* (5), 973-988.

Lesthaeghe, R., & Van de Kaa, D. J. (1986). Twee Demografische Transities? [Two Demographic transitions?]. In: D. J. Van de Kaa & R. Lesthaeghe (Eds.), *Bevolking: Groei en Krimp* [*Population: Growth and Decline*]. Deventer, the Netherlands: Van Loghum Slaterus.

Lyngstad, T. H., & Jalovaara, M. (2010). A review of the antecedents of union dissolution, *Demographic Research, 23* (10), 257-292.

Magdol L. (2002). Is moving gendered? The effects of residential mobility on the psychological well-being of men and women. *Sex Roles, 47*, 553-560.

Manley, D., & Van Ham, M. (2011). Choice based letting, ethnicity and segregation in England. *Urban Studies, 48* (14), 3125-3143.

Milewski, N., & Kulu, H. (2014). Mixed marriages in Germany: a high risk of divorce for immigrant-native couples. *European Journal of Population, 30* (1), 89-113.

Montenegro X. P. (2004). *The divorce experience: a study of divorce at midlife and beyond.* Washington, DC: AARP Public Policy Institute.

Mulder, C. (2013). Family dynamics and housing: conceptual issues and empirical findings. *Demographic Research, 29* (14), 355-378.

Mulder, C. H., Ten Hengel, B., Latten, J. J., & Das, M. (2012). Relative resources and moving from the joint home around divorce. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment, 2*, 153-168.

Mulder, C. H., & Malmberg, G. (2011). Moving related to separation: who moves and to what distance. *Environment and Planning A, 43* (11), 2589-2607.

Muszynska, M., & Kulu, H. (2007). Migration and union dissolution in a changing socio-economic context: the case of Russia. *Demographic Research, 17* (27), 803-820.

Nielsen S. S., Hempler, N. F., & Krasnik, A. (2013). Issues to consider when measuring and applying socioeconomic position quantitatively in immigrant health research. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 10* (12), 6354-365.

Odé, A. M. W., & Veenman, J. (2003). The ethno-cultural and socio-economic position of ethnic minority groups in the Netherlands. In L. Hagendoorn, L. (Ed.), *Integrating immigrants in the Netherlands* (pp. 172-199). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Schaake, K., Burgers, J., & Mulder, C. H. (2014). Ethnicity, education and income, and residential mobility between neighbourhoods. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40* (4), 512-527.

Schneider, J., & Crul, M. (2012) *Theorising Integration and Assimilation*. London: Routledge.

Smith, S., Maas, I., & van Tubergen, F. (2012). Irreconcilable differences? Ethnic Intermarriage and Divorce in the Netherlands, 1995-2008. *Social Science Research, 41* (5), 1126-1137.

South, S. J., Crowder, K. D., & Trent, K. (1998). Children's residential mobility and neighborhood environment following parental divorce and remarriage. *Social Forces, 77*, 667-693.

Staker, M. L. (1992). *The social legitimization of children in Suriname society: an ethnographic account of pregnancy and childbirth among the Creole in greater Paramaribo.* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Florida Digital Collections, accessed August 08 2015: http://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00003705/00001.

Statistics Netherlands, (2015). Accessed August 08 2015: www.statline.nl.

Sterckx, L., Dagevos, J., Huijnk W., & Van Lisdonk, J. (2014). *Trouwen van ver. Achtergronden van huwelijksmigratie en de leefsituatie van huwelijksmigranten* [*Marrying from afar. Background and social situation of marriage migrants*]. The Hague: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Thomas, K. J. A. (2012). Contemporary black Caribbean immigrants in the United States. In: R. Capps & M. Fix (Eds.), *Young children of Black Immigrants in America: Changing flows, changing faces* (pp. 21-44). Washington DC: Migration Policy Institute.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2013). *World Fertility Report 2012* (United Nations publication)**.**

Van der Vliet, R., Ooijevaar, J. and van der Bie, R. (Eds.) 2012. *Jaarrapport Integratie 2012* [Annual report on integration 2012]. The Hague: Statistics Netherlands.

Van der Vliet, R., Ooijevaar, J. and Wobma, E. (Eds.) 2014. *Jaarrapport Integratie 2014* [Annual report on integration 2014]. Den Haag / Heerlen: Statistics Netherlands.

Van Huis, M. (2013). Cohortvruchtbaarheid van niet-westers allochtone vrouwen [Cohort fertility of non-western migrant women]. *Bevolkingtrends,* April 2013. The Hague/Heerlen: Statistics Netherlands.

Van Huis, M., & Steenhof, L. (2003). Echtscheidingskansen van allochtonen: berekeningsmethode. *Bevolkingstrends, 51* (1), 49–53. Voorburg/Heerlen, the Netherlands: Statistics Netherlands.

Van de Kaa, D. J. (1987). Europe's second demographic transition. *Population Bulletin, 42* (1), 1987. Washington D. C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Vermeulen, H., & Penninx, R. (2000). *Immigrant integration: the Dutch Case.* Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Wolfinger, N. H. (2003). Family structure homogamy: the effects of parental divorce on partner selection and marital stability. *Social Science Research, 32* (1), 80-97.

Table1

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

		Dutch (n=602,899)	Turks (n=43,836)	Moroccans (n=35,980)	Surinamese (n=27,766)	Antilleans (n=7,058)
Variable	Range	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Dependent						
Separated (1=yes)	0-1	0.033	0.025	0.028	0.065	0.082
Individual characteristics						
Age (years)	15-65	43 (12)	37 (11)	37 (11)	40 (11)	38 (11)
Housing characteristics						
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
Family characteristics						
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
Migrant characteristics						
2nd 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

Source = System of Social statistical Datasets (SSD), 2008/2009.

Table 2

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

		Dutch (n=19,729)	Turks (n=1,098)	Moroccans (n=1,023)	Surinamese (n=1,814)	Antilleans (n=576)
Variable	Range	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Dependent						
Moved after separation (1=yes)	0-1	0.65	0.49	0.54	0.56	0.56
Individual characteristics						
Age (years)	15-65	34 (11)	32 (8)	31 (9)	35 (11)	31 (11)
(Former)housing characteristics						
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
(Former)family characteristics						
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
Migrant characteristics						
2nd 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

Source = System of Social statistical Datasets (SSD), 2008/2009.

Table 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
Individual characteristics				
Origin group (ref=Dutch)				
Turkish	0.759***	0.542***	0.454***	0.946†
	(.031)	(.032)	(.032)	(.034)
Moroccan	0.865***	0.618***	0.442***	0.990
	(.033)	(.033)	(.034)	(.036)
Surinamese	2.066***	1.839***	1.609***	1.664***
	(.025)	(.026)	(.027)	(.027)
Antillean	2.627***	1.798***	1.478***	1.472***
	(0.44)	(.045)	(.046)	(.046)
Age		0.842***	0.876***	0.966***
		(.004)	(.004)	(.005)
Age^2		1.001***	1.001***	1.000†
		(.000)	(.000)	(.000)
(Former)housing characteristics				
Housing type (ref=rented)				
Owner			0.531***	0.644***
			(.014)	(.015)
Missing information			1.153***	1.147***
			(.035)	(.035)
Living in 4 major cities (ref=elsewhere)			1.145***	1.103***
			(.014)	(.014)
(Former)family characteristics				
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)
Model R^2	.007	.095	.107	.145

†p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets.

Source = System of Social statistical Datasets (SSD), 2008/2009.

Table 4. *Predictors of residential mobility for separated women: odds ratios of Logistic Regressions (n=24,240)*

	Model I	Model II	Model III	Model IV
Individual characteristics				
Origin group (ref=Dutch)				
Turkish	0.517***	0.491***	0.573***	0.601***
	(.062)	(.063)	(.065)	(.067)
Moroccan	0.640***	0.583***	0.775***	0.812**
	(.064)	(.066)	(.068)	(.070)
Surinamese	0.688***	0.720***	0.846**	0.891*
	(.050)	(.051)	(.053)	(.054)
Antillean	0.698***	0.621***	0.768**	0.810*
	(.085)	(.087)	(.089)	(.090)
Age		0.902***	0.870***	0.893***
		(.008)	(.009)	(.010)
Age^2		1.001***	1.001***	1.001***
		(.000)	(.000)	(.000)
(Former)housing characteristics				
Housing type (ref=rented)				
Owner			2.039***	2.030***
			(.030)	(.030)
Missing information			1.492***	1.469***
			(.072)	(.072)
Living in 4 major cities (ref=elsewhere)			0.909**	0.894***
			(.029)	(.029)
(Former)family characteristics				
Household income (x1,000E)				1.000
				(.001)
Cohabiting (ref=married)				0.912*
				(.036)
Children at home (ref=none)				
1-3				0.785***
				(.034)
≥4				0.477***
				(.130)
Model R^2	.008	.062	.094	.099

†p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets.

Source = System of Social statistical Datasets (SSD), 2008/2009.

Table 5. *Predictors of separation per immigrant origin group (separate models): odds ratios of Logistic Regressions*

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

†p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets.

Source = System of Social statistical Datasets (SS), 2008/2009.

Table 6. *Predictors of residential mobility for separated women per immigrant origin group (separate models): odds ratios of Logistic Regressions*

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

†p<.10; *p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001.

Note. Standard deviation between brackets.

Source = System of Social statistical Datasets (SSD), 2008/2009.