MEAN AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE: WHERE ARE WE HEADING TO?[1]

ERIKA KULCSÁR[2]

ABSTRACT. The birth and life of people within a society has a direct impact on beliefs, values and behaviour. Core beliefs and values, such as faith in the institution of marriage, are transmitted from one generation to the next. It is considered that following the direct way from school to the register office belongs to the past. Based on scientific works, this paper identified which are the factors that had an impact on people's attitude towards the institution of marriage. Furthermore, in this paper a detailed analysis of the changes is presented regarding the variable `Mean Age at First Marriage of Women and Men`. In the process of collecting secondary data, for the analyzed variable, credible databases have been used which are known worldwide. According to the results the following can be stated: only in case of Europe and Asia there is a significant difference among the years included in the analysis (1990, 2000, 2010), related to the Mean Age at First Marriage variable; in Africa and America the included years in the analysis do not represent a significant influence regarding Mean Age at First Marriage variable. Following ANOVA analysis was observed that both in Europe and Asia, as well as across Africa and America, the "country" is an independent factor significantly influencing the evolution of the indicator Mean Age at First Marriage. The "Conclusions" highlight the role of marketing in terms of the analyzed theme.

Keywords: variable, mean age at first marriage, differences, Kruskal – Wallis test, ANOVA

JEL classification: J12

1. Introduction

Family is a highly important institution for the society. Changes in family structure, and thus in approaching the issue of marriage led to the appearance of

---

several specialized journals such as: Journal of Marriage and Family, Marriage and Family Review, Population Studies: A Journal of Demography, etc.

Analysis of changes occurred in family structure is particularly important:

(1) socially and economically, as they have a direct and substantial impact on the evolution of those indicators that define the social and economic environment. Changes in the family are primarily due to the emergence of a modern woman and modern man in the society. Professional success is a component /a major element in their lives, therefore their attitude towards the institution of marriage has undergone substantial changes.

(2) for marketers, because consumer behaviour is influenced to a significant extent by family structure. At the same time, it is worth mentioning that the role of marketers is not only to analyze the changes in the family, but their primary task is to identify new trends and furthermore to formulate strategies for responding to them. The complete family, family with a traditional structure, is the most attractive segment for marketers because its family members often appear in the purchasing process. For example, representative of the fair sex within a traditional family may purchase products and services but also fulfilling the role as mother and wife, women etc.

In this paper I would like to present in a structured form the research conducted from the perspective of the addressed topic. We also want to identify those (1) primordial factors influencing changes in sensitive matters of marriage, (2) tasks incumbent on marketers in terms of the analyzed theme.

2. Review of Literature

The behaviour is largely influenced by changes in the demographic area which is a component of the macro-environment. Among major demographic factors Philip and Keller (2006) mentions the following: the explosive growth of the world population, population structure by age, ethnic groups, educational groups, family structure, geographic population shifts.

Firstly, the family structure is influenced by the mean age of marriage. If in the Western world the referred variable has fallen in several countries (Hajnal, 1953) according to recent literature it can be stated that both women and men are extending the mean age of marriage. (Goldstein and Kenney, 2001; Quisumbing and Hallman, 2003) In 2012 the median age at first marriage was 26.6 years in the US (Arroyo et al., 2013). It should also be mentioned that pushing the year of getting married beyond 25 years, does not guarantee divorce avoidance (Glenn et al., 2010). The relationship between the age of marriage and marriage instability, the stability of first and second marriage presented the central theme of several scientific publications (Booth and Edward, 1985; Castro-Martin and Bumpass, 1989).

Among the factors that have a major influence on the analyzed indicator are: (1) education (Von Elm and Hirschman, 1979; Caldwell et al., 1983, Gavin, 2010; Isen and Stevenson, 2010; Cherlin, 2010; Carmichael, 2011), (2) ethnicity (Von Elm and Hirschman 1979, Benett et al., 1989; Stier and Shavit 1999), (3) home environment (McLaughkin et al., 1993), (4) the financial condition of the potential spouse/partner (Bergstrom and Bagnoli, 1993; Xie et al., 2003) (5) the economic situation of the country (Lichter et al., 2002; Harknett, 2012), (6) the socio-economic family background (Viik Aarskaug, 2009).

College graduates would rather marry a person who has similar educational training than someone who has a lower education level compared to his/her own (Schwartz and Mare, 2005) Among black women, respectively with lower education levels, wage inequality does not significantly influence their attitude toward the institution of marriage (Loughran, 2002). It should also be noted that the gap between the level of education between husband and wife has a negative effect on marriage (Frey and Stutzer, 2006), however divorced mothers have a lower standard of living, (Lichter et al., 2002) and children raised in such a family structure are at risk to a large extent (Carlson, 2001).

Women who marry at a younger age, being housewifes, have a low degree of involvement in the decision-making process, they meet the motherhood experience earlier as compared to women who devote a longer period of their lives to educational processes. (Jensen and Thornton, 2003). On the other hand, educated women opt for a smaller family (Isen and Stevenson, 2010)

Among men, extending the marriage age can be explained on one hand by the fact that the desire to be successful professionally is a substantial one, and on the other side the fact is not neglected that a good financial situation has a direct and positive impact on the process of attracting partners. (Goldin, 2003), simply because there are women for whom marriage is financial security (Bergstrom and Bagnoli, 1993; Isen and Stevenson, 2010).

It is also interesting how occupation affects people's attitudes towards the institution of marriage. According to researches, soldiers start families earlier, while the number of divorces in these marriages is lower than among other occupations of the same age. (Kelty et al., 2010). After analyzing the impact of the financial situation of potential partners on the attitude towards the institution of marriage, it was noted that "women's likelihood of marriage is not increased by economic potential to the same extent as men's, and that entry into cohabitation is not increased by economic potential to the same extent as entry into marriage." (Xie et al., 2003, p.25, available at: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.35.1851&rep=rep 1&type=pdf) Sweeney (2002) observed that men and women exhibit similar behaviour in terms of analysis of the economic outlook and decision to marry.

Ono (2003) continues this idea and finds that the attitude of women who have a substantial income differentiates towards the institution of marriage based on the culture that defines the country in which they live.

Surprising are the results of field researchers according to whom the economic recovery has not influenced people's attitudes towards the institution of marriage in the US, which otherwise is in a long decline. (Lichter et al., 2002) On the other hand, recession has not influenced the number of divorces recorded. Specific economic difficulties have not had the power to increase the rate of recorded divorces. (Harknett, 2012)

The attitude towards the institution of marriage has an economic connotation not only in case of the individual but also the society. As such, marriage is a major event in our lives with a direct and undeniable impact on social and economic environment (Quisumbing and Hallman, 2003). However, analysing the importance of family sustainability within the economic development is not a matter of major interest among researchers in spite of the fact that between the two institutions there is a strong interdependence. Changes in family structure have a direct impact on the economic sphere involving new business opportunities. (Aldrich and Cliff, 2003)

In this paper a detailed analysis of specific demographic variables will be made. Namely, I focus on the mean age at first marriage and difference between the genders in mean age at first marriage since the evolution of these indicators directly influence the society.

3. Material and Method(s)

In the first stage of collecting secondary data, the variable Mean Age at First Marriage was pursued to be analyzed for the following years: 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2010. During the process of secondary data collection for the mentioned variable it was found that the proposed analysis can be performed only of the following years: 1990, 2000 and 2010. The argument that can be noted in this regard is that in the years 1995 and 2005 respectively, the data related to the analyzed variable in the countries included in the analysis were incomplete. However there were also countries where all the secondary data specific of the analyzed variables were not complete. Accordingly the analysis included all countries where secondary data for Mean Age at First Marriage variable were available. If there were no secondary data for the years included in the analysis the secondary data existing for those years that were closest to the analyzed years was considered.

During data collection process special attention was paid to the quality of secondary data, therefore Databases which were the main source of secondary data, in addition to scientific articles are: (1). UNECE (United Nations Economic

Commission for Europe) – Statistical Database, (2). United Nations – Statistics Division, (3). United Nations – Department of Economic and Social Affairs, (4). The World Bank, (5). World – Statistics.org, (6). Asia Research Institute (National University of Singapore.

The reason I opted for the aforementioned databases is the fact that they contained secondary data which represent the foundations of this research and are considered credible databases. The databases which appear as secondary data information source in different scientific articles are considered as credible. For example, the United Nations and The World Bank respectively are referred to as secondary data source in the article "A note on marriage market clearing" (Neelakantan and Tertilt, 2008)

A similar structuring of secondary data on the indicators analyzed, may occur especially in the statistical journals, such as the National Vital Statistics Reports respectively with articles which have some sociological connotations. In this paper, the structuring of the data related to the analyzed indicators is identical to that used by Bergstrom and Bagnoli (1993).

In order to achieve statistical tests, countries were grouped according to their geographical location. In Europe, the countries were divided into 9 groups in Northern Europe, Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Southern Europe, Central Europe, Eastern Europe, North-West Europe, South - Eastern Europe, South-West Europe) as it is considered that countries structured in a group / geographic area show certain cultural characteristics which have a direct impact on the evolution of analyzed indicators. The reason that no similar structure has been achieved at the level of the other continents is that the number of countries included in the analysis, at their level, was lower.

To verify whether the secondary data for the Mean Age at First Marriage and Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage variable present a normal distribution the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample test was used. Due to the fact that the calculated significance level is higher than the value indicated by the significance level of 0.05 (Appendix C) H_0 is accepted, therefore the analyzed variables have a normal distribution both within Europe and Africa as well as across Asia and America.

4. Results and Discussions

The general assumptions include:

1. Apart from the observed trends, I also have in mind the trends presented/ identified in specialized European literature regarding the characteristics of modern man and of the modern woman, assuming, as a first step, that the difference between the genders in mean age at first marriage for the years included in the analysis (1990, 2000, 2010) is no more than 2.5 years.

65

2. In order to deepen the analysis I also made the assumption that each year included in the analysis brings something new in terms of marriage, and because of this I tested the existence of significant differences between the 1990, 2000, 2010 by mean age at first marriage.

3. Demographic phenomena can rarely be explained based on the influence of a single factor. There are situations where interaction relationships appear between the independent variables. Based on this brief consideration, an ANOVA analysis was performed with two independent variables which have interaction relationships. The independent variables included in the analysis are the year of marriage and the country of marriage. The dependent variable is represented by the indicator mean age at first marriage.

4. Furthermore, the question arose whether, within Europe, Africa, Asia and America there are significant differences regarding the progress of indicator difference between the genders in mean age at first marriage.

According to secondary data presented by Bergstrom and Bagnoli (1993) in their work, in Europe, in 1985 the mean age at first marriage for men was 26.16 years and for women 23.10 years, representing an overall mean of 24.63 years. This indicator specific to the demographic environment recorded the following values in the Europe in 2010: men married at the mean age of 31.02 years while women married at the mean age of 28.53, thus the overall mean being 29.77.

It can be concluded that in case of women, the evolution of the analyzed indicator experienced a greater growth than in case of men. If men have extended by 4.86 years the age of marriage, women waited more for getting married, in their case the difference being 5.43 in 2010 compared with 1985.

In addition to the previously identified data I also mention the followings with respect to the indicator mean age at first marriage (see Appendix A – Europe):

- In 1990 the highest value of the indicator mean age at first marriage for both sexes was recorded in Norway (30.3 years, 27.9 respectively).
- In 2000 the highest value of the analyzed indicator was registered in Sweden both with men (33.1 years) and with women (30.6 years).
- Sweden has managed to maintain the first place in 2010. The analyzed indicator was 35.5 years for men and 32.9 years for women.

Based on secondary data presented in the Appendix for the indicators difference in mean age at first marriage (t_0 = 1990, t_1=2010) the followings can be concluded:

- The greatest difference related to the analyzed variable, for both men and women, was registered in the Czech Republic. The difference being 7.5 years and 7.1 years respectively.
- The analyzed indicator, as for Hungary, for both men and women, developed to the same extent (6.7 years). Also, the variable included in the analysis recorded the same values (5.4 years) with both sexes also in Spain. In Sweden the analyzed variable was 5.3 years with both men and the fair sex.
- The lower difference concerning the discussed variable was recorded, with men in Switzerland (2.5 years) and with women in the Republic of Moldova (2 years).

In the case of Africa (Appendix A – Africa) the variable mean age at first marriage in 2010, with men was 27.31 years and with women 22.98 years. The analyzed indicator, in Asia, for men was 27.78 years and 24.66 years for women (Appendix A - Asia). In 2010 in America (Appendix A- America), this variable specific to the demographic environment was even less for men (27.17 years) and for women (24.45 years) as compared with the values recorded in Europe, Africa and Asia.

The results obtained using the SPSS program for acceptance or rejection of the assumptions made are listed below.

1. According to the results obtained at the European level (Appendix B – Europe) the null hypothesis is accepted, meaning that statistically there is no significant difference as compared to the value determined through the hypothesis. Consequently difference between the genders in mean age at first marriage decreased in the years included in the analysis. With the studied population both for Africa (Appendix B - Africa) and for Asia (Appendix B – Asia) and America (Appendix B – America), the mean is greater than 2.5 years in terms of difference between the sexes in mean at first marriage. Therefore we cannot say that the group of those men and women who keep up with emerging marriage trends specific to Europe is significant in Africa, Asia and America.

2. The results obtained by applying the Kruskal Wallis statistical test (Table no.1) indicates that $H = 59.235 \rangle \chi^2_{.05;2} = 5.99$, which means that the alternative hypothesis can be accepted. Therefore, between the three groups there are differences in terms of mean age at first marriage in Europe

Table 1.

Values calculated with Kruskal – Wallis test

	Europe	Africa	Asia	America
Mean Age at First Marriage				
Chi-Square	59.235	.454	7.914	3.056
df.	2	2	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.797	.019	.217

Grouping variable: Year

In conclusion, the passing of years bring changes and new elements in marriage and have a direct influence on the habits of marriage. These changes may be motivated, as mentioned before, by the appearance of the modern man for whom is more comfortable staying at 'mother hotel' or having his own household that he manages alone, than to start a family of his own (Törőcsik, 2006). These changes influenced the marriage habits of men. A modern woman has also appeared who prefers career to marrying and having children. Therefore, the occurrence of these trends in the demographic environment cannot be neglected considering the consequences in the society, at least in Europe.

For Europe the alternative hypothesis has been accepted, however, for Africa (Table no.1) the null hypothesis is accepted ($H = .454 \langle \chi^2_{.05;2} = 5.99$), and therefore among the three groups there is no significant difference in the variable mean age at first marriage. This finding can also be supported by the argument that, in Africa the respect for tradition, history and culture has an important role in the habits of marriage.

Asia is a special world, with a specific culture. The question is whether marriage traditions have been changed over the years. The results obtained ($H = 7.914 \rangle \chi^2_{.05;2} = 5.99$) shows that in the case of Asia (Table no.1) we can speak about a significant difference in the years included in the analysis with respect to mean age at first marriage. Can this mean that the values which defined marriage in Asia no longer fulfil the same role in people's lives? Does Asia keep pace with the trends occurring in marriage customs? Or do they create them themselves? In this context it should be mentioned, even if the analysis of this indicator is not the subject of this paper, but it is rather linked to the chosen study, that in Japan divorce ceremonies were invented as a response to the increasing divorce rate in Japan. Although according to the present knowledge about America, it would have been ``logic'' that in the years included in the analysis to find significant differences in the variable mean age at first marriage, but the results (Table no.1) indicate the opposite ($H = 3.056 \langle \chi^2_{.05;2} = 5.99$).

Thus, the world's idea about what America is, what it represents, what the characteristics are that define it as a nation is extremely confusing. According to Olins (2006, p.168) *to some extent, the opinion that the confusion that America is projecting is a direct reflection of what America is, is reasonable.*

1) In the next ANOVA table with two variables which have interaction ratios, the data appropriate to the variance due to interaction effects appear.

Table 2.

ANOVA with two interacting variables - Europe

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Mean Age at First Marriage

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	142831.830ª	93	1535.826	477.012	.000
Var2	597.523	2	298.762	92.792	.000
Var3	900.319	30	30.011	9.321	.000
Var2 * Var3	54.813	60	.914	.284	1.000
Error	299.430	93	3.220		
Total	143131.260	186			

a R Squared = .998 (Adjusted R Squared = .996)

In Europe (Table no.2) the following was found:

- For the variable year of marriage (Var2) we have $F_{calc.} = 92.792 \rangle F_{.05;2;93} = 3.2$, which supports the alternative hypothesis, that is, the year has a significant influence on the dependent variable.

- For to the variable country of marriage (Var3) we obtain $F_{calc.} = 9.321 \rangle F_{.05;30;93} = 1.7$ which leads to the conclusion that the country of marriage significantly influences the mean age at first marriage indicator.

- Similarly, for the product variable year of marriage ∗ country of marriage we get $F_{calc.} = .284 \langle F_{.05;60;93} = 1.5$, and consequently the interaction effect does not significantly influence the dependent variable.

According to the results obtained and presented for Africa in Table no. 3 it can be seen that the minimum significance level that can be accepted H_1 is $Sig. = .636 \rangle .05$, and thus the years included in the analysis do not significantly influence the variable mean age at first marriage. But the independent variable country of origin significantly influence the dependent variable

($Sig. = .000 \rangle.05$). H_0 is accepted, according to which, neither with Africa, the interaction effect between the two independent variables does not significantly influence mean age at first marriage variable.

Table 3.

ANOVA with two interacting variables – Africa

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Mean Age at First Marriage

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	67237.323ᵃ	54	1245.136	109.112	.000
Var2	10.423	2	5.211	.457	.636
Var3	728.009	17	42.824	3.753	.000
Var2 * Var3	39.350	34	1.157	.101	1.000
Error	616.221	54	11.412		
Total	67853.544	108			

a. R Squared = .991 (Adjusted R Squared = .982⁾

According to the results presented in Tables no. 4 and 5, ANOVA statistical tests showed that the independent variables significantly influence the dependent variable both in Asia and in America.

Table 4.

ANOVA with two interacting variables - Asia

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Mean Age at First Marriage

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	77598.726 ᵃ	60	1293.312	229.412	.000
Var2	64.082	2	32.041	5.684	.005
Var3	564.781	19	29.725	5.273	.000
Var2 * Var3	26.434	38	.696	.123	1.000
Error	338.250	60	5.638		
Total	77936.976	120			

a. R Squared = .996 (Adjusted R Squared = .991)

As I mentioned earlier in this article, in Europe and Africa, none of the independent variables included in this analysis affect the values of the other independent variable. The same finding holds true for Asia and America. That is, the interaction effect between variables year of marriage and country of

marriage does not influence the dependent variable (mean age at first marriage) included in the analysis.

Table 5.

ANOVA with two interacting variables – America

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Mean Age at First Marriage

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	49127.075[a]	39	1259.669	311.256	.000
Var2	27.219	2	13.610	3.363	.045
Var3	193.565	12	16.130	3.986	.000
Var2 * Var3	61.244	24	2.552	.631	.883
Error	157.835	39	4.047		
Total	49284.910	78			

a. R Squared = .997 (Adjusted R Squared = .994)

As shown in the table below (Table no.6), between the nine population groups there are differences in terms of difference between the sexes in mean age at first marriage ($H = 41.144 \rangle \chi^2_{.05;8} = 15.507$).

Table 6.

Values calculated with Kruskal – Wallis test

	Europe	Africa	Asia	America
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage				
Chi-Square	41.144	47.521	44.357	30.258
df.	8	17	19	12
Asymp. Sig.	.000	.001	.001	.001

Grouping variable: Part of Europe   Grouping variable: Country

Therefore, the culture specific to each part of Europe has a strong direct and significant influence on individual behaviour regarding marriage.

According to the obtained results we can say that the local culture, specific to the component countries in Africa, Asia and America play an important role in the variable difference between the genders in mean age at first marriage.

Consequently, with respect to marriage customs, borders do not disappear, those characteristics that define each nation individually directly influencing the habits of marriage.

71

5. Conclusions

I believe that `family` as a concept has lost its importance once it had in the past. In earlier ages divorce represented an event with a negative connotation in a person's life. Nowadays it can be noted that people's attitudes has changed regarding divorce. In my opinion, a family with a traditional structure is an institution that contributes to a significant extent to the development of the indicators defining economic environment. From this perspective, I believe that the most important task of marketing is to promote the values that define traditional family structure, thus contributing to the economic welfare of the country. There are countries where start of traditional families are stimulated, on the one hand it is promoted through characters who play an important role in society, and on the other by financial motivation. However, I consider that financial motivation is not a suitable alternative. As in case of service providers the quality of the services reaches the maximum level only if people - as marketing mix element – accept and include the brand. Thus, according to the findings, people have to live together with the values which define traditional family structure. Moreover, financial motivation, in my opinion, does not work among people who want to achieve professionally.

There is a striking similarity between the impact of decisions in matters of marriage and the choice of target markets from the perspective of international marketing. In international marketing, market choice is a strategic decision. Wrong choice of markets leads not only to a financial loss but also to other losses such as the opportunity cost, i.e. the loss of those benefits foregone from the time a particular alternative was chosen from all the available alternatives. The same holds true for personal lives. The question that arises relates to whether we need to keep pace with emerging trends in different sides of life or to make decisions that allow experiencing feelings worth living at every stage of the life cycle.

Just as any change, the changes in the approach to marriage, namely extending the year of getting married, bring both positive and negative aspects, at least in the European and Asian societies. Positive aspect of the economic environment is the fact that people who give up personal independence at later age exert a positive impact through their work on the evolution of the economy. Negative aspect is the fact that they may never meet particular feelings related to certain roles in life, such as becoming a grandfather/grandmother. What we know for sure is that this trend shall influence the developments of the indicators that define the macro environment. What we do not know for sure is the extent/intensity by which it influences the lives of future generations.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, E. H. and Cliff, E. (2003), "The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: toward a family embeddedness perspective", *Journal of Business Venturing,* Vol. 18 No. 5, pp. 537-596

Arroyo, J., Payne, K.K., Brown, S.L. and Manning, W.D. (2013), "Crossover in Median Age at First Marriage and First Birth: Thirty Years of Change", National Centre for Family & Marriage Research, available at: http://www.firelands.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/college-of-arts-and-sciences/NCFMR/documents/FP/FP-13-06.pdf

Bennett, G. N., Bloom, E. D. and Craig, H. P. (1989), „The Divergence of Black and White Marriage Patterns", *AJS (American Journal of Sociology)*, Vol. 95 No 3, pp. 692-722

Bergstrom, T. and Bagnoli, M. (1993), „Courtship as a waiting game"*, The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol.101 No.1, pp.85-202

Booth, A. and Edwards, N. J. (1985), „Age at Marriage and Marital Instability", *Journal of Marriage and Family,* Vol. 47 No.1, pp. 64-75

Caldwell, J.C., Reddy, P.H. and Caldwell, P. (1983), „The causes of marriage change in South India", *Population Studies: A Journal of Demography,* Vol. 37 No. 3, pp.343-361 DOI:10.1080/00324728.1983.10408866

Carlson, J.M. (2001), "Family Structure and Children's Behavioral and cognitive Outcomes", *Journal of Marriage and Family,* Vol. 63 No.3, pp.779-792

Carmichael, S. (2011), "Marriage and power: Age at first marriage and spousal age gap in lesser developed countries", *The History of the Family*, Vol. 16 No.4, pp. 416-436

Castro-Martin, T. and Bumpass, L. L. (1989), „Recent trend in marital disruption", *Demography*, Vol. 26 No.1, pp. 37-51 DOI:10.2307/2061492

Cherlin, J. A. (2010), "Demographic Trends in the United States: A Review of Research in the 2000s", *Journal of Marriage and Family,* Vol. 72 No.3, pp. 403-419

Gavin, J. (2010), "Changing Marriage Patterns in Asia", ARI Working Paper, No.131, available at: http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/docs/wps/wps10_131.pdf

Glenn, D. N., Uecker, J.E. and Love W.B.R. Jr. (2010), "Late first marriage and marital success", *Social Science Research,* Vol. 39 No 5, pp 787-800

Goldin, C. (2006), "The Quiet Revolution that Transferred Womens's Emloyment, Education, and Family", American Economic Association, NBER Working Paper No.11953, available at: http://www.fhu55.com/sites/default/files/hanehalki/Okumalar/The%20Quiet%20Revolution%20That%20Transformed%20Women's%20Employment,%20Education,%20and%20Family.pdf

Goldstein, R. J. and Kenney, T. C. (2001), „Marriage Delayed or Marriage Forgone? New Cohort Forecasts of First Marriage For U.S. Women", *American Sociological Review,* Vol.66 (August), pp.506-519

Hajnal, J. (1953), „Age at marriage and proportions marrying", *Population Studies: A Journal of Demography*, Vol. 7 No.2, pp. 111-136

Harknett, K., (2012), "Is a Bad Economy Good for Marriage? The Relationship between Macroeconomics Conditions and Marital Stability from 1998-2009", National Poverty Center, available at: http://npc.umich.edu/publications/u/2012-06%20NPC%20Working%20Paper.pdf

Isen, A. and Stevenson, B., (2010), "Women's Education and Family Behavior: Trends in Marriage, Divorce and Fertility", NBER Working Paper No. 15725, available at: http://www.nber.org/papers/w15725.pdf

Jensen, R. and Thornton, R. (2003), „Early female marriage int he developing world",
        Gender and Development, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 9-19
Kelty, R., Kleykamp, M. and Segal, R.S. (2010), "The Military and the Transition to
        Adulthood", The Future of Children, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp.1814-207
Kotler, Ph. and Keller K. L. (2006), *Marketing Management,* 12th Edition, Akadémia
        Publisher, Budapest
Lichter , T., D., McLaughlin, K.D. and Ribar, C., D. (2002), „Economic Restructuring and
        the Retreat from Marriage", *Social Science Research*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 230-256
Loughran, S.D. (2002), "The Effect of Male Wage Inequality on Female Age at First
        Marriage", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol.84 No.2, pp.237-250
McLaughlin, K. D., Lichter, T. D. and Gail, M. J. (1993), „Some Women Marry Young:
        Transitions to First Marriage in Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas",
        Journal of Marriage and Family, *Vol.* 55 No.4, pp. 827-838
Neelakantan, U. and Michèle (2008), „A note on marriage market clearing", *Economics
        Letters*, available at: http://tertilt.vwl.uni-mannheim.de/research/Neelakantan
        TertiltJune08.pdf
Ono, H., (2003), "Women's Economic Standing, Marriage Timing, and Cross-National
        Context of Grender, *Journal of Marriage and Family,* Vol. 65 No. 2, pp. 275-286
Quisumbing, A.R. and Hallman, K. (2003), "Marriage in transition: evidence on age,
        education, and assets from six developing countries", Working Paper 183. New
        York: Policy Research Division, Population Council.
Schwartz, R. Ch. And Mare, D.R. (2005), "Trends in educational assortative marriage
        from 1940 to 2003", *Demography,* Vol. 42 No.4, pp. 621-646
Stier, H. and Shavit Y. (1994), „Age at marriage, sex-ratios, and ethnic heterogamy",
        Eur Sociol Rev, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 79-87
Stutzer, A. and Frey, S. B. (2006), "Does marriage make people happy, or do happy
        people get married?", *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 35 No.2, pp.326-347
Sweeney, M.M. (2002), "Two Decades of Family Change: The Shifting Economic
        Foundations of Marriage", *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 67 No.1, pp 132-147
Törőcsik, M. (2006), *Consumer behaviour – trends*, Akadémia Publisher, Budapest
Von Elm, B. and Hirschman, Ch. (1979), „Age at First Marriage in Peninsular Malaysia",
        Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 877-891
Wally, O. (2002), *On brand*. KJK-KERSZÖV Publisher, Budapest
Wiik Aarskaug, K. (2009), „You'd Better Wait!' – Socio-economic Background and Timing of
        First Marriage versus First Cohabitation", *Eur Sociol Rev*, Vol. 25 No.2, pp. 139-153
Xie, Y., Raymo, M. J., Geoyette, K. and Thornton, A., (2003) "Economic potenáial and
        entry into marriage and cohabitation", *Demography*, Vol. 40 No. 2, pp. 351-367
http://w3.unece.org/pxweb/?lang=1 (accessed on March 2013 – March 2014)
http://unstats.un.org/unsd/default.htm (accessed on March 2013 – March 2014
http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WMD2012/MainFrame.html (accessed
        on March 2013 – March 2014)
http://www.worldbank.org/ (accessed on March 2013 – March 2014)
http://world-statistics.org/index.php (accessed on March 2013 – March 2014)
http://statinfo.biz/Geomap.aspx?region=002&act=2029&lang=2 (accessed on March 2013
        –March 2014)
http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/docs/wps/wps10_131.pdf (accessed on March 2013–March 2014)
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/japan/7822356/Tokyo-sees-rise-in-
        divorce-ceremonies.html (accessed March 12th, 2014)

APPENDIX A - EUROPE

Country	MALES			FEMALES			DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES		
	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av[3] Annual Change 1990-2000	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change
Austria	26.5	29.8	.12	24.3	27.3	.12	2.2	2.5	.00
Belarus	23.9	25	.05	22	22.8	.04	1.9	2.2	.01
Belgium	26.4	28.5	.08	24.5	26.3	.07	1.9	2.2	.01
Bulgaria	24.6	28.1	.14	21.4	24.7	.15	3.2	3.4	-.01
Croatia	26.9	28.6	.06	23.6	25.3	.07	3.3	3.3	-.01
Czech Republic	23.5	27.1	.15	21.1	24.6	.17	2.4	2.5	-.02
Denmark	30.2	32.6	.08	27.6	30.1	.09	2.6	2.5	-.01
Estonia	24.6	27.5	.12	22.5	25	.11	2.1	2.5	.01
Finland	28.5	30.9	.08	26.5	28.6	.08	2	2.3	.00
France	27.6	30.2	.09	25.6	28	.09	2	2.2	.00
Germany	28.4	31.2	.10	25.9	28.4	.10	2.5	2.8	.00
Greece	28	30.1	.08	23.8	26.8	0.13	4.2	3.3	-.05
Hungary	24.7	27.2	.10	22	24.7	.12	2.7	2.5	-.02
Italy	28.4	30.9	.09	25.6	28.1	0.10	2.8	2.8	-.01
Iceland	28.9	32.9	.14	26.9	30.3	.13	2	2.6	.01
Latvia	24.5	26.9	.10	22.7	24.9	.10	1.8	2	.00
Lithuania	24.2	25.7	.06	22.4	23.7	.06	1.8	2	.00
Republic of Moldova	22	24.9	.13	21	21.7	.03	1	3.2	.10
Netherlands	28.2	31	.10	25.9	28.5	.10	2.3	2.5	.00
Norway	30.3	32.2	.06	27.9	29.8	.07	2.4	2.4	-.01
Poland	24.7	25.2	.02	22.4	23.2	.04	2.3	2	-.02
Portugal	26.2	27.5	.05	24.2	25.7	.06	2	1.8	-.01
Romania	25	26.9	.08	22	23.6	.07	3	3.3	.01
Serbia	27.4	28.3	.03	23.6	24.9	.06	3.8	3.4	-.03
Slovakia	25.4	26.1	.03	22.7	23.6	.04	2.7	2.5	-.01
Slovenia	26.6	29.6	.11	23.8	26.7	.12	2.8	2.9	-.01
Spain	27.8	30.1	.08	25.6	28.1	.10	2.2	2	-.02
Sweden	30.2	33.1	.10	27.6	30.6	.11	2.6	2.5	-.01
Switzerland	29.1	30.3	.04	26.7	27.9	.04	2.4	2.4	.00
Ukraine	24.1	25.2	.05	21.7	24.5 22.4	.03	2.4	2.8	.02
United K	27.2	30.5	.12	25.2	28.2	.12	2	2.3	.00

---

[3] Average

Country	MALES		FEMALES		DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES	
	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change
Austria	31.9	.07	29.3	.07	2.6	.00
Belarus	26.5	.06	24.4	.07	2.1	-.01
Belgium	31.2	.09	28.8	.10	2.4	-.01
Bulgaria	30	.07	26.9	.09	3.1	-.02
Croatia	30.1	.05	27.3	.08	2.8	-.03
Czech Republic	31	.14	28.2	.15	2.8	-.01
Denmark	34.6	.06	32.1	.07	2.5	-.01
Estonia	30.4	.11	27.9	.12	2.5	-.01
Finland	32.6	.06	30.3	.06	2.3	.00
France	31.8	.05	30	.07	1.8	-.02
Germany	33.2	.06	30.3	.07	2.9	-.01
Greece2008	31.8	.06	28.9	.08	3.1	-.02
Hungary	31.4	.15	28.7	.16	2.7	-.01
Iceland	34.2	.04	32.1	.06	2.1	-.02
Italy 2009	33.1	.07	30.1	.07	2.9	.00
Latvia	29.4	.09	27.4	.10	2	-.01
Lithuania	28.7	.12	26.4	.11	2.3	.01
Republic of Moldova	26	.04	23	.06	3	-.02
Netherlands	32.8	.06	30.1	.06	2.7	.00
Norway	33.2	.03	31	.04	2.2	-.01
Poland	27.5	.09	25.6	.10	1.9	-.01
Portugal	30.8	.12	29.2	.14	1.6	-.02
Romania	29.1	.08	26	.10	3.1	-.02
Serbia	30.2	.07	27.1	.09	3.1	-.02
Slovakia	29.5	.13	26.9	.14	2.6	-.01
Slovenia	31.2	.05	28.7	.07	2.5	-.02
Spain	33.2	.10	31	.10	2.2	.00
Sweden	35.5	.07	32.9	.08	2.6	-.01
Switzerland	31.6	.04	29.4	.05	2.2	-.01
Ukraine	27.1	.08	24.5	.09	2.6	-.01
United K 2009	32.1	.05	29.9	.06	2.2	-.01

Country	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Male	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Female	DIFFERENCE In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990-2010	
			Male	Female
Austria	.20	.21	-5.4	-5
Belarus	.11	.11	-2.6	-2.4
Belgium	.18	.18	-4.8	-4.3
Bulgaria	.22	.26	-5.4	-5.5
Croatia	.12	.16	-3.2	-3.7
Czech Republic	.32	.34	-7.5	-7.1
Denmark	.15	.16	-4.4	-4.5
Estonia	.24	.24	-5.8	-5.4
Finland	.14	.14	-4.1	-3.8
France	.15	.17	-4.2	-4.4
Germany	.17	.17	-4.8	-4.4
Greece	.14	.21	-3.8	-5.1
Hungary	.27	.30	-6.7	-6.7
Iceland	.18	.19	-4.2	-3.2
Italy	.17	.18	-5.8	-6.5
Latvia	.20	.21	-4.9	-4.7
Lithuania	.19	.18	-4.5	-4
Republic of Moldova	.18	.10	-.4	-2
Netherlands	.16	.16	-4.6	-4.2
Norway	.10	.11	-2.9	-3.1
Poland	.11	.14	-2.8	-3.2
Portugal	.18	.21	-4.6	-5
Romania	.16	.18	-4.1	-4
Serbia	.10	.15	-2.8	-3.5
Slovakia	.16	.19	-4.1	-4.2
Slovenia	.17	.21	-4.6	-4.9
Spain	.19	.21	-5.4	-5.4
Sweden	.18	.19	-5.3	-5.3
Switzerland	.09	.10	-2.5	-2.7
Ukraine	.12	.13	-3	-2.8
United K.	.18	.19	-4.9	-4.7

APPENDIX A – AFRICA

Country	MALES			FEMALES			DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES		
	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change
Burundi 2002	25.7	26.1	.02	22.5	23.7	.05	3.2	2.4	-.03
Cape Verde	28.1	28.8	.02	25.7	24.6	-.04	2.4	4.2	.06
Zambia	25.9	25.4	-.02	21.2	20.9	-.01	4.7	4.5	-.01
Zimbabwe 1992, 2002	26.1	25.8	-.01	21.3	21.4	.00	4.8	4.4	-.01
Ethiopia 1994	25.6	25.8	.01	20.5	20.5	.00	5.1	5.3	.01
Burkina Faso 198, 1999	26.7	26.4	-.01	18.4	18.9	.03	8.3	7.5	-.04
Malawi 1987	23.6	23.5	.00	18.6	18.9	.02	5	4.6	-.02
Reunion 1999	30.3	32.8	.08	28.2	30.5	.08	2.1	2.3	.00
Rwanda 1996, 2005	24.8	26.5	.07	23.3	23.7	.02	1.5	2.8	.05
Uganda 1991, 2002	23.7	24.2	.02	19.4	20.2	.04	4.3	4	-.02
Cameroon 1987, 1998	26.4	26.7	.01	20	20.2	.01	6.4	6.5	.00
Iran 1991, 2006	24.4	26.4	.08	21	23.5	.12	3.4	2.9	-.04
Senegal 1993, 2002	30.3	29	-.04	21.6	22	.02	8.7	7	-.06
South Africa 1991, 2003	28.9	30.6	.06	26.8	28	.04	2.1	2.6	.02
United Republic of Tanzania 1998, 1999	25.8	24.7	-.04	20.5	20.4	.00	5.3	4.3	-.04
Nigeria 1991, 1999	27.2	27.2	.00	20.3	21.3	.05	6.9	5.9	-.05
Namibia 1991	31.1	30.1	-.03	27.6	27.5	.00	3.5	2.6	-.03
Ghana 1993	26.2	27.1	.03	20.5	22.4	.09	5.7	4.7	-.06

Country	MALES		FEMALES		DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES	
	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Annual Change 2000-2010	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change
Burundi	25.4	-.03	22.1	-.07	3.3	.04
Cape Verde 2005	27.9	-.03	22.8	-.07	5.1	.04
Zambia 2007	25.5	.00	21.1	.01	4.4	-.01
Zimbabwe	25.5	-.01	20.6	-.04	4.9	.03
Ethiopia 2011	25.7	.00	21.2	.03	4.5	-.03
Burkina Faso	25.3	-.04	19.5	.03	5.8	-.07
Malawi	23.9	.02	19.6	.04	4.3	-.02
Reunion 2006	33.2	.01	31	.02	2.2	-.01
Rwanda	26.6	.00	24.4	.03	2.2	-.03
Uganda 2011	24.3	.00	20	-.01	4.3	.01
Cameroon 2011	27	.01	21.3	.05	5.7	-.04
Iran 2011	26.8	.02	23.5	.00	3.3	.02
Senegal	30	.03	21.6	-.02	8.4	.05
South Africa 2011	33	.08	30.6	.09	2.4	-.01
United Republic of Tanzania	25.1	.02	21	.03	4.1	-.01
Nigeria 2008	28.5	.05	21.6	.01	6.9	.04
Namibia 2007	30.2	.00	28.3	.03	1.9	-.03
Ghana 2008	27.7	.02	23.4	.04	4.3	-.02

Country	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Male	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Female	DIFFERENCE In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990-2010	
			Male	Female
Burundi	-.01	-.02	.3	.4
Cape Verde	-.01	-.11	.2	2.9
Zambia	-.02	.00	.4	.1
Zimbabwe	-.02	-.03	.6	.7
Ethiopia	.00	.03	-.1	-.7
Burkina Faso	-.05	.06	1.4	-1.1
Malawi	.01	.05	-.3	-1
Reunion	.10	.10	-2.9	-2.8
Rwanda	.07	.05	-1.8	-1.1
Uganda	.03	.03	-.6	-.6
Cameroon	.02	.07	-.6	-1.3
Iran	.10	.12	-2.4	-2.5
Senegal	-.01	.00	.3	0
South Africa	.14	.14	-4.1	-3.8
United Republic of Tanzania	-.03	.02	.7	-0.5
Nigeria	.05	.06	-1.3	-1.3
Namibia	-.03	.03	.9	-0.7
Ghana	.06	.14	-1.5	-2.9

APPENDIX A – ASIA

Country	MALES			FEMALES			DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES		
	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change
Japan	30.4	30.8	.01	26.9	28.6	.06	3.5	2.2	-.05
Korea	28.5	30.3	.06	25.5	27.1	.06	3	3.2	.00
Taiwan	28.8	30.5	.06	26	27.6	.06	2.8	2.9	.00
China	23.8	25.1	.05	22.1	23.3	.05	1.7	1.8	.00
Singapore	29.9	30	.00	27	26.5	-.02	2.9	3.5	.02
Malaysia 1991	27.9	28.6	.03	24.6	25.1	.02	3.3	3.5	.01
Indonesia	25.2	25.9	.03	21.6	22.5	.04	3.6	3.4	-.01
Philippines	26.3	26.6	.01	23.8	24.1	.01	2.5	2.5	.00
India 1991, 2001	24	24.8	.03	19.3	20.2	.05	4.7	4.6	-.02
Pakistan 1998, 2003	25.8	26.4	.02	21.3	22.3	.05	4.5	4.1	-.03
Bangladesh 2011	24.9	25.3	.02	18.1	19.1	.06	6.8	6.2	-.04
Iran 1991	24.4	26.4	.08	21	22.4	.07	3.4	4.0	.01
Armenia 1989, 2001	24.2	27.4	.13	21.2	23.4	.10	3	4.0	.03
Azerbaijan 1999, 2006	27	26.7	-01	23.9	23.1	-.03	3.1	3.6	.02
Kazakhstan 1989, 1999	24.6	26.1	.06	22.4	23.4	.04	2.2	2.7	.02
Kyrgyzstan 1989, 1999	24	25	.04	21.6	21.9	.01	2.4	3.1	.03
Tajikistan 1989	23.2	24.1	.04	20.9	21.3	.02	2.3	2.8	.02
Israel 1995, 2002	27.6	28.3	.03	24.6	25.3	.03	3	3	.00
Mongolia 1989	25	25.7	.03	22.6	23.7	.05	2.4	2	-.02
Viet Nam 1989, 1999	24.4	25.2	.03	23.1	22.7	-.02	1.3	2.5	.05

MEAN AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE: WHERE ARE WE HEADING TO?

Country	MALES		FEMALES		DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES	
	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change
Japan	31.2	.01	29.7	.04	1.5	-.03
Korea 2012	32.1	.06	29.4	.08	2.7	-.03
Taiwan 2009	31.6	.04	28.9	.05	2.7	-.01
China	26.5	.06	24.7	.06	1.8	.00
Singapore	30.4	.01	27.9	.05	2.5	-.04
Malaysia	28.0	-.02	25.7	.02	2.3	-.04
Indonesia	25.7	-.01	22.3	-.01	3.4	.00
Philippines 2011	28.0	.05	25.3	.05	2.7	.00
India 2011	26.8	.08	22.2	.10	4.6	-.02
Pakistan 2007	26.4	.00	22.7	.02	3.7	-.02
Bangladesh 2011	25.4	.00	18.6	-.03	6.8	.03
Iran 2011	26.8	.01	23.5	.05	3.3	-.04
Armenia 2010	27.8	.01	24.4	.04	3.4	-.03
Azerbaijan 2009	28.2	.06	24.4	.06	3.8	.00
Kazakhstan 2009	28.1	.08	25.1	.07	3	.01
Kyrgyzstan 2009	26.3	.05	23.2	.06	3.1	-.01
Tajikistan	24.7	.02	22.1	.04	2.6	-.02
Israel 2009	29.1	.03	26.2	.04	2.9	-.01
Mongolia	26.2	.02	24.2	.02	2	.00
Viet Nam 2009	26.2	.04	22.7	.00	3.5	.04

Country	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Male	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Female	DIFFERENCE In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990-2010	
			Male	Female
Japan	.03	.10	-.8	-2.8
Korea	.13	.15	-3.6	-3.9
Taiwan	.10	.11	-2.8	-2.9
China	.11	.12	-2.7	-2.6
Singapore	.02	.03	-.5	-.9
Malaysia	.00	.04	-.1	-1.1
Indonesia	.02	.03	-.5	-.7
Philippines	.06	.06	-1.7	-1.5
India	.12	.15	-2.8	-2.9
Pakistan	.02	.07	-.6	-1.4
Bangladesh	.02	.03	-.5	-.5
Iran	.10	.12	-2.4	-2.5
Armenia	.15	.15	-3.6	-3.2
Azerbaijan	.04	.02	-1.2	-.5
Kazakhstan	.14	.12	-3.5	-2.7
Kyrgyzstan	.10	.07	-2.3	-1.6

Country	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Male	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Female	DIFFERENCE In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990-2010	
			Male	Female
Tajikistan	.06	.06	-1.5	-1.2
Israel	.05	.07	-1.5	-1.6
Mongolia	.05	.07	-1.2	-1.6
Viet Nam	.07	-.02	-1.8	.4

APPENDIX A – AMERICA

Country	MALES			FEMALES			DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES		
	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change 1990-2000	In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2000	Av Annual Change
United States	27.6	27.8	.01	25.4	26	.02	2.2	1.8	-.01
Aruba 1991	28.8	29.9	.04	26.2	26.8	.02	2.6	3.1	.02
Costa Rica 1992, 2002	25	26	.04	21.5	22.2	.03	3.5	3.8	.01
Panama	25.4	25.8	.02	21.9	21.9	.00	3.5	3.9	.02
Argentina 1991, 2001	25.8	26.9	.04	23.3	24.6	.06	2.5	2.3	-.02
Brazil 1991	25.8	26.2	.02	22.8	23.1	.01	3	3.1	.01
Mexico	24.7	25	.01	22.4	22.7	.01	2.3	2.3	.00
Chile 1992, 2002	25.8	27.7	.07	23.4	24.6	.05	2.4	3.1	.02
Ecuador 2001	25.2	24.6	-.02	22	21.5	-.02	3.2	3.1	.00
Bolivia 1998, 2001	25.1	25.8	.03	22.7	23.3	.03	2.4	2.5	.00
Cambodia 1998, 2004	24.2	24.6	.02	22.5	22.8	.01	1.7	1.8	.01
Dominican Republic 1993, 2002	26	26.1	.00	22.5	21.9	-.03	3.5	4.2	.03
Uruguay 1985, 1996	25.2	25.6	.02	22.9	23.3	.02	2.3	2.3	.00

Country	MALES		FEMALES		DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SEXES	
	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change 2000-2010	In Mean Age at First Marriage 2010	Av Annual Change
United States 2011	28.8	.04	26.9	.03	1.9	.01
Aruba	31.2	.04	28.5	.06	2.7	-.02
Costa Rica 2011	27	.04	23.9	.08	3.1	-.04
Panama	25.3	-.02	21.6	-.01	3.7	-.01
Argentina	26.6	-.01	24.6	.00	2	-.01
Brazil	31.9	.22	29.7	.29	2.2	-.07
Mexico	25.5	.02	23	.01	2.5	.01
Chile 2011	29.3	.06	27.4	.11	1.9	-.05
Ecuador	25	.02	21.8	.01	3.2	.01
Bolivia 2008	25.3	-.02	22.7	-.03	2.6	.01
Cambodia	24.9	.01	22	-.04	2.9	.05
Dominican Republic 2007	25.4	-.03	21	-.04	4.4	.01
Uruguay 2011	27	.05	24.8	.06	2.2	-.01

Country	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Male	Av Annual Change 1990-2010 Female	DIFFERENCE In Mean Age at First Marriage 1990-2010	
			Male	Female
United States	.04	.06	-1.2	-1.5
Aruba	.08	.09	-2.4	-2.3
Costa Rica	.08	.11	-2	-2.4
Panama	.00	-.01	.1	.3
Argentina	.03	.06	-.8	-1.3
Brazil	.24	.30	-6.1	-6.9
Mexico	.03	.03	-.8	-.6
Chile	.14	.17	-3.5	-4
Ecuador	-.01	-.01	.2	.2
Bolivia	.01	.00	-.2	0
Cambodia	.03	-.02	-.7	.5
Dominican Republic	-.02	-.07	.6	1.5
Uruguay	.07	.08	-1.8	-1.9

APPENDIX B - EUROPE

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage	93	2.498	.5024	.0521

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2.5					
				Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Difference	Lower	Upper
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage	-.041	92	.967	-.0022	-.106	.101

APPENDIX B – AFRICA

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage	54	4.442	1.7738	.2414

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2.5					
				Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Difference	Lower	Upper
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage	8.047	53	.000	1.9424	1.458	2.427

APPENDIX B – ASIA

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean at First Marriage	60	3.1720	1.09634	.14154

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2.5					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean at First Marriage	4.748	59	.000	.67200	.3888	.9552

APPENDIX B – AMERICA

One-Sample Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage	39	2.762	.6931	.1110

One-Sample Test

	Test Value = 2.5					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage	2.357	38	.024	.2615	.037	.486

85

APPENDIX C – EUROPE

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Mean Age at First Marriage
N		186
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	27.560
	Std. Deviation	3.1641
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.059
	Positive	.049
	Negative	-.059
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.808
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.531

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage
N		93
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	2.498
	Std. Deviation	.5024
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.100
	Positive	.100
	Negative	-.064
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.969
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.305

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Appendix C – AFRICA

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Mean Age at First Marriage
N		108
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	24.8066
	Std. Deviation	3.60944
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.100
	Positive	.100
	Negative	-.056
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.038
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.232

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage
N		54
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	4.442
	Std. Deviation	1.7738
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.078
	Positive	.078
	Negative	-.061
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.571
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.901

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Appendix C – ASIA

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Mean Age at First Marriage
N		120
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	25.3218
	Std. Deviation	2.88949
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.045
	Positive	.045
	Negative	-.027
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.489
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.970

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Difference Between the Sexes in Mean at First Marriage
N		60
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	3.1720
	Std. Deviation	1.09634
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.149
	Positive	.149
	Negative	-.071
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.155
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.139

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

APPENDIX C – AMERICA

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Mean Age at First Marriage
N		78
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	25.024
	Std. Deviation	2.3901
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.085
	Positive	.085
	Negative	-.071
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.752
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.623

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Difference Between the Sexes in Mean Age at First Marriage
N		39
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	2.762
	Std. Deviation	.6931
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.134
	Positive	.134
	Negative	-.072
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.838
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.483

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.