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ABSTRACT

The period from 1951 to 1976 has been one of substantial change in the demographic and household formation structure of Toronto's population. There have been four main changes: the maturing of the baby boom, the increasing tendency for families to maintain their own households, the increasing tendency for not-married individuals to reside on their own, and the decreasing popularity of marriage in recent years. Evidence is presented to show how these changes have contributed to a rapid increase in household formation over the twenty-five year period. Several hypotheses have been offered to explain these changes and these are reviewed in the paper.
Changing Patterns of Household Formation in the Toronto CMA; 1951 to 1976.

Toronto has been the site of rapid household and population growth over the past quarter century. The increase in the number of households over this period has outstripped the growth of population and family units. As a result, the average number of persons per dwelling unit has fallen. At the same time, non-family households have become much more prevalent relative to family households.

This decline in average household size can be attributed to three main sources. One is the rise of the one person household which is the fastest growing size category over this time period. Another is the decreasing average family size found after 1966. The third source is the increasing tendency of families to avoid sharing a household with other persons or families.

This paper has several purposes. First, it presents some historical data for the 1951 to 1976 time period to substantiate the quantitative and qualitative nature of household growth alluded to above. Secondly, it discusses some underlying shifts in the demographic structure of Toronto's population which have had repercussions on household formation. These include the maturing post-war baby boom, changing attitudes toward marriage and divorce, changing fertility trends, and the changing living arrangements of young single adults and elderly widowed and divorced persons. Finally, the paper reviews some major hypotheses about the causes of these demographic changes.

In what follows, an emphasis is placed on household formation in
Toronto. At the same time, it will become quite apparent that many of
the issues being discussed are common to household formation patterns
right across Canada and the United States. Nonetheless, the Toronto
area provides a useful focus for looking at these patterns.

I. Some Definitions

The data to be presented in this paper are drawn mainly from
the Censuses of Canada taken at five year intervals between 1951 and
1976. Some data are available only for more recent periods but where
possible all six census dates are included. The data for Toronto cover
the Census Metropolitan Area (CMA); a geographical unit whose boundary
has changed over time in an attempt to reflect the spatial extent of
the local labour market. When data for Toronto are not available,
reference is had to Ontario or Canada-wide data.

The use of Census data restricts one to the definitions used there.
Consider the notion of a "household". In the Census, the stock of dwell­
ings in Canada is divided into those which are vacant and those which
are occupied. A vacant dwelling is one in which no person claims to
be "regularly" resident and includes, for instance, second homes as well
as housing which is not being lived in at all. Further, occupied dwell­
ings are classified as collectives if they are of an institutional,
commercial, or communal nature. All other occupied dwellings are called
private dwellings and the individuals occupying them are private indivi­
duals. Our primary interest here is in such "private" dwellings and
individuals.
Note however that in restricting ourselves to "private" dwellings, we are making a somewhat arbitrary distinction. A communal dwelling, one type of collective dwelling, includes any dwelling containing ten or more persons unrelated to the household head. Thus, large groups of unrelated individuals living together are not treated as private households simply because of the number of persons present.

Every occupied private dwelling contains one and only one private household and every private person in Canada is associated with one and one "regular" place of residence (or household). Thus, a household is nothing more nor less than the group of individuals listing the same dwelling unit as their place of residence. Further, the number of occupied dwellings is approximately equal to the number of households.¹

In addition, the notion of a household is now seen to rest on the definitions of a dwelling unit. In Census terms, this is

"...a structurally separate set of living quarters with a private entrance from outside or from a common hallway or stairway inside the building, i.e., the entrances must not be through someone else's living quarters."²

¹The qualifier to this statement concerns the treatment of small numbers of Canadians temporarily abroad. Such people, where counted, are included in their municipality of regular residence in Canada but their foreign dwelling unit is excluded from the count of occupied dwellings.

Thus, for example, a two-story house with a group of individuals living on each floor but with access to the second floor only through the living area on the first would be treated as one dwelling and the residents as constituting one household. This would be true even if each floor had its own kitchen, bathroom, living and sleeping areas. Further, if the entrance to the second floor area were to be reconstructed so that it did not pass through the first floor area, the house would be counted instead as two dwelling units; each with its own household. Thus, an increase in the number of households might mean nothing more than some minor renovations to existing housing units.

There is a corollary for students of housing markets. In general, an increase in the number of Census-defined private households will mean that more residential buildings are constructed or converted from other (perhaps vacant) uses. However, the linkage is neither exact nor two-way. On the one hand, the demand for second homes may change even if the number of households remains constant. On the other, the number of households may increase simply because of small amounts of renovation within the existing housing stock.

The notion of a "family" in the Census is not quite so closely tied to the notion of a dwelling unit. A family is defined as:

"consisting of a husband and wife, with or without children who have never married regardless of age, or a parent with one or more children who have never married, living together in the same dwelling"

---

In other places, this is usually called a "nuclear" family. Changes in the size of a nuclear family can occur for several reasons. The birth or death of a family member is one source of change. However, if a child marries or itself becomes a parent, it is no longer treated as a member of its parents' family even if it continues to reside in the same household. Also, if a child moves away from its parents' household, it is no longer treated as a family member.

There are two more troublesome definitions which need to be considered here. These are the definitions of new family and new household formation. The problem here is that the family (or household) is always (or usually) made up of two or more individuals. While one can use birth and death data to identify the existence of persons, there is no equivalent for families or households.

One approach to the identification of family and household formation is the headship method. This is based on the simple premise that if each household (or family) has one person who can be designated as a "head", changes in the total number of households (or families) can be matched to changes in the number of "heads". A new household (or family) is said to be formed when a new head is identified. An old household (or family) is said to be dissolved when an old head ceases to be a head. Thus, consider for example the possibilities for household formation when a young couple get married and set up their own household.

(a) If each spouse was previously living with his or her parents or in any other situation such that neither was, before the marriage, a head, then a new household has been created.
(b) If exactly one of the spouses was previously a head of household (say, for example living alone prior to marriage) and became the head after marriage, there would be no new household formed.

(c) If exactly one spouse had previously been a head but the other spouse became the head after marriage, one new household would be formed and one old household dissolved. As in (b), the net number of households formed would be zero.

(d) If both spouses had previously been heads (as, for example, when both had previously been living alone), one old household would be dissolved and the net formation would be minus one.

One problem with the headship method is that a consistent definition of a head must be used over time. At first glance, it might appear that if one is interested only in net household (or family) formation, i.e., new households formed less old households dissolved, the designation of a head is inconsequential. The argument here is that, if we use one definition for the head in 1971 and another in 1976, an otherwise unchanged household might be counted over the period as one household dissolved (i.e., the old head) and one new household formed (i.e., the new head) for a net formation of zero. Alternatively, if the same definition for the head had been employed in 1971 and 1976, an otherwise unchanged household would be recorded as zero dissolutions and zero formation for a net formation of zero as well. While in agreement with this argument, it must be pointed out that any analysis of the change in number of households (or families) associated with changes in the demographic structure of a population must be based on a consistent definition of the household (or family) head.
The following definitions were employed in the 1971 and earlier censuses of Canada:

The head of household is defined as

"...the husband if both husband and wife are present, the parent if living with unmarried children, or any member of a group sharing a dwelling equally." 4

The head of a family is defined as

"the husband in a husband-wife family, or the parent in a one-parent family." 5

In the 1976 Census, the definition of the head was augmented to include either the husband or the wife in a household or family containing both.

In what follows, the pre-1976 definitions are used in the interest of consistency and the 1976 headship data are transformed to make them comparable with these definitions.

2. The Growth of Households

The number of households resident in the Toronto CMA has grown consistently and rapidly over the quarter century from 1951 to 1976. From Table 1, the total number of households is seen to have increased from 273,200 to 909,500 which constitutes an average annual compounded growth rate of 4.9%. 6 This household growth has been more rapid than


6 To the extent that the CMA area has generally increased over time, a small part of this growth is attributable to boundary changes.
Table 1: Households by Family Composition, Toronto CMA, 1951 to 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Family Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without Additional Persons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>310,900</td>
<td>392,700</td>
<td>513,500</td>
<td>596,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Additional Persons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,700</td>
<td>66,200</td>
<td>80,400</td>
<td>76,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199,200</td>
<td>256,200</td>
<td>376,700</td>
<td>458,900</td>
<td>594,000</td>
<td>672,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Family Households</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>41,400</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>28,200</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Person</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>104,600</td>
<td>164,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Persons</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>50,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,100</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>64,500</td>
<td>92,200</td>
<td>152,300</td>
<td>215,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>273,200</td>
<td>341,100</td>
<td>482,500</td>
<td>586,600</td>
<td>774,500</td>
<td>909,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1961 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 14.  
1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 11.  
the CMA growth of either total population (at 3.7% per year) or number of families (at 3.5% per year) (see Figure 1). Thus, population and family growth in Toronto must be considered together with other factors such as shrinking household sizes (persons per household) and the increasing number of non-family households in explaining this rapid rate of household formation.

The numerical importance of the one-family household without additional persons can be seen from Table 1. In 1976, approximately two-thirds of all households were of this type. Thus, an emphasis on the patterns of family formation, change, and dissolution is important in any study of housing demand in Toronto. However, one must also note the importance of the one person non-family unit which included 18% of all households in 1976.

There have been substantial changes in the family composition of households which include the increasing importance of the one person household and the decreasing proportion of households shared by a family with other persons. Some evidence of this is also presented in Table 1. There, it can be seen that one family households without additional persons and multiple-person non-family households have grown at about the same rate as total households from 1951 to 1976. One person households have grown much faster at an annual compounded rate of 10.6%. However, one family households with additional persons present and multiple family households have increased only slightly or declined over this period. This would indicate that some amount of the total growth in households in Toronto can best be understood in terms of "undoubling";
Figure 1: The Growth of Households, Population, and Families in the Toronto CMA, 1951 to 1976.

Note: Population here includes both private and non-private individuals.
the establishment of separate households by families or individuals who previously resided in a dwelling shared with other persons.

The family composition changes witnessed in Table 1 are reflected in changes in the size distribution of Toronto households from 1951 to 1976. From Table 2 can again be seen the rapid rise in relative terms of the one-person household. At the same time, the slow but steady proportionate growth of the two-person household is noteworthy. All other size classes of households have declined relatively with the greatest reductions occurring in households with more than six persons. The result of these trends was that, by 1976, the most common household size had become two persons with one, three, and four-person households more or less tied for second place.

3. The Approach Taken

In Canada, a high value has been placed on privacy and independence by many individuals in recent decades. The desire to "lead a separate life", although not universal, has led many people to want to share their accommodations only with spouse, children, and/or close friends. Further, this desire has created a demand for the kinds of housing units which afford privacy. In particular, housing units wherein one group of individuals must pass through another's living quarters to reach their own have fallen into disfavour. It is no accident therefore that, in the Censuses, the definitions of both family and household embody these goals of privacy and independence.
Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Households by Number of Persons; Toronto CMA, 1951 to 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Per Household</th>
<th>1951 (%)</th>
<th>1956 (%)</th>
<th>1961 (%)</th>
<th>1966 (%)</th>
<th>1971 (%)</th>
<th>1976 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1951 Census of Canada, Vol. 3, Table 47.
1956 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 36.
1961 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 5.
1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 5.
While on the one hand there has been a high value placed on privacy and independence, there have also been factors present which restrict or enhance the ability of individuals to realize this goal. Some of these factors are specifically economic in nature. These include for example the price and availability of different kinds of housing units, the incomes of individuals, and the extent of housing subsidies. Other factors are more non-economic in nature. Consider for example the variety of social factors motivating the behaviour of widowed grandparents, young adults about to leave their parents' homes for the first time, and unattached individuals considering the prospect of living together. This great variety of reasons why people choose particular living arrangements makes it difficult to generalize about changing patterns of household formation.

Most empirical studies tend to emphasize the effects of changes in the age, sex, and marital status structure of a population on household formation. Underlying this approach is a commonly held view that people pass through one of a number of kinds of "life cycles", the most prevalent being some sort of family life cycle with for instance marriage, child-bearing, child-rearing, child-launching, retirement, and widowhood phases. In such a view, the number and sizes of family units, say, at any point in time is a function of the number of persons in each stage of this family life cycle. Since the age, sex, and marital status of a person is usually a good clue as to his or her life cycle status, shifts in the age distribution of the population are one indicator of changes in household formation.
However, it would be foolish to argue that all household formation can be predicted from a knowledge of future age, sex, and marital status distributions alone for at least three reasons. First, new kinds of (non-family) life cycles have become more popular in recent times. These new kinds of life cycles are not as well understood as the family life cycle making it more difficult to attach household formation tendencies to specific age, sex, and marital status groups. Secondly, among individuals following the family life cycle, there have been changes in the average ages at which specific phases such as marriage, childbirth, and widowhood take place. This also alters relationships between age and household formation. Finally, the family life cycle describes only family formation and change characteristics. It does not directly translate into household formation. To make this last connection, one must examine the living arrangements of different kinds of family units; i.e., under what circumstances does a family choose to form its own household as opposed to residing with other individuals or families.

Thus, an explanation of the growing stock of households in Toronto from 1951 to 1976 must cover several topics. First, it has to explain the changing age distribution of the population. Secondly, it has to explain the changing marital status and family formation characteristics of different age and sex cohorts. Thirdly, it has to explain the changing pattern of living arrangements of different age, sex and marital status cohorts. In providing these explanations, a mixture of economic and noneconomic rationales are appropriate. In section 4 we will simultaneously look at the first two of these and will follow this up with a discussion.
of changing living arrangements in Section 5.

4. Population Growth, Marital Status Changes, and Fertility Trends

The Toronto CMA has experienced a rapid rate of population growth due to both natural increase and net in-migration. At the same time, as with other urban areas in Canada, there have been marked changes in the relative sizes of different age cohorts. Finally, there have been changes in the patterns both of marriage, separation, divorce and widowhood and of total fertility and child spacing in family planning. All of these changes have repercussions on family and household formation and the size characteristics of these units which need to be considered.

It is difficult to understate the importance of the "baby boom" in Canada on the age distribution of Toronto's population. A measure useful in analyzing this boom is the period Total Fertility Rate (TFR).\(^7\) The TFR for Ontario women between 1921 and 1974 is presented graphically in Figure 2. The high TFR values between roughly 1946 and 1965 and the subsequent sharp decline have had the effect of producing an age-cohort bulge.

This bulge is observable in the age distribution of the Toronto CMA. The under 15 population increased, both absolutely (Table 3) and proportionately (Figure 3) from 1951 to 1966. The absolute change in this cohort was positive until 1971 but subsequently was negative as the

\(^7\)The Total Fertility Rate in year 't' is the number of live births expected from 1,000 women who are age 15 in year 't' and who proceed through age 49 with the fertility rates observed for women in year 't'.
Figure 2: Total Fertility Rate, Ontario, 1921-1974.

Table 3: Population by Age Groups, Toronto CMA, 1951 to 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15 years</td>
<td>238,700</td>
<td>337,900</td>
<td>527,700</td>
<td>630,700</td>
<td>707,300</td>
<td>662,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>161,900</td>
<td>171,000</td>
<td>225,700</td>
<td>322,800</td>
<td>463,200</td>
<td>508,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>197,600</td>
<td>250,100</td>
<td>298,200</td>
<td>311,500</td>
<td>401,400</td>
<td>483,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>173,200</td>
<td>207,500</td>
<td>278,300</td>
<td>325,700</td>
<td>354,900</td>
<td>359,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>247,900</td>
<td>277,500</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>503,100</td>
<td>560,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 or more</td>
<td>98,200</td>
<td>114,100</td>
<td>142,600</td>
<td>162,800</td>
<td>198,200</td>
<td>229,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,117,500</td>
<td>1,358,000</td>
<td>1,824,500</td>
<td>2,158,500</td>
<td>2,628,000</td>
<td>2,803,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Population here includes both private and non-private persons

Sources: 1951 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 25.
         1956 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 20.
         1966 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 23.
         1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 1(2), Table 12.
Figure 3: Percentage Distributions of Population by Age Groups, Toronto CMA, 1951 to 1976.

Source: See Table 3.
as the bulk of the baby boom began to mature into the 15–24 age group. Further, by 1976, the leading edge of the baby boom had begun to swell the 25–34 age cohort.

In addition to changes in the age composition of Toronto’s population, there have been substantial alterations in the marital status of individuals residing in the CMA. The percentage distributions of age cohorts by marital status (single, married, widowed, and divorced) are presented in Figure 4(a) through 4(d). The proportion single (i.e., proportion never married) contains two trends. On the one hand, an increasing proportion of persons aged 15 through 34 are remaining single while among those over 35 this proportion is decreasing. This same trend shows through in the percent married distributions with the 15 through 34 age cohorts showing the most rapid decline from 1956 to 1976. However, the percent married among 35–44 year olds has recently also begun a slight decline; apparently due to the increasing divorce rate. The percent widowed has declined for all age groups except those over 65 due either to increased male survivorship or to remarriage of widowed spouses. Finally, the divorce rates for all age groups have climbed sharply over the period although the most rapid rate of increase occurred in the late 1960’s with the liberalization of divorce laws.

What kinds of explanations have been forwarded for these temporal trends. Let us examine first the explanations of changing patterns of first marriage, divorce, widowhood, and remarriage. Subsequently we shall look at the pattern of child-bearing.
Figure 4(a): Percent Single by Age Cohorts; Toronto CMA, 1956 to 1976.
Figure 4(b): Percent Married by Age Cohorts; Toronto CMA, 1956 to 1976
Figure 4(c): Percent Widowed by Age Cohort; Toronto CMA, 1956 to 1976.
Figure 4(d): Percent Divorced by Age Cohort: Toronto CMA, 1956 to 1976

Note: Includes both private and non-private persons.

Sources: 1956 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 31.
         1966 Census of Canada, Vol. 1, Table 36.
         1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 1(4), Table 3.
4.1 Age at First Marriage

Evidence on age at first marriage is not available for the Toronto CMA. However, for Canada as a whole, it is possible to calculate First Marriage Rates by age and sex groups for census years. These Rates are the ratios of first-time brides or grooms during the year to the population of single persons in that age-sex cohort as enumerated in the Census of June 1 of that year. First Marriage Rates for Canadian men and women between 1951 and 1976 are presented in Figure 5. Several trends over this time period are noteworthy;

(1) the relatively stable rate for men under 20 years of age,
(2) the generally increasing rates for men between 20 and 29 from 1951 to 1971 followed by a sharp drop in 1976,
(3) among men over 30, a declining rate from 1951 to 1961 followed by a small but unsteady upsurge since then,
(4) the steady decline since 1956 in the rate for women under 20,
(5) the steady rate for women 20-24 from 1956 to 1971 with a subsequent sharp drop in 1976,
(6) the bumpy decline in First Marriage Rates for women 25-34, and
(7) the relatively stable rates for women over 35.

The major changes being witnessed since 1956 are thus among men aged 20-30 and women under 30. The 25-29 age group has had sharply declining First Marriage Rates since 1966 while among 20-24 year olds the decline is evident only after 1971. Among females under 20, the decline was initiated after 1956.

What has caused this decline in First Marriage Rates among the under 30's? Some researchers such as Freiden (1974), Preston and Richards
Figure 5: First Marriage Rates by Age-Sex Cohorts; Canada, 1951 to 1976.

Sources: Computed from: (1) Vital Statistics, Volume 2; 1976, Table 6. (2) Census of Canada: 1951-Vol. 2, Table 1
1956-Vol. 1, Table 28
1961-Vol. 1(3), Table 78
1966-Vol. 1, Table 34
1971-Vol. 1(4), Table 1
1976-Vol. 2, Table 22.
(1975), and Walsh (1970) see this trend as primarily the result of improved educational and job opportunities for women. They argue that young women make a choice between educational and/or labour force participation on the one hand and marriage and child-bearing on the other. In choosing to go to school or work, the young woman is seen to defer, or even opt out of, marriage. They suggest that the job alternative has become more attractive with the erosion of sex discrimination in hiring, the move toward pay equality for men and women and the increasing public acceptance of working women.

Others also see marriage as an economic decision but put an emphasis on the aspirations of both spouses. Easterlin (1972), Festy (1973), and Dixon (1971) for example all argue that family formation is related to economic well-being. They suggest that young adults considering marriage and child-bearing look at their incomes and potential standard of living. Also, given that family formation tends to coincide with new household formation, there is often a quantum jump in the cost of living which must be borne by the new family. Such economic considerations are seen to be an important factor in the marriage decision.

Another group of researchers suggest that changing marriage patterns are a consequence of the marriage "squeeze." This argument is built on two observations; (i) the tendency for women to marry men two to five years older than themselves, and (ii) the maturing "baby boom" of the late 1960's and the 1970's. During this period, the number of 20-24 year olds, for example, has been markedly larger than the number of 25-29 year olds. Thus, women approaching marriageable ages have tended to find a
shortage of eligible (older) males. Proponents such as Hall (1976) suggest that more women have deferred or opted out of marriage because of this "squeeze".

A final group of writers would suggest that changing marriage patterns are due to evolving sets of social values. One manifestation is the apparently increasing extent of common law marriage not counted in the data presented which provides an alternative (either temporary or permanent) to legal marriage. Another manifestation is the increasing public tolerance of gay individuals and their lifestyles. Another manifestation, it is often argued, concerns commonly-held attitudes about the best age for first marriage. Carter and Glick (1976) for example suggest that the late 20's are the most preferred age. The decline in marriages involving persons under 25 since 1972, they would argue, is merely an indication of this emerging preference.

4.2 Age at Divorce

As seen in Figure 4(d), there have been marked changes in the stock of divorced persons in the Toronto CMA. Such a census count includes only those divorced persons who have not since remarried and therefore does not lend itself to an analysis of current divorce patterns. Any analysis of time trends is further complicated by the federal divorce legislation of July 2, 1968. This legislation widened the grounds for divorce and made divorces easier to obtain. Further, data on divorce patterns prior to 1969 are very sketchy and reliance here must be placed on post-1968 data.
It is possible to calculate age-specific Divorce Rates for Canada in 1971 and 1976. These Rates are the ratios of divorces granted by age-sex group during a census year to the population of married persons in that cohort as enumerated in the census. These Rates are presented below in Table 4. As can be seen from this table, the age groups most prone to divorce are the 25-34 year olds although the Rates are also quite high for all other age groups between 20 and 49. Further, the rapid increase in these Divorce Rates between 1971 and 1976 is evident for all age groups.

Table 4: Age-Specific Divorce Rates for Michael's U.S. Sample of Females (1960 and 1970) and Canadian Men and Women (1971 and 1976).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1960 (%)</th>
<th>1970 (%)</th>
<th>1971 (%)</th>
<th>1976 (%)</th>
<th>1971 (%)</th>
<th>1976 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or older</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Data from R.T. Michael (1978)
Canadian data calculated from:
(1) 1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 1(4), Table 1.
(2) 1976 Census of Canada, Vol. 2, Table 22.
Tables 20 (1972) and 16 (1976).
While such Divorce Rates are not available for earlier census dates, it is instructive to compare them with similar, earlier data for the United States. Michael (1978) has estimated Divorce Rates, for women alone, for a 15-state area of the U.S. in both 1960 and 1970. His estimates are included in Table 4 and they suggest a rapid increase in Divorce Rates between 1960 and 1970. Further, while the Canadian and U.S. Rates are somewhat comparable for women over 30, the Canadian data lag for behind comparable U.S. Rates for the younger age cohorts.

What explanations have been offered for those patterns? A number of authors suggest factors similar to those used in explaining the declining popularity of marriage; improved educational and job opportunities for women and more liberal attitudes toward marriage, divorce, and living arrangements. In the U.S. case the Vietnam War has also been singled out as leading to many divorces between returning soldiers and their spouses. This latter explanation also might help to explain the very high divorce among U.S. women under 25 compared to Canadian women. Other researchers such as Weed (1974) have suggested that an important factor has been the incidence of marriage among teen-agers; the age group most prone to subsequent divorce. Finally, Michael (1978) has suggested that the rising rate of divorce is attributable to the increasing age of mothers at first birth. Divorce is often seen to be less difficult when there are no children present. Thus he suggests that delays in childbearing after marriage enhance the desirability of divorce for some couples.
4.3 Age at Widowhood

There appears to be little published data on the incidence of widowhood. Although death data are relatively complete, no direct record is kept of the number and ages of widows and widowers created by these deaths. Therefore, one can only speculate on how the patterns of widowhood have changed since 1951.

A glance at Figure 4(c) might suggest that the frequency of widowhood status has remained constant for the over 64's while on the decline among all younger age groups. While this may be true, there are at least two phenomena which might be distorting 4(c). One is the incidence of remarriage of widowed persons which will be discussed in the next section. The other is the differential between the two sexes. It has been suggested that among the over-64's, the relatively steady proportion widowed is a combination of a rising rate of female widowhood and a declining rate of male widowhood. This is argued to arise from the steadily growing differential in mortality rates between the sexes as described by Rutherford (1975). In other words, not only are women and men living longer but women are as well increasingly outliving men.

The net effect of these changing mortality rates on married couples is quite clear. Because life expectancy is increasing for both partners they can expect to spend a longer time together. Notably, this increase usually arises in the post-child-launching phase of the family life cycle. Further, because of their relative gain in life expectancy, women can expect to spend a greater part of their lives in a widowed state.
4.4 Age at Remarriage

Remarriage, of course, can occur to a person who was previously married but had in the interim become either widowed or divorced. The Remarriage Rates for these two groups are, however, quite different. In Figures 6 and 7 are presented the Remarriage Rates for both divorced and widowed persons in Canada between 1951 and 1976. By comparing Figure 6 with the earlier Figure 5, it can be seen that the Remarriage Rates for divorced persons tend to be much higher than the corresponding First Marriage Rates. Further, from Figure 7, the Rates for widowed persons are on the same order of magnitude as First Marriage Rates.

At the same time, these two sets of remarriage rates show some similar patterns. Some noteworthy common features are:

(1) the overall decline in remarriage rates for virtually all cohorts,

(2) the especially rapid decline from 1956 to 1971 in the under-40 age groups.

(3) the higher remarriage rates for males than for females at all but the youngest age group, and

(4) the greater volatility of male remarriage rates over time, especially among the under 35's.

There is very little discussion in the demography literature of the remarriage behaviour of divorced or widowed persons. What there is suggests the same reasons as for the decline in first-marriage rates. Economic and educational opportunities for women and more liberal attitudes towards marriage and non-marriage are offered to explain the long-term decline in remarriage rates. An explanation for the volatility of remarriage rates for younger divorced males might be in terms of the
Figure 6: Age and Sex-Specific Remarriage Rates for Divorced Persons, Canada, 1951 to 1976.

Note: Remarriage Rate is the percent ratio of divorced persons remarrying in a given year to the census stock of divorced persons in that year.

Sources: See Figure 5.
Figure 7: Age and Sex-Specific Remarriage Rates for Widowed Persons; Canada, 1951 to 1976.

Note: Remarriage Rate is the percent ratio of widowed persons remarrying in a given year to the census stock of widowed persons in that year.

Sources: See Figure 5.
business cycle. If younger males are the group most adversely affected by high unemployment rates, then one might expect to see remarriage rates decline during recessions. Add to this, the financial hardship commonly faced by the divorced person considering remarriage (new household costs plus alimony and/or support payments) and the dependence of remarriage rates for younger males on economic conditions becomes more pronounced. It is therefore not surprising that remarriage rates for younger males should be high in 1951, 1956 and 1966 (years with relatively low unemployment) and low in 1961, 1971, and 1976 (years with high unemployment.)

4.5 Fertility and Ages of Parents

The Total Fertility Rate data for Ontario presented in Figure 2 earlier show up the magnitude of the baby boom from 1940 to 1960 and the subsequent "bust". To a certain extent, this boom and bust pattern is present in all age-specific fertility rates as well. There have however also been shifts in the relative frequency of childbearing for women at different ages and in the ages at which different birth orders occur. It is these variations that will be explored now.

---

8 The rather abrupt drops in remarriage rates in 1971 for widowed men 25-34 requires some additional explanation. An examination of the numerator and denominator of the remarriage rate suggests the importance of the volatility of the denominator in 1971. For example, remarriages of widowed males aged 25-29 were 140 in 1966, 134 in 1971, and 140 in 1976. The census counts of widowed males in those respective years were 572, 1615, and 795. Thus a very high 1971 census count of widowed males aged 25-34 seems to be part of the cause of the abrupt decline in this cohort's remarriage rates in 1971.
Age specific fertility rates for Canada between 1951 and 1976 are presented in Figure 8. In 8(a) are graphed the number of live births by age of mother per 1000 women in that age group. Several trends are noteworthy;

1. the decline in fertility rates for all age groups after about 1961,
2. the peak in fertility rates for women over 30 being closer to 1956 while for younger women being closer to 1961, and
3. for women over 30, a relatively greater drop in fertility over the period.

To some extent, any underlying patterns in 8(a) might be affected by the changing marital statuses of women between 1951 and 1976. In 8(b) are graphed the number of live births by age of mother per 1000 married women in that age group. These latter rates show much in common with the rates in 8(a) with the following exceptions noted;

1. for all age groups the peak in fertility rates now appears to be around 1951-1956 instead of 1956-1961, and
2. the relative decline in fertility among 15-19 year olds is considerably attenuated.

An examination of the ages of mothers at the births of first, second, third, and later children provides additional information. In Figure 9 a series of such fertility rates is presented. In 9(a) for example are presented the number of first births by age of mother per 1000 married women in that age group. From these data, a number of

9 Note that this includes all births regardless of the marital status of the mother.

10 Note that by summing these fertility rates in 9(a) through 9(d) for any one age cohort, one obtains the appropriate curve in Figure 8(b).
Figure 8: Age-Specific Fertility Rates for Canadian Women; 1951 to 1976.

Sources: Census of Canada: 1951 - Vol. 2, Table 1.
1956 - Vol. 1, Table 28.
1961 - Vol. 1(3), Table 78.
1966 - Vol. 1, Table 34.
1971 - Vol. 1(4), Table 1.
1976 - Vol. 2, Table 22.
Figure 9: Marital Fertility Rates by Birth Order; Canada, 1951 to 1976.

Sources: Computed from Figure 8 and Vital Statistics Tables 38 and 40 (1951), Table 16 (1956), Table B11 (1961), Table B11 (1966), Table 13 (1971), and Table 11 (1976).
observations are drawn;

(1) at all ages there is a very marked decline in fourth and higher order fertility rate after about 1961,

(2) a similar though less sharp decline is found in third order fertility rates,

(3) a sharp decline in first and second order fertility rates among 15-24 year old women after anywhere from 1956 to 1966, and

(4) among 25-34 year old women, variable first and second order fertility rates showing an upward trend since about 1966.

These patterns are quite consistent with arguments that Figure 8(b) is a reflection of both an increasing delay of initial child-bearing and an increasing preference for smaller family sizes.

What kinds of explanations have been offered for these fertility trends? Most researchers see fertility behaviour as a matter of conscious choice by one or both parents. Sometimes, their hypotheses assume that the parents have some fixed notions as to a best starting age and a most desirable 'completed' family size. At other times, their hypotheses assume merely that parents make a choice about additional children one at a time.\(^\text{11}\) Nevertheless, underlying either approach is a view that fertility behaviour represents a conscious rather than random choice.

Some of these explanations are inter-related with the marriage decision itself. The increasing labour force participation of women combined with improved wage levels may make (early) marriage less attrac-

\[^{11}\text{A perspective adopted for example by Lee and Khan (1978) and Hout (1978).}\]
tive specifically because it often entails child-bearing which can restrict such labour force activity. Thus in that delays in initial child-birth and overall family size reductions may be conducive to increased labour force participation, delays in, or opting out of, marriage may become attractive.

Several economic rationales have been offered for the increased delay in initial child-birth and lower completed family sizes. These are usually cast in terms of the costs and benefits of child-bearing; the decline of child labour which reduces "benefits" to parents, the increasing formal education period which raises the "cost" of having the child, and improved old age welfare and pension programs which reduce the need for supporting offspring.

Another important economic factor has been rising incomes. Some writers have suggested that a rising family income tends to increase the demand for children (the income effect) but that this effect is swamped by the increased amount spent per child (the "price" effect) which is very income elastic. The net effect is thus seen to be a decreased number of (more expensive) children as family incomes increase.

---

12 See for example Hogan (1978), Mott (1972) and Walsh (1970).

13 This line of argument is followed by Becker (1973), Michael (1973), Sanderson and Willis (1971), Willis (1973), and Becker and Lewis (1973).
Other researchers have suggested instead that rising incomes lower the number of children desired by another means. They argue that conspicuous consumption increases with income levels and that larger family sizes are not as desirable when income increases as are other forms of "consumption". Still another group of researchers has suggested that tastes and preferences change with income level and that this leads to shrinking family sizes and delayed initiation of child-bearing.

Non-economic rationales have also been forwarded to explain the decline in fertility. Changes in religious beliefs, increasing public concern over environmental preservation, and the recent focus on zero population growth have all served to change attitudes toward child-bearing. Further, the acceptance of new contraceptive methods, particularly in the 1960's, has enabled couples to better bring their actual child-bearing experience into line with their 'desired' level. Finally, the decline in infant mortality rates over the past several decades has had some effect in reducing the desired number of births by ensuring that a greater proportion of live births survive to some older age.

Most of the above arguments suggest a long-term decline in fertility rates. The "boom" and "bust" experience since 1940 however requires some additional explanation. One of the best of these appears to be Easterlin's (1972) Relative Economic Status hypothesis. His hypothesis is built on three assumptions which may be paraphrased as follows:

Al. Under prevailing social norms, the most desirable family sizes call for between 2 and 4 children. Within this range the couple is usually indifferent as to size.
A2. The number of children a couple will have (between 2 and 4) is basically determined by the number of fertile years covered by the marriage. The older is the woman at the time of marriage, the fewer children (i.e., closer to 2) can be expected. This arises, he argues, because fertility experience at younger ages conditions expectations about completed family size.

A3. In deciding when to marry, young couples weigh their economic status relative to that of their parents at the time they left their parents' homes. The lower their relative economic status is, the more likely they are to delay marriage.

Easterlin presents evidence to support his argument that fertility behaviour and relative economic status are highly correlated over the 1940-1970 period for the United States. His model seems to correctly predict both the 1940-1960 fertility boom and the subsequent bust.

5. Living Arrangements

In this section, we shall look at the living arrangements of different age, sex and marital status cohorts. First, the behaviour of single individuals will be examined. Following this will be an analysis of the living arrangements of married, widowed and divorced persons in turn.

5.1 Single Persons

It is helpful to look at the living arrangements of single persons in three steps. First, we shall look at the leaving-home phase of the young adult's life. Then, we shall investigate the post leaving-home living arrangements of singles at different ages. Finally, these two will be combined to look at the overall pattern for single persons.

Historical data on the home-leaving of single persons in Canada are somewhat scarce. For this reason, we begin with Kobrin's (1976)
analysis of young males and females in the United States. Kobrin found that between the Censuses of 1940 and 1970 there has been a marked increase in the proportion of single 18-24 year olds residing with unrelated individuals (i.e., away from their parents' homes). Similar trends are observable for 15-24 year olds in Ontario although Census data for this are available only from 1966 onwards. In both Canada and the United States, young adults appear to be leaving their parents homes at younger ages and in greater numbers now than used to be the case twenty or thirty years ago.

Looking at the living arrangements of single ex-children over 24, evidence can be found of some dramatic changes in household headships rates in recent years. In figure 10 are presented age and sex-specific headship rates for Ontario non-children singles between 1961 and 1976. Striking features are:

(1) the rapid increase in headship rates for all age and sex cohorts with no evidence to date of any attenuation,

(2) the rapid convergence of these rates for all over-24 age groups for each sex, and

(3) the greater tendency for women than for men to be household heads once away from their parents's home.

Several factors have been forwarded to explain both this earlier home-leaving and greater incidence of headship among single persons. Some researchers have viewed it primarily in terms of rising incomes. They argue that both young and single adults now are better able to afford separate housing. Although critics might point to the increasing average length of school attendance and question how young adults in
Figure 10: Household Headship Rates for Never-Married Private Persons who are no Longer Children by Age and Sex; Ontario, 1961-1976.

Note: These data exclude individuals for whom relationship to head of household could not be determined. This averaged about 40,000 persons in all marital status cohorts in each census.

1966 Census of Canada, Vol. 2, Table 93.
1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 85.
1976 Census of Canada, Vol. 3, Table 47.
particular can be so affluent, proponents such as Beresford and Rivlin (1966) point to the rapidly rising labour force participation of students and other young adults alike.

Other writers have suggested that the provision of modern, inexpensive, available, and easy-to-maintain housing has helped to attract singles. The high-rise apartment, tiny though it may be, with its shag rug, dishwasher, and frost-free refrigerator, its potential anonymity, and its minimal upkeep is argued to have provided a housing alternative to single adults which did not exist before.

Finally, still others have argued that the increase in headship rates for single adults reflect only small quantitative changes in the nature of the housing being occupied. Whereas in earlier times, a single person may have been a lodger, occupying a single room, he or she is now more likely to be residing in a bachelor or bachelorette apartment. The addition of private cooking and toilets facilities and a private entrance has resulted in a new household but the amount of floorspace occupied (or some other housing consumption measure) has perhaps remained the same.

Whatever the reasons, the increasing tendency of young singles to live apart from their parents and the increasing incidence of headship among single ex-children have wrought substantial changes in the headship rates for (all) single persons. Such rates for the Toronto CMA in 1961 and 1976 are presented in Table 5. These data show a pronounced increase in headship rates among all cohorts over the period. The
Table 5: Household Headship Rates by Age and Sex for Single Persons; Toronto CMA, 1961 and 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These headship rates are the proportion of all persons in a cohort who are household heads. The denominator thus includes both private and non-private persons.

Sources: 1961 Census of Canada; Vol. 2(1), Table 28, and Vol. 1(3), Table 80.
1976 Census of Canada; Vol. 2, Table 24, and Vol. 3, Table 44.
average annual (compounded) rate of increase for each cohort is also displayed in Table 5 and these rates of increase are markedly higher for the younger age groups. Unfortunately, similar data for other years are not published for the Toronto CMA. By examining the headship rates for all single persons in Canada as a whole (Figure 11) however, it can be seen that these rates have increased generally steadily over the entire 1951 to 1976 period.

These headship rate increases have been associated for the most part with the formation of small households. In the Toronto CMA in 1976, for example, about 3/4 of all households headed by a single person over 34 are of size one and about 1/6 are of size two. In the 25-34 age group, the respective fractions are 2/3 of size one and 1/4 of size two. 14

5.2 Married Persons

The general tendency is, of course, for married persons to reside in families. In Ontario in 1976, just under 97% of all married persons were members (spouse and/or parent) of families. In Figure 12 are presented the rates of non family membership by age and sex for Ontario residents since 1961. From this figure, it can be seen that family membership has become increasingly more frequent since 1961 for age groups over 34 years old. The opposite pattern has been the case for the under 35 age group however.

14 Computed from the 1976 Census of Canada: Vol. 3, Table 44.
Figure 11: Headship Rates by Age and Sex for Single Persons; Canada, 1951 to 1976.

Note: These headship rates are the proportion of all persons in a cohort who are household heads. The denominator thus includes both private and non-private persons.

Source: (1) 1951-1971 data are taken from Statistics Canada (1975). Household and Family Projections for Canada and the Provinces to 2001. Tables 4.1 and 4.3

(2) 1976 data computed from the 1976 Census of Canada; Vol. 2, Table 22, and Vol. 3, Table (43).
Figure 12: Percent of Private Married Age and Sex Cohorts Not in Families; Ontario, 1961 to 1976.

Note: These data exclude individuals for whom relationship to head of household could not be determined. This averaged about 40,000 persons in all marital status cohorts in each census.

1966 Census of Canada, Vol. 2, Table 93.
1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 85.
1976 Census of Canada, Vol. 3, Table 47.
Let us now turn our attention to the family unit. It can be seen in Table 6 that in the Toronto CMA, a family unit has increasingly come to mean a household unit. The number of families not maintaining their own households has shrunk from 1951 to 1976 at a compounded rate of 3.5% per annum.

The effect of undoubling here is quite substantial. To give some idea, suppose that the low 1951 ratio of families maintaining own households (i.e., $235,900/302,400 = 0.780$) had not changed through 1976. In 1976, there would have been only 558,900 families maintaining their own households (i.e., $0.780 \times 716,500$) or 130,300 fewer such families than actually materialized. From Table 1, it can be now seen that undoubling since 1961 may account for something on the order of 20% (i.e., $30,000/636,300$) of the total increase in households. Such calculations show up the very important influence of undoubling over the 1951 to 1976 period.

At the same time, Table 5 can also be used to speculate on the future effects of undoubling. By 1976, 96.2% of all families in Toronto were maintaining their own households. Thus, future undoubling by families should have a quite limited effect on total household growth.

What kinds of family units tend to be doubled up? For the most part, these tend to be families which can be thought to be in difficult economic circumstances. One such category is the recently-arrived immigrant family. In Table 7, Toronto CMA families in the 1961 and 1971 censuses are subdivided by whether or not the head immigrated to Canada within the preceding fifteen years. A fifteen year period is used here
### Table 6: Families by Living Arrangements, Toronto CMA, 1951-1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Own Household</td>
<td>235,900</td>
<td>294,500</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>488,100</td>
<td>615,500</td>
<td>689,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Maintaining Own Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Relatives</td>
<td>27,900</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Unrelated Persons</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>66,400</td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>46,600</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>27,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>302,400</td>
<td>360,900</td>
<td>466,500</td>
<td>534,700</td>
<td>652,700</td>
<td>716,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Families</td>
<td>937,400</td>
<td>1,150,400</td>
<td>1,581,300</td>
<td>1,879,900</td>
<td>2,247,000</td>
<td>2,371,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons not in Families</td>
<td>180,100</td>
<td>207,600</td>
<td>243,200</td>
<td>278,600</td>
<td>381,000</td>
<td>431,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1951 Census of Canada, Vol. 3, Table 130.  
Table 7: Percentage Distributions of Families by Living Arrangement and Immigration of Head; Toronto CMA, 1961 and 1971.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living Arrangement</th>
<th>1961 Census</th>
<th></th>
<th>1971 Census</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant Headed</td>
<td>All Other Families</td>
<td>Immigrant Headed</td>
<td>All Other Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1946-1961* (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>1956-1971* (%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Own Household</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Maintaining Own Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Relatives</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with Unrelated Persons</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Families</td>
<td>127,000</td>
<td>339,000</td>
<td>153,100</td>
<td>499,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Includes up to June 1 of Census year.

Sources: 1961 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(1), Table 77.
1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(2), Table 70.
because it provides the only comparable data between the two census although a shorter period would have been more suitable for examining recently-arrived immigrants. Nonetheless, in Table 6 it is seen that these immigrant-headed families are overall more than twice as likely as other families to be not maintaining their own household.

Other categories of family units which might be in difficult economic conditions are the young family and the lone-parent family. In Table 8 are presented data on the proportions of different types Toronto families in 1971, headed by married persons of various ages, who do not maintain their own households. These data support the argument that families headed by a person under 25 or by a lone parent (especially a young lone parent) are much more likely to be living with relatives or lodging.

In light of the above, the extent of family undoubling in the Toronto CMA since 1951 is all the more surprising. The boom in young families from the mid 1960's onwards with the maturing of the baby boom should have increased the incidence of families not maintaining their own households. Further, the increasing incidence of divorce since 1969 should have also contributed to this by increasing the incidence of one-parent families. In order to accommodate the undoubling that has occurred, the proportions of families maintaining their own households have increased since 1951 for all age groups but especially for those under 55. Evidence on the rate of decline from 1951 to 1976 in the proportion of Toronto CMA families not maintaining their own households is presented in Table 9.
Table 8: Proportion of Families Not Maintaining Own Household By Family Type and Age of Head for Married Heads. Toronto CMA, 1971.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Head</th>
<th>Husband and Wife at Home</th>
<th>Husband Only at Home</th>
<th>Wife Only at Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>594,125</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>2,215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1971 Census of Canada, Vol. 2(2), Table 52.
Table 9: Proportions of Families Not Maintaining Own Household by Age and Sex of Head;
Toronto CMA, 1951 to 1971.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1951 Census of Canada; Vol. 3, Table 137.
1961 Census of Canada; Vol. 2(1), Table 74.
1966 Census of Canada; Vol. 2, Table 80.
1971 Census of Canada; Vol. 2(2), Table 52.
This increasing tendency of families to maintain their own households shows up clearly in headship rate data for married persons. See Table 10. For married males, the headship rates have been very high and therefore (with the exception of the under 25 group) have experienced only small increases between 1961 and 1976.

The increasing rate of headship among married females over this period is also quite marked. It is noted of course that the Census definition of a household head excludes a married woman if her spouse is present.\textsuperscript{15} Thus an increase in headship among married women can occur given a combination of the following reasons; (i) an increasing proportion of husbands living apart from their spouses and (ii) an increasing proportion of married (spouse absent) women maintaining their own households rather than residing with another person (e.g., a parent). In Table 9 is presented evidence of the latter reason. Support for the former reason is found in Table 11. There it can be seen that at least since 1966 there has been a sharp upturn in Ontario in the proportion of married woman under 45 who are living apart from their spouses. The opposite trend however is the case for older women.

\textsuperscript{15}In the 1976 Census, the designation of a head was made optional in the case of married couples. In this study, the pre-1976 convention of specifying the male as head was used to redefine headship to conform to earlier data.
| Age Group | Male Heads | | | | Annual | Female Heads | | | | Annual |
|-----------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Under 25  | .593       | .729 | .774 | .852 | 2.4        | .007 | .011 | .022 | .030 | 10.2 |
| 25-34     | .797       | .848 | .901 | .922 | 1.0        | .015 | .020 | .034 | .047 | 7.9  |
| 35-44     | .891       | .919 | .946 | .963 | 0.5        | .024 | .028 | .037 | .047 | 4.6  |
| 45-54     | .909       | .936 | .951 | .969 | 0.4        | .033 | .035 | .040 | .045 | 2.1  |
| 55-64     | .893       | .915 | .927 | .951 | 0.4        | .036 | .034 | .039 | .042 | 1.0  |
| 65 and over | .856     | .871 | .873 | .889 | 0.3        | .041 | .036 | .042 | .045 | 0.6  |

Note: (1) 1976 headship data have been transformed to be compatible in definition with the 1961 through 1971 data.
(2) See note to Table 5.

Sources: 1961 Census of Canada; Vol. 1(3), Table 80 and Vol. 2(1), Table 28.
1966 Census of Canada; Vol. 1, Table 36 and Vol. 2, Table 38
1971 Census of Canada; Vol. 1(4), Table 3 and Vol. 2(1), Table 55.
1976 Census of Canada; Vol. 2, Table 24 and Vol. 3, Table 44.
Table 11: Percent of Private Married Women Living Apart from Their Spouses by Age Group; Ontario, 1961 to 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1961 (%)</th>
<th>1966 (%)</th>
<th>1971 (%)</th>
<th>1976 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>7.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Figure 10

Source: See Figure 10
The size distributions of households headed by married persons have also changed in recent years. In Figure 13 we presented the distributions for married males and females by age group in the Toronto CMA in 1966 and 1976. Among the over-44 male age groups, the 1966 and 1976 distributions are quite similar. The households headed by younger male heads however reflect the sharply dropping fertility rates present since about 1962. Among the 15-24 male age group, this shows up primarily as an increase in two person households and a decline in larger households. In the 25-44 age group of males, the pattern is an increase in two through four person households and a decline in all larger sizes.

The size distributions of households headed by married females have also changed in recent years. From Figure 13, it can be seen that the changes are most apparent in the under-35 and over-54 age groups. Among the under 35's, households of size one and two have become relatively more common. Among the over-54's, the shift has been rather dramatically into one person households exclusively.

5.3 Widowed and Divorced Persons

When a person's marriage is dissolved through the death of a spouse or through divorce, that person may well have to actively reconsider his or her living arrangements. Our interest here is in whether that individual decides to assume (or continue) headship of a household or move into someone else's household. Several main factors condition this choice, the age and sex of the person, the person's
Figure 13: Sizes of Households of Married Heads by Age Groups, Toronto CMA, 1966 and 1976

(a) Married Male Heads
Figure 13: (continued)

(b) Married Female Heads

Note: (1) See Note to Table 10.
(2) ——— 1966; ——— 1976

Source: See Table 9.
income, the presence of relatives, and the presence of dependent children.

Of these, the presence of dependent children is perhaps one of the most useful in predicting household formation. Without dependent children, the widowed or divorced person becomes a nonfamily individual in census terms. The household headship rates for such nonfamily persons in Ontario in 1976 are shown in Table 12. These rates are very similar for the younger age groups to those for the never-married nonchildren cohorts found in Figure 10. In other words, the younger formerly married nonfamily individual is about as likely to be a household head as is the younger never-married nonfamily individual. Differences begin to emerge among formerly-married women over 45 and formerly-married men over 55. These groups have somewhat higher headship rates than do similar never-married groups. This perhaps reflects higher incomes or greater asset accumulations among the formerly-married.

Of course, the likelihood of family status among widowed and divorced persons varies considerably with their age and sex. There are, as shown in Table 13, relatively few widowed and divorced family individuals who are under 25 or over 55. In addition, the customary situation in which divorced wives retain custody of children contributes to a high incidence of non-family status among divorced males. The differences in family status between widowed men and women may reflect both differences in age at marriage and differences in remarriage rates.\(^{16}\)

\(^{16}\) It may well be that widowed men with dependent children are more likely to remarry than either other widowed men or widowed women. Such behaviour could lead to the higher nonfamily rates for widowed men observed in Table 13.
Table 12: Household Headship Rates for Widowed and Divorced Nonfamily Persons by Age and Sex; Ontario, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Divorced and Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Figure 10

Source: 1976 Census of Canada; Vol. 3, Table 47

Table 13: Proportion of Widowed, Divorced Who are Nonfamily Individuals by Age and Sex; Ontario, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Divorced and Separated</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Figure 10

Source: See Table 12
Among widowed and divorced persons who are family members (i.e., heads of families), the incidence of household headship is high. The rates for Ontario individuals in 1976 are shown in Table 14. These rates, both male and female, are very comparable to the headship rates for married males in Table 10. The major discrepancies occur at the younger age groups (particularly the under 25 age group) where the married male is more likely to be a household head than is either the divorced or widowed person.

Why is the family headed by a young divorced or widowed person less likely to maintain its own household. Sweet (1972) examined the living arrangements of widowed, divorced, and separated mothers and found three main sets of reasons; the preferences of the mother, her economic circumstances, and the options open to her. He suggests that the presence of very young children is a strong incentive for a mother to live with relatives or friends who might assist in child-rearing. The absence of very young children better enables a mother to maintain her own household both by reducing the need for child supervision and by increasing the time available for employment and income generation.

In Tables 15 and 16 respectively are presented estimates of the overall headship rates for Toronto CMA widowed and divorced persons between 1961 and 1976. These rates confirm the age and sex differentials expected from the above discussion. At the same time, these rates have for the most part shown steady increases between 1961 and 1976 with the
Table 14: Household Headship Rates for Widowed and Divorced Family Persons by Age and Sex; Ontario; 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.924</td>
<td>.946</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>.954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Figure 10

Source: See Table 12
Table 15: Household Headship Rates by Age and Sex for Widowed Persons; Toronto CMA, 1961 to 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.108*</td>
<td>.115*</td>
<td>2.7*</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.328*</td>
<td>3.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>.660*</td>
<td>4.0*</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.575</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.571</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: (1) *These data are considered to be under-estimates because of unusually large counts of young widowed persons in 1971 and 1976. See text.

(2) See note to Table 5.

Source: See Table 10.
Table 16: Household Headship Rates by Age and Sex for Divorced Persons; Toronto CMA, 1961 and 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male Heads 1961</th>
<th>Male Heads 1976</th>
<th>Annual Increase (%)</th>
<th>Female Heads 1961</th>
<th>Female Heads 1976</th>
<th>Annual Increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and Over</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.702</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Table 5.

Source: See Table 5.
largest gains among the younger cohorts.  

Kobrin (1973) presents a novel argument to explain the increasing incidence of headship in recent years among elderly widowed and divorced women. Kobrin asserts that an increase in the incidence of such women living by themselves since 1950 is not necessarily attributable to a desire for privacy and the enhanced economic capacity to effect it. Rather it is argued that such women have had few children because of the low fertility rates between 1925 and 1945. Therefore, it is concluded that a larger proportion of these women have no willing off-spring with whom they might live. In this view the current upturn in headship among elderly divorced and widowed persons may be nothing more than a reflection of the low fertility rates three decades before.

6. Conclusion

The past century has been a period of perhaps unparalleled change in the demographic and household formation structure of Toronto's population. There have been four main areas of change. First, there has

---

17 The under-35 headship rates for widowed persons in 1971 and 1976 appear to be under-estimates. In 1971, and to a lesser extent in 1976, there was an unusual increase in the number of young adults relative to the number of heads) who reported themselves as widowed. From 1966 to 1971 for example, there was a 10-fold increase in widowed men under 25 although the number of heads in this cohort went up only 4-fold. Whether this is a counting error, a deliberate mis-response on the part of young adults, or something else is unknown. It is assumed here the denominator of the headship rate has been over-estimated and the rate therefore under-estimated.
been the maturing of the baby boom. In its infancy prior to the mid-
1960's, this boom meant larger household sizes. In its maturing phase
from the mid - 1960's to mid - 1980's, it has meant and will mean
substantial new household formation. Secondly, there has been an increasing tendency for families to maintain their own households. This 'undoub­
ing' trend has been evident since at least 1951 but by 1976 had pretty
well run its course in terms of contributing to new household formation.
Thirdly, there has been an increasing tendency for un-married individuals,
especially young adults and the elderly, to live on their own or at least
away from family units. This trend is evident throughout the study period
and shows little evidence of dissipating in the near future. Fourthly,
changing attitudes toward marriage and divorce began to appear in the
mid 1960's. The decreasing popularity of marriage, the increase in
families with a spouse absent, the rising rates of divorce, and the
decreasing rates of remarriage are all changes that appear to be continuing
at present.

All four of these demographic changes have contributed to the rapid
change in household formation over the past 25 years. These changes help
to explain why the number of households has increased relatively faster
than the population. They also help to explain why household sizes have
tended to shrink over this period.

In addition, we have reviewed several social and economic hypotheses
which have been forwarded to explain why these demographic changes occurred.
These different hypotheses are sometimes complementary and sometimes at
odds with one another. However, none of those presented appears to be entirely without substance although one might want to argue about relative importance. Further, depending on the appeal of different hypotheses, there are clearly different implications about the near-future growth of households.
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