	Relationship domain:					
Behavior	Siblings	Other Relatives	Friends	Co-Workers	Any	
Child care	19	29	51	35	67	
Cohabited	8	12	38	18	47	
Non-marital birth	2	4	13	5	17	
Said will not marry	5	9	23	14	32	
35+ and not married	10	27	39	41	73	
Any	34	52	77	58	92	

Table 1. Percent knowing someone who engaged in the designated behavior by type of relationship domain and type of behavior

Number of relationship domains:							
Behavior	0	1	2	3	4	Total	
Child care	33	27	20	13	7	100	
Cohabit	53	25	16	5	2	100	
Non-marital birth	83	13	3	1	0	100	
Said will not marry	68	18	10	3	1	100	
35+ and not married	26	42	22	8	1	100	

Table 2. Percent distribution of the number of relationship domains in which a person knows someone who has engaged in the specified behavior

		Weighted	
Variable	Category	percent	
		distribution	
Gender	Male [#]	51	
	Female	49	
Age	25-29	23	
8-	30-34	22	
	35-39#	17	
	40-44	17	
	45-49	21	
Marital status	Currently single [#]	33	
	Currently married	67	
Education	Junior high	7	
	Senior high [#]	43	
	Professional/other ¹	12	
	Junior college	14	
	University	24	
Coresidence	Co-residing with parents (in-law)	46	
	Not co-residing with parents $(in law)^{\#}$	54	
Size of residence	Large metropolitan eity	22	
Size of residence	Modium size eity [#]	22	
	Small aity	20 18	
	Sinan City Rural area	10	
	Kulai alva	20	

Table 3. Distribution by gender, 5-year age group, marital status, education, coresidence with parents (or parents-in-law), and size of place of residence

[#]Reference category used subsequently in the multivariate analysis.

¹ These are non-university schools that provide training in bookkeeping, accounting and/or computer usage for white collar jobs.

Domain	Child suffer	Woman full life	Man full life	Should not Cohabit	Nonmarital birth	Sex before marriage	
Had a baby in childcare							
Sibling Relative Friend Co-worker Any	0.27*** ² 0.26*** 0.28*** 0.35*** 0.29***	-0.04 0.03 0.19** 0.01 0.14*	-0.17 -0.09 -0.04 - 0.14 * -0.07	-0.10 0.01 0.04 0.02 0.06	0.12 -0.02 0.20** 0.02 0.15*	-0.04 0.01 0.11 0.11 0.10	
Cohabited							
Sibling Relative Friend Co-worker Any	0.11 0.13 0.21** 0.20* 0.19**	0.39** 0.23* 0.39*** 0.18* 0.33***	0.33* 0.24* 0.33*** 0.12 0.26***	0.79*** 0.48*** 0.73*** 0.59*** 0.71***	0.59*** 0.31** 0.53*** 0.32*** 0.49***	0.55*** 0.32** 0.84*** 0.68*** 0.80***	
Had non-marital birth							
Sibling Relative Friend Co-worker Any	0.11 0.02 0.16 0.08 0.09	0.87*** 0.33 0.35 *** 0.23 0.33 ***	0.67* 0.17 0.36*** 0.26 0.27**	0.16 0.06 0.39*** 0.25 0.32***	1.02** 0.10 0.48*** 0.26 0.44***	0.11 0.18 0.15 0.06 0.18 *	
Said might not marry							
Sibling Relative Friend Co-worker Any	-0.09 -0.20 0.03 0.07 -0.00	0.40** 0.43*** 0.43*** 0.26* 0.30***	0.21 0.31** 0.38*** 0.29* 0.26**	-0.11 -0.12 0.17* 0.04 0.13	0.12 0.00 0.19* 0.01 0.06	-0.17 -0.14 0.31 *** 0.21 * 0.24 **	
<u>35+ and not married</u>							
Sibling Relative Friend Co-worker Any	-0.04 -0.07 0.13 0.15 * -0.01	0.30** 0.05 0.17* 0.01 0.13	0.16 -0.12 -0.00 0.13 0.05	-0.03 0.03 0.02 0.08 -0.02	0.10 0.02 0.12 0.07 0.07	0.06 -0.02 0.09 0.44*** 0.33***	

Table 4. Results from ordered logistic regression models of knowledge of behaviors by attitudes,¹ within relationship types

¹ Attitudes are coded so that high scores represent the least traditional position. Significant coefficients are in bold, with * = .05, ** = .01, and *** = .001.

² The value of 0.27 in the upper left cell corresponds to an ordered logistic regression in which the response variable is the respondent's attitude (one of five categories) indicating how much they agree or disagree with the statement that a preschool child suffers if its mother works and the predictor variable is whether the respondent has a sibling with a child in day care.