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‘SELECTION’ or ‘CAUSES’
Possible influencing factors for demographic behaviour not measurable retrospectively and measurable only at time of the survey (1st wave’)

- **CAUSES**
  - **Resources**
    - Labour market status, occupational status
    - Housing
    - Income, assets, poverty
    - Networks
  - Behavioural factors
    - Values
    - Intentions
    - Quality of the partnership

- **CONSEQUENCES**
  - Childbearing
  - Partnership formation
  - Divorce
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'ADAPTATION’ or ‘CONSEQUENCES’
Possible results of demographic behaviour measurable retrospectively and measurable only at time of the future (‘2nd wave’)

- CAUSES
  - Childbearing
  - Partnership formation
  - Divorce

- CONSEQUENCES
  - Resources
    - Labour market status, occupational status ‘carrier’
    - Housing
    - Income, assets, POVERTY (Becoming poor or escaping poverty?)
  - Behavioural ‘outcomes’
    - Values (adaptation?)
    - Intentions (adaptation?)
    - Quality of the partnership
      - Happier or unhappier?
      - More satisfied or not?
    - Perception of the society
      - Uncertainly
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Identifying factors causing poverty: using the first wave as a cross sectional sample

- Modelling structural processes responsible material disadvantage
- Dependent variables:
  - Defining measures of material disadvantage
- Independent variables:
  - Choosing factors what can be assumed as stable before measuring material situation
  - No inclusion subjective variables
Definition of poverty and deprivation

- Parallel usage of different kind of approaches
  - Income poverty
    - (below the 50% of equivalent HH income)
  - Poor housing condition
  - Absolute deprivation (8 items)
  - General deprivation (exclusion)
    - 18 items scale
The ratio of people living in poverty and deprivation, different measure
Independent variables

- Gender
- Age
- Residence
- Ethnicity
- Level of education
- Number of children in the Household
- Marital status
- Partnership Status
- Activity status
- Occupational status
The ratio of people living in poverty and deprivation by level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Income poverty</th>
<th>Absolute poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Összesen (16,8%)  
Összesen (12,4%)
The ratio of people living in poverty and deprivation by number of children in the household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Income poverty</th>
<th>Absolute deprivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (16.8%)

Total (12.4%)
The ratio of people living in poverty and deprivation by marital status and partnership
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Logic of modelling

- Logistic regression
- 1st step, uncontrolled effects
- 2nd step, basic model
  - Gender, age, residence, ethnicity
- 3rd step
  - + Changing demographic factors (number of children, partnership status)
- 4th step
  - + labour market and occupational status
- Define the reference group
Odds ratios of logistic regression models analysing absolute deprivation, uncontrolled effects

Reference group:
- male,
- age group 30–39,
- living in Budapest or county capital,
- not Roma,
- vocational training educational level,
- married,
- one child in the household of the respondent,
- skilled worker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–29 years</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49 years</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59 years</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–69 years</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–75 years</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities/towns, Central and North-western Hungary</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities/towns, Southern and Eastern Hungary</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages, Central and North-western Hungary</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages, Southern and Eastern Hungary</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma ethnicity</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete primary</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Odds ratios of logistic regression models analysing absolute deprivation, basic model

Reference group:
– male,
– age group 30–39,
– living in Budapest or county capital,
– not Roma,
– vocational training educational level,
– married,
– one child in the household of the respondent,
– skilled worker
Odds ratios of logistic regression models analysing absolute deprivation, model2

**Reference group:**
- male,
- age group 30–39,
- living in Budapest or county capital,
- not Roma,
- vocational training educational level,
- married,
- one child in the household of the respondent,
- skilled worker
Odds ratios of logistic regression models analysing income poverty, model2

Reference group:
- male,
- age group 30–39,
- living in Budapest or county capital,
- not Roma,
- vocational training educational level,
- married,
- one child in the household of the respondent,
- skilled worker