

**UNITED NATIONS STATISTICAL COMMISSION
and ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**STATISTICAL OFFICE OF THE
EUROPEAN UNION (EUROSTAT)**

CONFERENCE OF EUROPEAN STATISTICIANS

Joint Eurostat/UNECE Work Session on Demographic Projections
(28-30 April 2010, Lisbon, Portugal)

Item 6 – Forecasting demographic components: fertility

**Applying fertility projection system to period effect analysis:
an examination on recent upturn in Japan¹**

Ryuichi Kaneko², National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, Japan

ABSTRACT

Models of population projection play a significant role in analyzing demographic processes as well as forecasting its future course. In this study, I attempt to utilize a fertility projection of the official population projection for the period effect analysis of current fertility trends in Japan. The objective of the paper is three fold; first I demonstrate the usefulness of population projection models in analyzing demographic processes in the past and current as well as in the future, secondly I attempt to classify and clarify the period effects in terms of cohort fertility schedule so that causes and mechanisms of fertility changes can be sorted, and thirdly I apply the framework to the recent peculiar fertility development in Japan, especially the upturn since 2006. As a result, unlike the preceding upturns seen among countries in Europe and North America, the period effects without tempo effect played a major role in recent fall and raise in Japanese fertility, although the recuperation mechanism is also induced in irregular manner by the effects.

1. INTRODUCTION

The role of population projections is to provide information on various changes in the demographic structure, such as population size and age composition by sex, into the future based on assumptions on future course of vital events typically as fertility, mortality and migration. However utilizing their potential as a comprehensive demographic model, they can be of wide range use in analyzing population processes. In this paper, I attempt to use a fertility projection employed as assumption in the official population projection for analysis of the period effects in past and current fertility trends in Japan.

It is crucial to understand the relationships between the period and cohort observations of fertility to seize the essence trends and prospects. As adjustments and adaptation behavior in individual reproductive process take place along with his/her life course, most of the macro regularities in fertility tend to emerge among cohort experiences. Demographic measures, however, usually trace fertility development annually, and try to provide description on it with the lifecycle measures by means of the hypothetical cohort of the period. Hence two lifecycle measures with different values, i.e. those for true and hypothetical cohorts, describe the very same phenomena. Much effort has been made towards the connection and formulation between these measures most notably by Bongaarts and Feeney (1998).

In addition to these formal issues, it is often attempted to understand fertility changes in terms of period and cohort effects, which have different mechanisms to modify fertility trend. In most cases, however, those seem likely to be unsuccessful due to mixture of those effects in practice.

In the present paper, therefore, the period effects are first sorted out according to their ways of effect to cohort fertility schedule. Then applying the cohort-based fertility projection model, separation of the period effect from fertility fluctuations observed in recent Japan is conducted so that the driving forces of changes are to be identified.

¹ This is a draft paper presented to the Joint Eurostat-UNECE Work Session on Demographic Projections (Lisbon, Portugal, 28-30 April, 2010), and to be revised. Do not cite any material in the preset paper.

² E-mail: r-kaneko@ipss.go.jp.

Accordingly the purpose of this paper is a compound of three objectives; (1) to show the usefulness of population projection models in analyzing demographic processes in the past and current as well as in the future, (2) to measure and understand the period effects in terms of modifier of cohort fertility schedule, and applying those new procedures (3) to identify factors and mechanisms of the recent peculiar fertility development in Japan, especially paying attention to whether the small upturn in Japan is induced by the similar mechanisms as working behind the fertility upturns observed among most of countries in Europe and North America.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Historic population trends and the lowest low fertility in Japan

The year 2005 is a dividing ridge of population trends in Japan in several senses; first the population of Japan was announced to have decreased from the previous year for the first time after about hundred and fifty years of rising trend since the closing period of the Tokugawa era, secondly the proportion of population aged 65 and above exceeded one fifth or 20.2 percent marking the highest in the world.

Though the combination of low fertility rate and high longevity is the very cause of these striking population changes of Japan, the prolonged continuation of low fertility rates below the replacement level fertility, which Japan has been experiencing since the 1970s, are of main promoter.

In spite of a series of measures and escalating public awareness, fertility continued to decline until it fell into so called the lowest low level for the first time in 2003, and finally reached the ever lowest TFR of 1.26 in 2005. The number of live births, which exceeded 2.09 million in 1973, had decreased by nearly half, to 1.06 million, in 2005—again the lowest number recorded since the Second World War.

Because of the population momentum, the course of these historic population changes is already inevitable at this point, but the achieved level and pace of changes depend on the future fertility rates, albeit only slightly. The consequence of fertility rise and fall on the society could be of great significance.


As a matter of fact, fertility made an upturn immediately after in 2006 and onward. The TFR rose by 0.06 to 1.32, which is the largest amount of increase since 1970s. It kept rising to 1.34 in 2007, and 1.37 in 2008. It is since 1982-1984 that uprising continues for more than three years. Although the extent of the increase is minor and the level still far below replacement, this recent upturn of fertility is a significant turnaround since it is unique in terms of magnitude and continuation in its past downward trends. A detailed examination of this phenomenon is given.

2.2 On upturn of period fertility rate in 2006 and onward

As already explained, the total fertility rate (TFR) in Japan reached its lowest value ever in 2005. In the following year, however, it showed a surprisingly strong recovery and has been increasing since, at least until 2008. Figure 1 shows the TFR trend together with the development of the population replacement level and different assumptions used for the Population Projections for Japan. In this graph, the values recorded in the three years from 2006 to 2008 are shown as dots. This reversal gives the impression that the constant decline throughout the years leading up to 2005 has suddenly turned around. In fact, the TFR values in 2007 and 2008 are higher than any of the fertility assumptions of the latest official population projections based on the values until 2005, even the high variant assumption.

In the past, such sudden upturns were also observed in the three-year period from 1982 to 1984 as well as in 1994. In the case of the upturn in 1982 to 1984, the TFR of 1.74 in 1981 had increased by 0.07 by 1984. In 1994, an increase of 0.04 was recorded in a single year. The increase observed from 2006 to 2008 amounts to 0.11, which is clearly a significant increase compared to these past upturns. Moreover, the increase of 0.06 in 2006 is the greatest increase observed in a single year since the 1970s.

Figure 1 - Trends of Total Fertility Rate: Observed and Assumed



Source: *The Vital Statistics, NIPSSR(2007)*.

In contrast, looking at the TFR in the years immediately following the periods of past increase, both 1985 and 1995 witnessed relatively sharp reductions of -0.05 and -0.08, respectively. It is not known if this most recent increase will follow the same profile as in the past, or if it might last for a relatively long period of time. However, looking at the monthly development shown below, some deceleration and signs of stagnation can already be observed in 2009.

Whether this recent upturn is temporary or caused by actual, substantive changes in the basic course is considered to be of significant importance when investigating the future fertility trend. The assumptions on fertility rate in the latest population projection, in particular, are based on the actual values measured until 2005, and in the medium-variant scenario the long-term TFR value is projected to end up at the very low level of 1.26. Since this assumption was established by projecting cohort fertility rates, a deviation of actual values in recent years does not directly mean that these assumptions are inappropriate. Nonetheless, if the deviation occurs as a result of more basic changes in the reproductive behaviors, the assumption must be reviewed for the future projections. Thus, this upturn is examined in more detail in the following.

From the mid-1990s to the beginning of the second millennium, one by one, the so-called lowest low fertility countries in Europe experienced reversals of their fertility rate trends. Indeed, as of the time of this writing, the majority of these countries have broken away from the lowest low fertility status (Goldstein et al. 2009). In fact, while the occurrence of reversal of fertility rate trend is not limited to low fertility countries, and the period and degree vary, it can be said that the US and most of the countries in Europe are currently experiencing a steady upturn in fertility rates.

To begin with, with few exceptions, the decline of fertility rates in these countries was generally caused by a general delay of childbearing known as “postponement transition” (Kohler et al. 2002, Sobotka 2004, Billari 2008); Goldstein et al. explain the fertility rate upturns in recent years were caused by the weakened tempo effects on the period fertility rate due to this transitional trend diminishing or dying out. They call this process “tempo transition” (Goldstein et al. 2009). One very important point in this perspective is the interpretation that the cohort fertility rates have not actually reached the level of 1.3, called the lowest low, in any of the countries and this level in the period TFR is a transient phenomenon due to the aforementioned tempo effect.


If this interpretation is correct and the fertility rate upturn in Japan observed since 2006 is caused by a mechanism similar to that of the trend observed in the US and countries in Europe, there is a possibility that the recovery may continue for a relatively long period of time in the same way as has been observed in the US and Europe, in which case it is unlikely that the future cohort fertility rate will drop below the lowest low level, as projected by the medium (and low) variant assumptions in the Population Projections in Japan.

3. DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS ON THE UPTURN

3.1 Close look at the upturn – Examination of monthly data

In order to analyze changes in the various fertility rates in Japan in recent years more closely, the observed data is first plotted on a monthly basis. Figure 2 shows monthly fertility rates and their trends after making seasonal adjustments by birth order in the period from January 2002 to June 2009 (the latest values obtained as of November 2009). In the figure, fertility rates are indicated as annual values (corresponding to 365 days), obtained by adjusting the age-specific number of births in individual months to have the same number of days and dividing the values by the projected population by age in the middle of the given month. Moreover, seasonal adjustment is performed according to the U.S. Census Bureau's X-11 method. Please note that the annually published values of fertility rates in Japan use the population as of October 1, rather than the middle of the period, as the denominator. Thus the fertility rate values become slightly higher than the case here, where the population in the middle of a month is used.

Figure 2 - Monthly Progresses of Fertility Rates by Birth Order: 2002-2009



Note: Dots with thin lines denote monthly time series of annualized TFR by birth order, and lines represent seasonally adjusted trends with the U.S. Census Bureau's X-11 method.

First, looking at the monthly changes of the overall TFR by birth order, it is seen that the TFR began to drop suddenly from December 2004, and remained low for six months until May 2005. Then, however, after bottoming out at this point, the TFR shows a subsequent sharp rise. This rising trend accelerates from around December 2005, exhibiting the largest increase in March 2005. Although the rate of increase significantly drops from around June 2005, the rise itself continues steadily until October 2008 and exhibits a local maximum in November. The TFR then declines slightly or levels off for seven months afterward.

The period where these changes occurred is divided into the following detailed phrases.

- (1) December 2004 to May 2005 (6 months): Sudden drop
- (2-1) June 2005 to November 2005 (6 months): Sharp rise
- (2-2) December 2005 to May 2006 (6 months): Sharpest rise
- (3-1) June 2006 to February 2007 (9 months): Level off for 1st and 2nd children
- (3-2) March 2007 to November 2008 (21 months): Slow increase
- (4) From December 2008 and onward: Level off or decline

Each of the four phases—(1) sudden drop, (2) sharp rise, (3) slow increase, and (4) level off or decline—shows significant change. The phases where the TFR rises, (2) and (3), can further be divided into two sub-periods each, according to the difference in pace. The most remarkable change in this period is the change from phase (1) to phase (2), where the TFR bottoms out in May 2005 and shifts from dropping sharply to rising sharply. The time period and pattern of this change are common to the TRF for all birth orders (except that the fertility rate of the first child does not bottom out until June 2005), and it looks as if a sudden restraint and release of childbearing occurred simultaneously among women of all parities.

The second most remarkable change is the change from phase (2) to phase (3), where the TFR of the first and second children sharply increases until December 2006 and then shifts to a slow rise, which continues until December 2008. Note that this pattern is not observed in the TFR of the third and more children; in this particular case, the trend continues to rise at a consistent pace until phase (4).

Since these children were conceived approximately nine months before each phase, it is necessary to retrace the timing of pregnancy for each phase in order to investigate the triggers of phase shifts. However, no obvious factors have been found so far (one significant event that occurred in August 2004, i.e., nine months before May 2005, where the greatest change was observed, is the 28th Summer Olympic Games held in Athens, Greece, from August 13 to 29; however, the influence of this event on pregnancy is unknown).

The leveling-off trend observed among all birth orders at the same time in December 2008 and onward in phase (4) may quite possibly signal the end of the rising trend and should be observed closely. Some care must be taken when computing seasonal adjustment according to X-11, as the method tends to generate instability at the terminal parts of time-series data (values may change due to addition of new data), but there can be no doubt that a new trend is beginning in this phase. This phase corresponds to the time period where the influence of the global financial crisis started to spread. However, the period of conception of those births is nine months earlier, where there were no obvious events that might have influenced childbearing to be found.

3.2 Examination of Tempo Effect – Is it Due to a Catch-up Effect?

The fact that the monthly changes in the fertility rates show the same patterns among all birth orders suggests that the driving force behind these changes is a period effect. That is, if each cohort goes through different changes, there must be some time lag in terms of the changes occurring among higher birth orders. The term period effect here refers to a change in fertility rates caused by certain temporary factors (usually meaning social economic events, such as times of war and economic crisis). In order to examine such changes in the following, it is necessary to define them more clearly.

One of the important points of a period effect is that it leaves little influence on the completed fertility of any cohorts involved, although it may bring about significant changes in annual fertility rates. Here, we will use this characteristic as the definition of a period effect for the time being. That is, a period effect is a fertility rate change observed in a certain period, which does not influence the cohort completed fertility (cohort TFR).


According to this definition, a period effect can be said to be a change in timing occurring in the childbearing schedule in terms of cohort fertility rates. A cohort is considered to have a unique childbearing schedule with a certain potential regularity, and a period effect is a change that causes the actual fertility rates to deviate temporarily from the original schedule without affecting the long-term balance. Not affecting the long-term balance of cohorts means that the change is redeemed by other periods.

It is possible to consider several different types of such changes in cohort childbearing schedules. The first group of change is the case where the childbearing timing of a cohort as a whole shifts. In this case, a well-known tempo effect acts on the fertility rate for a period. That is, if the mean age at birth (MAB) of a cohort is rising, for example, a tempo effect acts on the period TFR to go down. On the other hand, if the rise of the MAB stops or the MAB drops, a tempo effect that pushes up the period TFR comes into play. In this paper, these effects are called type-T period effects (see figure 3 for illustration).

As shown in the figure, there are three different types of effect separated under the type-T period effects, i.e. shift in location of fertility schedule on age axis (type-Tl), shift in dispersion (type-Td), and shift in shape (type-Ts).

Another type of change encompasses disturbances occurring only for parts of a cohort childbearing schedule (the last graph in Figure 3). That is, this type encompasses fertility rate changes caused by a cohort reacting to certain events occurring in the environment and hastening or postponing its childbearing time period.


Figure 3 - Types of Period Effect in Terms of Cohort Fertility Schedule.



Note: The period fertility exhibits similar changes due to different type of changes in the cohort fertility level and schedule. The period effect of type-T is caused by the shift of the cohort fertility schedule. The period effect of type-H is caused by the temporary fluctuation that is redeemed in other period, while the type-H' effect is the temporary fluctuation that continues to change the completed level of cohort fertility. Thus the type-H' effect is not the genuine period effect by our definition.

In fact, a case example that clearly shows the second type of change exists in recent Japanese history: the so-called Hinoe-uma (Fiery Horse) phenomenon, which occurred in 1966. The Hinoe-uma is a calendar event based on Chinese astrology occurring once every 60 years. Due to the superstition that girls born in that year would cause bad luck for their husbands, many couples avoided having children in that year, and the fertility temporarily dropped by one fourth from the average level (the TFR in 1966 was 1.58 or 75 percent of the average level over 1963 through 1969 except 1966, see changes of TFR in Figure 1). However, all the main cohorts involved in childbearing in this year (the cohorts born from 1923 to 44, who were 22 to 49 years of age at that time) compensated for this loss in the following years and no cohorts exhibited TFR values lower than 2.0. In other words, the Hinoe-uma phenomenon had little effect on the cohort TFR, making it an example of a pure period effect (Figure 4). This type of fertility rate change is called type-H period effects here.

Figure 4 - Age-specific Fertility Rate of Japanese Female Cohort Born in 1935.




Note: Female cohort born in 1935 experienced the Hinoe-uma in 1966 at age 31.

It should be noted, however, that some fertility rate changes caused in reaction to changes in social economy do have lasting influence on the cohort completed fertility. Because they are changes in individual cohorts, it is appropriate to call them period-cohort effects or similar, considering them as a type of cohort effects induced by a certain period. However, whether this type of period changes is limited to pure period effects (i.e., type-H period effects) or is a period-cohort effect affecting the cohort's long-term balance, cannot be known until the affected cohorts complete their childbearing process. Moreover, in terms of the occurrence mechanism, it is irrelevant whether or not it affects a cohort's long-term balance. For this reason, there should be no problems in handling such period changes as type-H period effects from the viewpoint of investigating causes of the occurrence. Period-cohort effects may simply be considered to be the results of prolonged type-H period effects (hereinafter written as type-H'), as illustrated in Figure 5.

Now, in recent fertility changes in Japan, it is speculated that type-H period effects are important because the same changes are seen among all the fertility rates by birth order, as explained above. Moreover, if the changes that occurred in this period are the results of type-T period effects, it would mean that low fertility rates before reaching the point of reversal were caused by tempo effects due to postponement transition of each cohort and that upturns of fertility rates would signify regression to cohort fertility level due to the shift in childbearing timing ending. However, this can be ruled out by observing the monthly MAB development simultaneously. The MAB has been increasing without leveling off throughout the entire period of drop and upturn in the fertility rate since 2002 for the first and second children, who are the main force of fertility. Thus, it is unlikely that the reversal trend is a sign of reverting to the cohort level due to tempo effects dying out, i.e., "tempo transition."

Figure 5 - Types of Period Effect in Terms of Cohort Fertility Schedule



Bongaarts and Feeney (1998) proposed an index that eliminates tempo effects from period TFR. Here, we will use this index to check the development of the effects acting on the period TFR in Japan and whether or not they are tempo effects³. The index proposed by Bongaarts and Feeney referred to as ATFRp in the following. Figure 6 illustrates the development of ATFRp along with the normal TFR. Tempo effects are represented as the differences between ATFRp and TFR. It is seen that relatively large tempo effects have been in action even after the start of upturn in 2006, reflecting the continuous rise of the MAB mentioned above. It can furthermore be seen that the tempo effects in 2006 and 2007 amount to 0.17 and 0.14, respectively, which are substantially larger than the value of 0.12 in 2005 when the TFR bottomed out. The value for 2008, 0.09, is only tentative, but at least it does not appear as if the rise of TFR since 2006 is caused by tempo effects dying out (here fertility rates are calculated with only births to Japanese women).

Now, the ATFRp approach estimates tempo effects under certain assumptions. That is, the age-specific period fertility rate is composed of age-specific fertility rates of a large number of cohorts, but the ATFRp index proposed by Bongaarts and Feeney assumes that the age-specific period fertility rate is composed of age-specific fertility rates of all cohorts who are experiencing the timing shift at the same speed, and then eliminates the tempo effects (or tempo distortion) caused by this shift (Bongaarts and Feeney 1988). The uniform timing shift speed $r(t)$ in year t is given as the change in the average age of childbearing in a given period compared to the previous year (in this paper, the average value of change from the previous year and the change to the next year is used).

This view implicitly allows the timing change speed of fertility rate $f(tc+a, a)$ experienced at a certain age (a) in a certain year (t) to fluctuate by age a (that is, for each year t) when focus is placed on a single cohort (birth year tc) and, instead, assumes that all cohorts involved have a common timing change speed within a given year (period-shift framework). That is: $ATFRp(t) = \sum f(t,a) / (1 - r(t))$, where \sum is the sum for age a (note that this calculation is performed for each birth order and the value is obtained by summing up the results).

This view prioritizes harmonization among age-specific period fertility rates. However, in some cases it might be more appropriate to prioritize harmonization of age-specific cohort fertility rates; that is, a framework in which the timing change speed of fertility rate of a single cohort would be seen as characteristics unique to the cohort and tempo effects it has on the period as characteristics unique to the cohort as well (cohort-shift framework). This can be achieved by expressing the timing change speed of a cohort as a function of cohort birth year tc , the timing effect on the year for this cohort as $\tau(tc) = 1/(1 + r(tc))$ (van Imhoff 2001), and the period TFR with adjusted timing effects as $ATFRc(t) = \sum f(t,a) / \tau(t-a)$, where \sum is the sum for age a (note that this calculation is also performed for each birth order and the value is obtained by summing up the results).

Note that in this calculation, in addition to actually measured age-specific fertility rates, the timing change for related cohorts is required, and has to be obtained from cohort fertility rate assumptions in the Population Projections. Please be aware that it is only the timing changes in future fertility rates that are required, and hence the fertility rates themselves are not used.

Figure 6 shows the result of calculating the ATFRc index from the fertility trend data recorded in Japan. In the period leading up to 2000, both ATFRp and ATFRc follow very similar paths. From 2000, however, they show slightly different behaviors. In particular, in 2000 and onward, ATFRc continues dropping alongside the TFR trend and also indicates a rapid increase at the upturn in the same way as for TFR. Assuming that the cohort-based timing change is essentially continuous, the period effects are filtered and show smooth development, but persistent tempo effects still appear clearly, suggesting that the true cohort TFR is actually higher than the values observed in each period.

The two adjusted TFR indices show upturn in the same way as for actually measured TFR, suggesting the increase in this period is not the recovery brought about by the elimination of type-T tempo effects, but is a substantive rise of type-H effects.


³ Since the fertility rate (i.e., including children with Japanese nationality born to non-Japanese women) and the total fertility rate (see the formula below) defined in the same way as in the Vital Statistics corresponding to the aforementioned fertility rate composition all depend on the demographic compositions of Japanese and non-Japanese women, they can be calculated as a result of population projection. Handling such individually defined fertility rates in the overall fertility rate assumptions of the future population projection makes the projection methodology considerably more complicated, though it is an indispensable mechanism for accurate reproduction of the future population status where international population exchanges have advanced.

Definition of the total fertility rate of the Vital Statistics;

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{(Total fertility rate)} &= \sum_{\text{Sum for ages (15-49)}} \frac{\text{(Number of births by Japanese females)} + \text{(Number of births with Japanese nationality born from non-Japanese females*)}}{\text{(Population of Japanese females)}}
 \end{aligned}$$

* A child with Japanese nationality born from a non-Japanese female is a child whose father is Japanese.

Figure 6 - Trends of the Total Fertility Rates with/without Tempo-adjustment



Note: The fertility rates are calculated based on births by Japanese women only.

Now, the discussion above suggested that the main cause of the recent upturn in the fertility rate is a type-H period effect. However, it has also been confirmed that the MAB for the first and second children continuously rises, which means that tempo effects that push down the period TFR exist, as can also be seen from the development of the ATFRp and ATFRc indices for this period. The question is then, how the scale of type-H period effects can be measured while such effects exist.

We propose to apply a model based on the population projections. In the “Population Projections for Japan,” a cohort model is used for formulating fertility rate assumptions⁴. In particular, the childbearing schedule in the entire reproductive life course is projected for individual single year cohorts of women, and this schedule is then reorganized in order to project age-specific fertility rates on a yearly basis from the past into the future (Kaneko et al. 2008).

The projection model is particularly good at describing the age-specific cohort fertility rate, and is regarded as fully capable of describing and expressing regularities latent at the base of the cohort childbearing schedule (see figure 7). Of course, there are cases where the achieved values deviate from the regularities in some ages. In fact, these deviations are exactly period effects of type-H. For this reason, the period effect can be obtained as the difference between the fertility rate achieved in a given year/age and the corresponding model value. On the other hand, type-T period effects caused by the shift of cohort childbearing schedule are included in the projected fertility rate and are thus excluded from the period effect obtained as the difference between the projected value and achieved value; only type-H period effects are captured in this way.

Under normal circumstances, the model fertility rates used in the Population Projections for Japan are future predictions that have not yet been achieved. In contrast, the method proposed here uses model values of years and ages in the past. How accurate the measurement result achieved by this method is, depends on the accuracy of the cohort

⁴ The model is based on the probability density function of the generalized log-gamma distribution, which is one of standard distributions in statistics. The fertility rate at age x for n -th birth is $f_n(x): f_n(x) = C_n \cdot \gamma(x; u_n, b_n, \lambda_n)$

where,
$$\gamma(x; u_n, b_n, \lambda_n) = \frac{|\lambda_n|}{b_n \Gamma(\lambda_n^{-2})} (\lambda_n^{-2})^{\lambda_n^{-2}} \exp \left[\lambda_n^{-1} \left(\frac{x - u_n}{b_n} \right) - \lambda_n^{-2} \exp \left\{ \lambda_n \left(\frac{x - u_n}{b_n} \right) \right\} \right]$$


Here, γ and \exp are the gamma and exponential functions, respectively. C_n , u_n , b_n , and λ_n are parameters of the fertility rate function of birth order n ; this is an extension of the Coale-McNeil Model. The further adjustment is made so that it should reproduce the characteristics of Japanese age-specific fertility rate precisely. A standard pattern of errors (ε_n) was identified by comparison with the actual fertility rates and the modeled rates to adjust the model schedule. As a result, the function of cohort fertility rate by age x , $f(x)$ is given as follows. See Kaneko (2003) for the details.

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{4+} C_n \cdot \left\{ \gamma \left(x; u_n, b_n, \lambda_n \right) + \varepsilon_n \left(\frac{x - u_n}{b_n} \right) \right\}$$

model. The applicability of the cohort model is high and the model is accurate for cohorts who have completed their childbearing process up to significantly high ages, as shown in the graphs above. For young cohorts with little experience in the childbearing process, however, there are more speculative factors involved in their remaining childbearing schedule and the accuracy of the model is less well known. Therefore, the measurement values should be treated as provisional for the most recent years, where such cohorts contribute more.

Figure 8 illustrates the result of measuring type-H period effects using the method proposed above. Figure 8-a and Figure 8-b shows projected values of type-H period effects by age group and by birth order as bar graphs, respectively (left scale). Both figures show the total period effect, i.e., period effects on TFR, as line plots (right scale) as well. Note that the right scale is twice as large as the left scale.


Figure 7 - Actual and Modeled Fertility Rates of Japanese Female Cohorts by Birth Order




Note: Actual age specific fertility rates by birth order for female cohorts are plotted by dots, while modeled rates are plotted by lines. The actual rates are calculated only for female with Japanese nationality. The model rates are those employed in the official population projection conducted in 2006 as the medium assumption.

Figure 8 - Estimates of Period Effects as Differences between Actual and Projected Fertility Rates by Five Year Age Groups: 1985-2008.

a. Age groups



b. Birth orders



Note: The total period effects (solid line – right scale) is drawn in half the scale of the effects by age group (bar graph – left scale). Fertility rates are calculated based on births by Japanese women only here as well.

In the period up to 2005, the absolute value of period effects on the TFR (the scale on the right axis) exceeds 0.03 only in 1989 and 1994. In other years, the period effects, in general, amount to very little. In 1989 and 1994, some changes can be recognized also in the figures showing the annual TFR development (figures 1). 1989 is the year the TFR dropped below the value in the year of Hinoe-uma and recorded the lowest value in the history and the year of “Merkmal” that triggered the Japanese society’s awareness of its low fertility rates. Note that the period effect value is -0.034; the absolute value is not very large. On the other hand, in 1994, the period effect value is 0.058, which is quite prominent in the period up to 2005. Although the cause of this effect is not certain, one possible cause that has been suggested is the marriage between Crown Prince Naruhito to Princess Masako Owada, who was a diplomat at the time, in June of the previous year, which attracted the attention of many citizens.

In other years, positive period effects are observed in the three-year period from 2000 to 2002, among the 20 to 24-year old women and for the first children only. Millennium effects were anticipated in this period, but the TFR itself did not show any significant rise. At closer inspection, it is noted that the fertility rates of the age group of 22 to 25 years of age for the first children show actual values higher than expected from the cohort model.

In the sections above, the relatively prominent changes that occurred up to 2005 were discussed. Compared to those changes, the recent three-year period from 2006 to 2008 shows a very strong rise in terms of period effects. The projected period effects are high, 0.065, 0.095, and 0.134, respectively, and indicate a yearly upward trend. Looking at the values by age group (figure 8-a), the upward effects in the 30s age group are outstanding in each year. In 2007 and 2008, the value shows a dramatic rise for the age group in the latter half of the 20s as well. Looking at the values by birth order (figure 8-b), the period effect seems to contribute to all orders roughly equally.

Table 1 shows the contributions of age-specific and birth-order-specific subgroups to the entire period effects for both 1989 and 1994, for the purpose of comparison. In 1994, which shows relatively large positive period effects, the relative contribution of the age group of 25 to 29 years of age is large, while in 2006 to 2008, the contributions of the age groups of 30 to 34 years of age and especially 35 to 39 years of age are dramatically high. Moreover, in terms of birth order, while the contribution of the first children is large in 1994, the contribution of the third and further children is large in 2006 to 2008. Taking these characteristics into account, the period effect patterns in these recent three years are clearly different from the past.

Table 1 - Contribution of Subgroups to Period Effects of Type H in Selected Years

a. Age groups (%)					
Age group	Years whose "period effect" exceeds 0.03				
	1989	1994	2006	2007	2008
15-19	4.2	2.0	6.8	5.2	2.9
20-24	<u>26.1</u>	10.3	7.8	1.7	2.5
25-29	<u>58.0</u>	<u>42.6</u>	7.9	11.5	16.1
30-34	17.9	32.0	<u>46.5</u>	<u>43.1</u>	39.0
35-39	4.0	18.8	<u>42.5</u>	<u>45.5</u>	<u>41.8</u>
40+	2.2	1.7	2.2	3.4	3.5
Total (values)	100.0 (-0.034)	100.0 (0.058)	100.0 (0.065)	100.0 (0.095)	100.0 (0.134)

b. Birth orders (%)					
Birth order	Years whose "period effect" exceeds 0.03				
	1989	1994	2006	2007	2008
1st birth	<u>57.9</u>	<u>58.9</u>	42.5	40.4	40.8
2nd birth	34.3	27.3	33.6	29.8	30.0
3rd birth	5.6	9.7	<u>19.4</u>	<u>24.0</u>	<u>22.8</u>
4th & higher	2.1	4.1	4.5	<u>5.7</u>	<u>6.4</u>
Total (values)	100.0 (-0.034)	100.0 (0.058)	100.0 (0.065)	100.0 (0.095)	100.0 (0.134)

Note: Comparatively outstanding values for the age groups and birth order are underlined.

In general, the rise of fertility in this period is known as “last-minute birth” and similar terms. These terms generally imply that women who delayed in having children are now having more children while they are still able to. The age patterns of period effects show an upward movement in age groups from the middle of the 30s to the early 40s, which also supports this view. This generation includes the second baby boomers that were born in the period from 1971 to 1974. They tend to be promoters of lower fertility rates, who significantly postponed family formation and/or childbearing. For this reason, if they wish to have a fixed number of children in their lives, this period happens to be

their last chance. If only period effect patterns are examined, however, they not only tended to give birth to the first and second children they felt compelled to have in order to avoid childlessness and only-child, but also gave an increasing number of births to the third and further children in a rather prominent manner. This suggests that the people who shifted towards more reproductive behaviors were not limited to those who had delayed family formation specifically, but encompassed a wider range of people as well. The significance of this will be examined in the subsequent discussion.

4. DISCUSSION

In the present paper, I utilized fertility projection prepared for the official population projection to analyze the period effects that are latent within the past and current fertility trends. Before applying the framework to the subject in practice, I operationally defined period effect as a fertility rate change observed in a certain period of time, which does not influence the cohort completed fertility (cohort TFR). Then I sorted out several types of period effect according to its effect on cohort fertility schedule, i.e. Three different types of type-T period effect (T_l , T_d , and T_s), and type-H. Type-T period effect is equivalent to so called tempo effect.

Then period fertility rates synthesized from projected cohort fertility schedules are compared with observed rates. The former includes cohort changes and type-T period effects, but is free from the type-H period effects. Therefore difference between the projected and observed period fertility rate identifies the type-H (or type-H') period effects which should be induced by some period specific events.

Three time components of driving factors, i.e. period, cohort and age effects, are recognized in trends of demographic measures in general. In our framework, the age effects are expressed with a function of age as the regularity possibly approximated by a mathematical function, while the cohort effects (variation by cohort) is represented by the different parameter values of the function. The period effects are disturbances to the age schedules shaped by the function with the certain parameter values affecting simultaneously over many cohorts at different ages.

The fertility rates dropped continuously until 2005 in Japan, and the so-called lowest low fertility was attained for a three-year period from 2003 to 2005. However, from 2006 to 2008, an upward trend has been observed in the fertility rates, and the breadth of this upsurge is quite extraordinary as compared to the past fluctuation since the fertility decline below replacement level started in 1974. Considering how important the fertility trends are for the society already in depopulation and rapid aging, it is highly interesting to consider whether or not the recent rise in fertility rates is likely to affect the long term outlook. For this reason, this paper investigated the nature of the upturn, by closely examining the monthly development of fertility rates in this period, attempting to estimate tempo effects caused by adjusted TFRs such as the index proposed by Bongaarts and Feeney, and by estimating period effects (type-H period effects) that exclude tempo effects.

As a result, it was estimated that the recent upturn of fertility rates could generally be explained by type-H period effects. That is, it was found that the upturn is an emergent change that cannot be reproduced by continuous changes in each cohort and which occurred in a manner deviating from the regularity of childbearing schedules of each cohort. For some cohorts in higher ages concluding their reproductive processes, however, it is likely the completed fertilities become slightly larger than previously estimated, from a windfall type effect of type-H'.

In the US and Europe, upturns of fertility rates have been observed since the 1990s in one country after another, and the majority of the countries experiencing lowest low fertility rates have already broken away from that status at the time of this writing. Thus, it is crucial to identify whether the upturn in Japan is similar to those observed in the US and Europe. However, whereas the upturns in the US and Europe are generally considered to have occurred because the period TFR returned to the long-term cohort TFR as tempo effects die out due to completion of postponement transition (Goldstein et al. 2009), it was suggested that the upturn being observed in Japan is of a different nature and is caused by other, peculiar causes.

From a long-term perspective, if the rise in fertility currently being observed is purely caused by type-H period effects, the period fertility rate should decline again within the next several years and will ultimately not significantly change the long-term outlook for the fertility rate. In fact, according to observation of the monthly development, fertility rates have already been turning around to a downward trend again for at least eleven months since December 2008.

On the other hand, this downturn itself might have been caused by transient disturbances related to the financial crisis starting roughly in September 2008 (Goldstein et al. 2009) and may actually be indicative of a complicated situation where different period effects overlap in some way.

Meanwhile, if the circumstances that brought about the recent upturn also serve to keep the fertility rates at higher levels than in the past for an extended period of time, overcoming this transient period of decline, the end result will be a positive influence on the cohort fertility, where the long-term outlook will involve a higher fertility than in the past. In this case, current period effects are modified from type-H to type-H'.

Here, let us consider the causes of the upturn. According to the analysis of observed age-specific fertility rates, the main players in the recent reversal are the so-called second baby boomers, i.e., the generation born in the period from 1971 to 1974. The second baby boomers were expected to give birth to the third baby boomers in the latter half of the 1990s and onward. However, this event was never realized due to significant postponement of family formation and/or childbearing.

On the contrary, their fertility rates kept on falling in 2000 and onward as well and reached the lowest low level in 2003. However, eventually it likely became clear to them that if they wished to have a certain number of children in their lives, they were approaching the age limit to realize their desire. This childbearing urge should have reached super-saturation in 2003 and onward. Assuming these conditions hold, it appears that pregnancy and childbirth were further suppressed from 2004 to the first half of 2005 for some reason. One can thus imagine that excessive energy recoil had been accumulated.

Continuing this line of thought, it is possible that the changes in the social economic mood, which among other things involved a generally improved employment environment, triggered the sudden release of this accumulated energy among the second baby boomer generations to realize their urge. In other words, although the trigger itself was a very ordinary change, there is a distinct possibility that it led to abrupt, significant changes in the trend due to the combination with the circumstances of the players.

If that is the case, it means that decline of fertility from around 2003, particularly the drop in 2005, was caused by type-H period effects in the negative direction and the rise afterward occurred as a rebound to the decline, caused by type-H period effects in the positive direction. Note that the recent rise is actually accelerating and is exceeding the level of the rebound in 2004 to 2005, suggesting the possibility that additional factors are involved.

For example, the large-scale second baby boomer generation's growing desire to get married and/or have children itself forms a market and is likely to gather momentum through mass media and similar channels. Magazines targeting women aged 30 years and up began to feature many positive articles featuring marriage, pregnancy, childbirth, and childrearing, and fashionable new words related to such subjects are becoming commonplace⁵. Furthermore, the government and local governments are advertising their measures as well. Spearheaded by the mass media, such measures seem to form a positive feedback relationship with the increasing fertility. Namely the initial rise from rebound caused increase in media coverage about marriage and family, which promoted further marriages and caused additional births to occur.

What will happen to this reversal trend of fertility in the future? First, if the rise in most cohorts would end up as a simple type-H period effect from rebound and temporary boom, the fertility rates should regress on the line of previous prospect. In this scenario where the recent boom comes to an end soon and it becomes difficult to maintain the current level if the fertility starts to stagnate and the feedback cycle with society is cut. Signs hereof may be already beginning to show in the monthly development.

On the contrary, if boom continues for long enough to make rises type-H' to raise the levels of completed fertility, and if those age patterns are continually succeeded by the following cohorts, then it means that the shrinking trend of cohort fertility reverses and the long term prospects of fertility should be seen as high as improved level of cohort completed fertility. In this case, the feedback relationship would be maintained. It is possible the group of single people and families of under-parity has ballooned to a huge size by now, because it contains the second baby boomers.

There are several other factors affecting the future course of fertility, among which the new child allowance is particularly notable. The new government has promised the adoption of this policy, and it amounts to 26,000 yen (about 290 US dollar) a month per every child through junior high. The current plan is to enact half the amount of allowance in April 2010, and the full amount in April 2011. Though it may have a certain impact on fertility, it seems necessary that it be perpetual and reliable to alter the long term trends beyond just period fertility in the short term.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, three objectives are sought; (1) to show the usefulness of population projection models in analyzing demographic processes in the past and current as well as in the future, (2) to measure and understand the period effects in terms of modifier of cohort fertility schedule, and (3) to identify factors and mechanisms of the recent peculiar fertility development in Japan, using the proposed framework.

Fertility projection is utilized to analyze the period effects that are latent within the past and current fertility trends. It seems that the framework is useful to separate out the type-H and H' period effects from the type-T period effects (the

⁵ "Kon-katsu" (activities to look for marriage partners) - there is affirmative nuance for the activities. "Ara-for"(Around Forty) - a somewhat positive title for single women around age 40, who are typically active in work and romance. "Sosyoku-danshi" (herbivorous boy) - a label for young men who are passive to romance and marriage, suggesting that women should be active to make those come into existence.

tempo effects) and cohort effects so that causes of changes in fertility trend may be identified.

The fertility rates in Japan have dropped continuously since the mid 1970s below the replacement level until 2005, and Japan experienced the so-called lowest low fertility for a three-year period from 2003 to 2005. However, in the recent three years from 2006 to 2008, an upturn trend has been observed in the fertility rates, and TFR became to 1.37 in 2008.

According to the period effect analysis composed with fertility projection system, it is estimated that the recent upturn could mainly be explained by the period effect, which does not change cohort completed fertility, and particularly the effects that temporally works and would be redeemed in other period (termed as the period effect of type-H). For some cohorts in higher ages, however, it is likely the completed fertilities become slightly larger than previously estimated as a result of the type-H' effect. These are the different in causes from the upturns seen in the US and Europe, where the period fertility rates have been reversed mostly by "the tempo transition"(Goldstein et al 2009) which is the completing phase of the "postponement transition"(Kohler et al 2002). This corresponds to the period effect of type-T in our terminology.

The upturn in Japan seems to be caused by a rebound of the short term too-low fertility in the lowest low period, or in 2003-2005, followed by a boom induced mainly by the media targeting the single's and family of under parity's market whose size is unprecedented these years, partly because it includes the second baby boomers.

It is possible that the long term prospects of fertility formed in the latest population projection, which are based on the data corrected by the year 2005, might be underestimated in light of the present situation. It depends on whether the rise in fertility schedules of cohorts in their mid-thirties and beyond in this period is continually succeeded by the following cohorts ending up with rises in their cohort completed fertilities.

6. REFERENCES

Billari, Francesco C. (2008). Lowest-low fertility in Europe: Exploring the causes and finding some surprises. *Japanese Journal of Population* (Tokyo) vol.6, No.1, pp. 2-18.

Bongaarts, John and Griffith Feeney (1998). On the quantum and tempo of fertility. *Population and Development Review* (New York) vol.24, No.2, pp.271-291.

Goldstein, Joshua R. Tomáš Sobotka, and Aiva Jasilioniene (2009). The end of 'lowest-low' fertility? Paper presented at the XXVI IUSSP International Population Conference, Marrakech.

Kaneko, Ryuichi (2003). Elaboration of the Coale-McNeil nuptiality model as the generalized log gamma distribution: A new identity and empirical enhancements *Demographic Research* (Rostock) Vol. 9, No. 10, pp.223-262.
<http://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol9/10/9-10.pdf>

Kaneko, Ryuichi, Akira Ishikawa, Futoshi Ishii, Tsukasa Sasai, Miho Iwasawa, Fusami Mita, and Rie Moriizumi (2008). Population projections for Japan: 2006-2055: outline of results, methods, and assumptions. *The Japanese Journal of Population* (Tokyo), Vol.6, No.1, pp.76-114.
http://www.ipss.go.jp/webj-ad/WebJournal.files/population/2008_4/05population.pdf

Kohler, Hans-Peter, Francesco C. Billari, and José A. Ortega (2002). The emergence of lowest-low fertility in Europe during the 1990s. *Population and Development Review* (New York) vol.28, No.4, pp.641-680.

National Institute of Population and Social Security Research (NIPSSR), 2007. *Nihon no Syorai Suikei Jinko* (Population Projection for Japan: 2006-2055), Tokyo: Kosei Tokei Kyokai.

Sobotka, Tomáš (2004). Is lowest-low fertility explained by the postponement of childbearing? *Population and Development Review* (New York) vol.30, No.2, pp.195-220.

van Imhoff, Evert (2001). On the Impossibility of Inferring Cohort Fertility Measures from Period Fertility Measures, *Demographic Research* (Rostock) Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 24-64.
<http://www.demographic-research.org/Volumes/Vol5/2/5-2.pdf>