

Gert Hullen  
Federal Institute for Population Research, Wiesbaden, Germany

## **The effects of education and employment on marriage and first birth**

The Family and Fertility Survey enables to analyse on a broad empirical basis the influence of the education and the occupation on the demographic behaviour. There are survivor function-like figures of the age at birth of the first child and the education level in the Country Reports, equally differentiated tables of the desired child number as well as tables of the (implemented) child number. *Beets* (1999) reported in international comparison the general delay of the first births and also that the age of women with high education is five years higher than that of the women giving birth with a low education. Four FFS countries were the base of the empirical test of major theories by *DiGiulia, Lesthaeghe, Moors, and Pinnelli* (1998). A broad outline on FFS countries was undertaken in the anthology of *Corijn and Klijzing* over "Transitions to Adulthood" (*Corijn, Klijzing* 2000). We will refer to that later.

Here now it is intended to analyse more exactly, which influence education and occupation do have on the partnerships and the first births, if one more exactly differentiates between effects of the status and the level. This is a part of the investigation of the influences of the education and occupation systems.

### **Historical development**

Since generally the demographic development of the last decades characterised by decrease or delay of marrying and of births should be familiar, only some few specification is to be given here to the education and labour force participation of the young women.

#### ***Development of school enrolment***

In Europe the school enrolment at age 12 to 17 could only slightly rise in the last decades because of the high level already achieved (1980 79.8 per cent, 1992 81.8 per cent). There were however strong changes at age 18 to 23. In the year 1980 approximately a quarter visited schools, in the year 1992 over a third. The increase for women was even more largely than for men (annex table). The average school enrolment increased in few decades strongly. In a publication of the *OECD* from the year 1997 it became estimated that a child at the age of five years, growing up in the developed countries, will visit schools still fourteen to sixteen years, i.e. that most young people begin a gainful employment only with twenty years (annex table).

#### ***Transitions to the employment system***

According to the longer education the entrance into the labour force market shifted for ever more young persons into the third life decade. Because of the since the 70s risen unemployment the proportion of those furthermore has grown, for which the attendance of educational facilities was a substitute for non-existent jobs. Above all the south European countries are affected by high youth unemployment.

„The situation of young people in Greece, Italy, and Spain has deteriorated in various ways between 1986 and 1994, particularly with their failure to achieve full social integration as responsible, independent adults. More than half of these countries' 30-year-olds have still not achieved the full autonomy associated with a job and a home of their own [...] In southern EU countries, the common causes of the problem should be sought not so much in shared cultural values as in similar structure and recent history.“ (*Cordón* 1997, 607)

Also in those countries, which attribute their comparatively smaller youth unemployment to the so-called dual system of school enrolment and formation on the job (Germany, Austria, sections of Switzerland), the increasing employment problems after the apprenticeships postponed the entrance into the labour market.

#### ***Labour force participation of women***

After decades where the labour force participation of the women had hardly changed, there were considerable increases (annex table) in the 70's and 80's. Particularly the gainful employment of married women and of women

with children increased strongly. The difficulties to combine the request of occupation and family are cited as an important reason for the decrease of the birth rate. On the other hand it is even this development, which enabled the increase of labour force participation. Schwarz estimated for the period 1972 to 1986 in Germany that approximately half of the increase of the labour force participation of married women is based on the decrease of the child number of the marriages and the other half on a larger readiness for the gainful employment (Schwarz 1988, cit. after Grünheid 1999: 149 f.). Apparently there are interactions between fertility and labour force participation which might be stronger than the mutual influences of education and fertility.

## Theoretical considerations

Gary Becker explained the declining birth rate in economic terms by comparing (opportunity) costs of different uses of women's time and resources. Higher educated women would delay births on behalf of their better earning chances on the labour market (Becker 1975, 1991; Cigno 1991). For a broader attempt to analyse the influence of education and employment on the fertile behaviour it is important to distinguish between the effects of the level and the effects of the status. Grundmann, Huinink and Krappmann have given a systematic description:

### **1. The education or labour force/acquisition participation as such**

"The acquisition of an education or a formation certificate needs more or less (life) time, depending on which school career and which formation way were taken, in which substantial sections of the everyday life are controlled by this activity. For ever more young adults the formation phase persists into the third life decade, it can last into the fourth life decade. The issue whether someone attends to a vocational activity or not, has for the life organisation of men and women likewise crucial consequences, which affect other areas of life [...]

### **2. The education and qualification level in each at different time**

The education level and the vocational status, then one argues, are also of indirect and direct importance for the family development and the individual attitudes and behaviour pattern in all other areas of life [...]

For both aspects, the education and labour force participation and that of the qualification level or the rank of the vocational position, at least three dimensions of their meaning for the family development can that be constituted:

1. First of all, so the assumption, they are connected with different individual orientations, preferences, aspiration levels, life options and different strategies of the life style. Thus, with their consequences for other areas of the personal record (working sphere, leisure time, public commitment etc.), they can influence directly, but indirectly too, the option and the decision-making process for the issue of a partnership or own children. These preferences can be differently stable in the time and are not determined necessarily for any time [...]
2. The aspects of qualification and gainful employment mentioned are connected with several situational and structural conditions of the life organisation and life planning as well as possibilities of the life style (materially, time-related, age-referred, socially and culturally). In different ways they open chances and options, and they cause restrictions for the current or the future life too. Rather different factors belong to them, as material resources, the conditions of time use in the everyday life, social contacts and networks, the conditions of the spatial environment, access to and processing of information etc. Direct and indirect effects are to be expected also here on the current organisation of the way of life and the family career with potential parenthood.

The decision for parenthood during a formation is very improbable under the social conditions of West Germany (and meanwhile Germany at a whole) [...]

3. The individual and partnership-referred orientations, personal attributes and living conditions are connected therefore generally with the institutional basic conditions and contextual chance structures, which are set by economical conditions, political decisions and social standards. Such infrastructural and cultural condition factors regionally [...] may be shaped very differently [...]"

Grundmann, Huinink, and Krappmann mention the pronatalistic policy of the former GDR as an example for institutional influences on parenthood and they postulate:

"The personal founding of partnership and family is to be characterised as a more or less long process of experiences, searches and decisions, in which long-term like current individual propensities, conceptions over 'whether' and 'if', and factors which are not foreseeable, not planned or influenceable by the individual play a role for the manifested behaviour. We will differentiate therefore the following three aspects [...] of the family development: individual propensities, desires and conceptions to partnership and parenthood (preference), the temporal staging in the individual life course (timing) and the question whether it finally comes at all to a

partnership, a marriage or a parenthood (prevalence)." (*Grundmann, Huinink, Krappmann 1994: 50; own translation*)

## Research methods

Some remarks on the "state of the art" will be given for the research of the contribution of education, employment, and – in general – of individual and societal characteristics to first births.

### **Cross section analysis**

Cross section analysis is a usual procedure for the analysis of the influence of the education on demographic behaviour. It has been executed with the extensive and over decades available data of the official statistics. Age specific birth rates, age at first birth or parity progression ratio have been calculated and differentiated after the education level of the mother (*Schwarz 1989; Retherford, Luther 1996*). In some of these macroanalyses also the effects of national policy on the birth development were tried to detail after the education level. *Joshi and David* summarised:

„*Gauthier (1996b)* reviews evidence of effects on fertility (and family structure) of the impact of fiscal incentives on fertility. The evidence is for nothing more than a very modest effect (which was not altered when she included maternity provisions and child care provision in a study of twenty-two industrialized countries). The study by *Ekert (1986)* of eight EC countries suggested that cash benefits of the order offered in France raised total fertility by 0.2 children. A similar result was confirmed by *Blanchet and Ekert-Jaffe (1994)* using data on 11 European countries, and by *Ermisch (1988)* based upon births of different order in England and Wales. His estimate was that a doubling of child-benefit would, eventually, raise completed family size by 0.15 children. This implies that should the government wish to be so un-British as to manipulate the birth rate, the costs of achieving significant change through cash benefits would be prohibitive." (*Joshi, David 1996: 118-120*)

Particularly - so long it existed - the family-political measures of the former GDR were considered. *Büttner, Lutz 1990a, Schwarz 1992, Schott 1999* dealt with the fact that the promotion of the young families also meant to facilitate combining family founding and studies or vocational education.

### **Event history analysis**

More sophisticated investigations were undertaken with the help of the event history analysis. It assumes that the demographic processes are Markovian processes and that they can be parameterised. The influence of a multiplicity of variables, by which the respective initial conditions are described, on status changes are determined. With the help of suitable distribution functions models of occurring the questionable events can be estimated.

The deep-going analysis of the influence of the education on the fertility was advanced in Germany by the anthology of *Diekmann and Weick (1993)*. *Blossfeld and Jaenichen* presented the distinction of status and level of the education - not without contradiction (*Blossfeld, Jaenichen 1996; Brüderl, Klein 1996*). In the last decade further event analyses of different surveys followed (*Klein, Lauterbach 1994; Klein 1992; Hullen 1995, 1998*). Larger enterprises were the comparison of the family founding published by *Blossfeld* as well as the comparison of the transitions to adulthood in Europe conceived by *Corijn and Klijzing (Blossfeld, ed. 1995; Corijn, Klijzing, eds., 2000)*.

## **The investigation of Blossfeld et al. 1995**

"The idea for this international comparative project was stimulated by a surprising finding Johannes Huinink and I made during an event history study carried out in West Germany. This research showed that (1) the entry of West German women into marriage and motherhood was not influenced by their level of educational attainment, and (2) their level of career resources had virtually no effect on the rate of first marriage and only slightly affected the timing of first motherhood. Instead, the study revealed that extended schooling of successive birth cohorts of women was the most important factor responsible for change in the process of family formation in West Germany. An increasing number of better-educated women only temporarily postponed their entry to marriage and the birth of a first child. Thus, it was not the *level* of labor market-related human capital investments of women but *thee time it took to acquire qualifications* that seemed to be the driving force behind change in the process of family

formation in West Germany." (*Blossfeld* 1995: XI-XII). The authors of the book made reference to the United States, Great Britain, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, West Germany, Hungary, Italy, and Spain.<sup>1</sup>

## **The project „Transitions to Adulthood“ of Corijn and Klijzing**

"In this study we bring together a description of the similarity and diversity in the timing and kind of transition to adulthood for post-war cohorts in several European countries. The diversity in this transition process invites us to speak about the transitions to adulthood in Europe. A second aim is to analyse the impact of determinants of the transition to adulthood in these countries. Related to the main societal developments since the Second World War particular kinds of determinants are in the focus. Because of the general educational expansion and the increased labour market participation of young women, we study the impact of the educational level and the occupational career on the transition to adulthood. Because of the process of secularisation, we study the impact of religion on the transition to adulthood." (*Corijn, Klijzing* 2000)

"A major asset of this study is that for most of the countries involved in this project use is made of a similar survey, being the Fertility and Family Survey. The organisation of a round of Fertility and Family Surveys (FFS) in the nineties was part of the programme of the ECE's Population Activities Unit (PAU) ... Indeed we do have data from Northern Europe (Norway), Southern Europe (Spain, Italy), Eastern Europe (Poland), Central Europe (Austria, Germany), Western Europe (Belgium, the Netherlands, France) and non-continental Europe (Britain)." (*Corijn, Klijzing* 2000)<sup>2</sup>

## **Own Research Design**

The description of *Grundmann, Huinink* and *Krappmann* delivers a framework for the own investigation. However a limitation is made, as the effects of the education and the gainful employment respectively on the preferences remain out of consideration. This has to be reserved to further analyses of the FFS, the PPA and the European Value Panel (EVP). Therefore here only one note: *Dorbritz, Fux* (1997:80 f.) showed the preferences for children (VOC-like scale) of women of the FFS countries at age 20 to 39. Women with a low education status had an amount of 10.4, women with high education status in contrast to this 8.7. However, with the education level the deviation had increased (with low education status 2.79, with high education status 3.43). This points on the fact that the preferences for children probably are in a mutual relationship to the actual living arrangement.

## **Empirical base**

In 1998 the FFS data of the following countries were available: Austria, Belgium (i.e. Flanders), Germany, Finland, France, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland.<sup>3</sup> The data set from Norway caused some problems and was not analysed further. Because of the known differences of the demographic behaviour, West Germany and East Germany were analysed separately. One might regret that the Netherlands were not included. Beets had written, they were „‘world champion late parenthood‘ since in 1997 no other country, as far as we know, had an older age of the mother at first birth: 29.0 years“ (*Beets* 1999: 5).

For standardisation the respective national samples were limited to the cohorts 1956 to 1970. These respondents were between 19 (Finland) and 40 years (Austria, Italy) old when the national surveys took place from 1989 to 1996.

## **Variables**

In the event history analysis the influence of covariables on the entrance of an event and a status change is determined. The questionable events were the first marriage and the birth of the first child. The FFS offered

---

<sup>1</sup> Authors of the country specific chapters have been Britta Hoem, Henri Leridon, Laurent Toulemon, Jenny de Jong Gierveld, Aart C. Liefbroer, Kathleen E. Kiernan, Éva Lelièvre, Valerie Kincade Oppenheimer, Hans-Peter Blossfeld, Achim Wackerow, Antonella Pinnelli, Alessandra De Rose, Margarita Delgado, Peter Robert.

<sup>2</sup> Authors of the country specific chapters have been Pau Baizan, Ann Berington, Martine Corijn, Gert Hullen, Miranda Jansen, Irena Kowalska, Aart Liefbroer, Vera Nowak, Turid Noack, Fausta Ongaro, Christiane Pfeiffer, Wiktoria Wróblewska.

<sup>3</sup> The author wish to thank the Advisory Group of the FFS programme of comparative research for its permission to use the FFS data on which this study is based.

monthly data - naturally only for those women who got married and had actually births. The records of the other respondents were handled as "censored cases",

The following variables have been used in the analysis:

1. ‚Cohort‘ with three values for the birth cohorts 1956-60, 1961-66, 1966-1970 (reference: 1956-60); in most countries these cohorts have approximately equal number of cases, in some countries the younger cohorts were smaller.
2. ‚Single‘ as dichotomous time-dependant variable with reference ‚not single‘; this variable was only involved in the analyses of births where it is of course of an overwhelming importance and should not be ignored.
3. ‚Educational level / aspiration‘ with ‚first level‘ as reference. In some countries, in which the FFS was implemented, the education biography of the respondents is reported in detail. In other ones it was asked only for the achieved highest education level at the time of interview. This date is called now "educational aspiration", and one assumes that this remained relatively alike during the examined adult years of the respondents. The seven levels of the ISCED classification were reduced to five, as the levels 0 to 2 were summarised (first level).
4. ‚Educational enrolment‘ as dichotomous time-dependant variable with reference ‚not enrolled‘.
5. ‚Occupational level / aspiration‘ with the categories ‚professions‘, ‚clerks‘, and ‚operators‘ (reference: professions); these information had been given time-dependant, coded with ISCO.
6. ‚Occupational status‘ as dichotomous time-dependant variable with reference ‚without occupation or not full occupied‘.

The variables were coded in such a way that their effects on the events presumably were negative. This is a precautionary measure. If one permits variables, which increase the risk (positive sign), event analyses result in sometimes extremely high values for the relative risks.

Splitting of the episodes was required to get the value of time-dependant variables at the time of event. The variable "occupational status" was granted a fuzzy time of three months foregoing the events marriage and birth respectively. This means that a women was regarded as "occupied" even if the (full time) employment had ended in that period, maybe forced by pregnancy.

Computations were done with the program TDA of Rohwer (Rohwer, Pötter 1998) using the exponential model which has been proven as the most robust model.

## Results

### *First Marriage*

For the "first marriage" three event-analytic models were calculated, with which the number of the included variables was gradually increased. Beta coefficients of the regression equation, which have a positive sign show that the variable accelerates the occurring of the event, minus signs vice versa demonstrate postponing. The extent of this effect can be read concerning the relative risk [ $\exp(\beta)$ ]: Each increase of the value of a dynamic variable by one unit or applying a 0/1-coded variable changes the occurrence of the event around the term [ $1-\exp(\beta)$ ] expressed in per cent.

In model 1 only the cohort and the variable "educational level / aspiration" were included. The younger cohorts in all countries had a significantly smaller marriage propensity (cf. annex of tables) in the comparison to the oldest one (1956-60). The influence of the education was not so unique. In most countries a higher education entails later marriage. In Austria, East Germany, Finland and Sweden the influence of the education level is however not significant.

This finding which is plausible and confirms the expectation must be questioned, if, as in the model 2 occur, also the education status is included, apart from the education level. The education status exerts thereafter the stronger influence on the marriage propensity, the education level loses importance.

In model 3 apart from the cohort and the two education variables also the variables of the "occupational aspiration" and "full occupation" are included. The influence of the education level turns almost into the opposite of model 1: If education status and gainful employment are controlled, then a higher education coincides with a higher marriage propensity of the women in Belgium, East Germany, Finland, Italy and Poland. In not any country a significantly negative influence is to be determined.

Women, who are still in educational institutions have a high-significantly smaller, women, who were fully employed, a high-significantly higher marriage propensity in all included countries. The influence of the

occupation level in most countries is not significant, in Austria, Italy and Sweden high-significantly positively, in Finland as only country however significantly negatively. In order to clarify this, the specification concerning the occupations would have to be checked.

**Table 1: First marriage**

	Model 1	Model 3			
	Educ.Aspiration	Educ.Aspiration	Educ. Enrolled	Occ.Aspiration	FullOccupation
Austria	n.s.	n.s.	neg ***	pos ***	pos ***
Belgium	neg ***	pos ***	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Germany East	n.s.	pos ***	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Germany West	neg ***	n.s.	neg ***	pos *	pos ***
Finland	n.s.	pos ***	neg ***	neg ***	pos ***
France	neg ***	n.s.	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Hungary	neg ***	n.s.	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Italy	neg ***	pos ***	neg ***	pos ***	pos ***
Poland	neg ***	pos ***	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Sweden	n.s.	pos	neg ***	pos ***	pos ***
Switzerland	neg ***	n.s.	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***

### **First birth**

For the analysis of the influences of the education on the age at first birth, also three models were calculated. In model 1 the cohorts and the variable "educational aspiration" were included. The affiliation to the younger cohorts contributed in most countries to a delay of the births. In Austria the younger women had surprisingly a higher birth propensity. In the other countries the influence was not significant. Thus the - negative - cohort effect on the delay of the births is smaller than their effect on the timing of marriage described above.

In model 1 a higher education level has a high-significantly negative influence on the propensity to the first child. Exceptions are East Germany and Austria. The special features East Germany and Austria become clearer, even if apart from the education level the education status is considered (model 2) and additionally also the two variables of the "occupational aspiration" and "full occupation" (model 3; cf. annex of tables). In East Germany even positive effects went out on the relation of higher education to the first child.

In West Germany the beforehand highest-significantly negative effect (0.001) is only on the 0.05-level significant, in Finland it loses its significance completely. The change of the effect of the education level is due to the control of the education status made in model 3 and also to the check of the employment status. The event analysis shows that in all countries women, as long as they are in educational facilities have a smaller propensity to give birth to a child. On the other hand the influence of an (full) employment is positive in most countries (of course this may change with the birth of the second child). The exceptions Belgium, Italy and Poland suggest that the mothers there had ended a vocational activity earlier than in other countries.

**Table 2: Birth of the first child**

	Model 1	Model 3			
	Educ.Aspiration	Educ.Aspiration	Educ. Enrolled	Occ.Aspiration	FullOccupation
Austria	pos ***	n.s.	neg ***	pos ***	pos ***
Belgium	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	pos ***	n.s.
Germany East	n.s.	pos ***	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Germany West	neg ***	neg *	neg ***	pos *	neg ***
Finland	neg ***	n.s.	neg ***	pos **	pos ***
France	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	pos **	pos ***
Hungary	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***
Italy	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	n.s.	n.s.
Poland	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	n.s.	n.s.
Sweden	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	pos *	pos ***
Switzerland	neg ***	neg ***	neg ***	n.s.	pos ***

The synopsis of the results of model 3 with those of *Blossfeld (1995)* and *Corijn/Klijzing (2000)* shows the perpetuation of negative effects of the education level on the propensity to the first child. The own work, in

which comparatively more recent cohorts and some more countries were included confirmed former findings. In addition, apart from this predicate it is to be summarised that the influence diminishes considerably, when the education status and the employment status are controlled. Both have unique effects: The birth of the first child is postponed apparently so long, as the women are enrolled. Full employment however carried the family foundation in all countries except of West Germany.

**Table 3: The effect of educational level / educational aspiration on women's earlier timing of first birth**

Country	Blossfeld (ed.) 1995: 22	Corijn/Klijzing (eds.) 2000, cohorts 1950-65	own calculations, cohorts 1956-70
		Covariables: employment, religion, interaction variables	Model 3 –Covariables: cohorts, educ. status, educ. aspiration, employment status, empl. aspiration
Austria		negative	ns
Flanders (Belgium)		neg+age <sup>a)</sup>	neg
Germany East		ns	pos
Germany West	no effect	negative	neg
Finland			ns
France	neg., weak	neg+age	neg
Hungary	neg., weak		neg
Italy	neg., strong	neg+age	neg
Netherlands	neg., strong	neg+age	
Norway		negative	
Poland		neg+age	neg
Spain		neg+age	
Sweden	neg., weak		neg
Switzerland			neg

a) negative effect of education level in interaction with age (education level\*age)

## Discussion

With the education expansion in the last decades in Europe the school attendance times became longer, the desired and the achieved level of education higher. At a first glance there is a direct relation between rising education level of women and the postponement of marriages and first birth. But the contributions of education are more complicated. The level of education is not as important as the enrolment status. The boundaries have weakened, but in general the period of educational enrolment and the period of living with children and being married remained separated.

When they had finished schools, universities, or vocational training women with higher education had even a relatively higher propensity to marry. This may be attributed to their age, their attractiveness on the marriage market and an affection to follow traditions.

Being fully employed in all countries coincided with a higher propensity to marry. In most of them the women's labour force participation had also a positive effect on giving birth to a child.

The education level in historical comparison kept its negative effect on first births, lost however at significance. It remained general with the fact that women which had been enrolled beyond the secondary school got their first child later.

Finally is to be dealt with the special position of the mothers in the former GDR. The more educated women married earlier and got their first child at a younger age, not only compared with other countries, but also compared with women in the GDR without tertiary education. This is certainly a result of the pronatalistic family policy. *Huinink* referred to the "instrumentalization of the family policy". He explained:

"The proportion of the women, who became during a formation for the first time mother, rises over the cohorts and is remarkably high compared with West Germany. This behaviour is not owed only advantages or temporary securities, but it is possible only if one has also already at this time stable future expectations, which let the long-term risk to parenthood appear as insignificant. " (*Huinink* 1995: 47)

The results at all give some doubt to the thesis of the "new role of the women" (*Blossfeld 1995*). It can not be seen that the child desire does step no more into competition to the other possibilities of the life organisation, which are offered with a higher education in particular. Family policy could change this but obviously only with strong restrictions to other parts of society and only for short times.

## Literature

Becker, G.: Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education. Chicago (Univ. of Chicago Press, 2. Aufl.) 1975.

Becker, Gary S.: A Treatise on the Family (1981). Cambridge/London (Harvard Press) 1991.

Beets, Gijs C.N.: Education and Age at First Birth. In: *demos - Bulletin on Population and Society*, 15 (1999), Special issue, 5-8.

Blossfeld, Hans-Peter (Hrsg.): *The New Role of Women - Family Formation in Modern Societies*. Boulder (Westview) 1995.

Blossfeld, Hans-Peter; Jaenichen, Ursula: Bildungsexpansion und Familienbildung. In: Diekmann, Andreas; Weick, Stefan (Hrsg.): *Der Familienzyklus als sozialer Prozeß. Bevölkerungssoziologische Untersuchungen mit den Methoden der Ereignisanalyse*. Berlin (Duncker & Humblot) 1993. 165-193.

Brüderl, Josef; Klein, Thomas: Bildung und Familiengründungsprozeß deutscher Frauen: Humankapital- und Institutioneneffekt. In: Diekmann, Andreas; Weick, Stefan (Hrsg.): *Der Familienzyklus als sozialer Prozeß. Bevölkerungssoziologische Untersuchungen mit den Methoden der Ereignisanalyse*. Berlin (Duncker & Humblot) 1993. 194-215.

Büttner, T.; Lutz, Wolfgang: Estimating fertility responses to policy measures in the German Democratic Republic. In: *Population and Development Review*, 16 (1990), 3, 539-555.

Cigno, Alessandro: *Economics of the Family*. Oxford (Clarendon) 1991.

Cordón, J.A. Fernández: Youth residential independence and autonomy. A Comparative Study. In: *Journal of Family Issues*, 18 (1997), 6, 576-607.

Corijn, Martine; Klijzing, Erik: Transitions to adulthood in Europe: Conclusions and discussion. In: Corijn, Martine; Klijzing, Erik (Hrsg.): *Transition to Adulthood*. in prep. (2000) (=European Studies of Population).

Diekmann, Andreas; Weick, Stefan (Hrsg.): *Der Familienzyklus als sozialer Prozeß. Bevölkerungssoziologische Untersuchungen mit den Methoden der Ereignisanalyse*. Berlin (Duncker & Humblot) 1993.

DiGiulia, P.; Lesthaeghe, R.; Moors, G.; Pinnelli, A.: *Fertility tempo and quantum: An empirical test of major theories with data from four FFS-countries*. Brüssel 1998.

Dorbritz, Jürgen; Fux, Beat (Hrsg.): *Einstellungen zur Familienpolitik in Europa. Ergebnisse eines vergleichenden Surveys in den Ländern des "European Comparative Survey on Population Policy Acceptance (PPA)"*. München (Boldt im R. Oldenbourg Verlag) 1996. (= Schriftenreihe des Bundesinstituts für Bevölkerungsforschung, 24)

Gauthier, Anne Hélène: *The State and the Family. A Comparative Analysis of Family Policies in Industrialized Countries*. Oxford (Clarendon) 1996.

Gauthier, Anne H.: The Measured and Unmeasured Effects of Welfare Benefits on Families: Implications for Europe's Demographic Trends. In: Coleman, David (Hrsg.): *Europe's Population in the 1990s*. Oxford (Oxford Univ.Press) 1996. 297-331.

Grundmann, Matthias; Huinink, Johannes; Krappmann, Lothar: Familie und Bildung. Empirische Ergebnisse und Überlegungen zur Frage der Beziehung von Bildungsbeteiligung, Familienentwicklung und Sozialisation. In: Büchner, Peter; Grundmann, Matthias; Huinink, Johannes; Krappmann, Lothar; Nauck, Bernhard; Meyer, Dagmar; Rothe, Sabine (Hrsg.): *Kindliche Lebenswelten, Bildung und innerfamiliäre Beziehungen. Materialien zum 5. Familienbericht. Bd. 4* München (Vlg. Deutsches Jugendinstitut) 1994. Bd. 4: 41-104.

Grünheid, Evelyn: Zur Entwicklung der Erwerbstätigkeit in Deutschland aus demographischer Sicht - historische Betrachtung der letzten Jahrzehnte. In: *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, 24 (1999), 2, 133-163.

Huinink, Johannes: Familienentwicklung und Haushaltsgründung in der DDR: Vom traditionellen Muster zur instrumentellen Lebensplanung? In: Nauck, Bernhard; Schneider, Norbert; Tölke, Angelika (Hrsg.): *Familie und*

Lebensverlauf im gesellschaftlichen Umbruch. Stuttgart (Enke) 1995. (=Der Mensch als soziales und personales Wesen, Bd. 12) 39-55.

Hullen, Gert: Lebensverläufe in West- und Ostdeutschland. Längsschnittanalysen des deutschen Family and Fertility Surveys. Wiesbaden (Leske + Budrich) 1998. (= Schriftenreihe des Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung, 26)

Hullen, Gert: Germany. In: Corijn, Martine; Klijzing, Erik (eds.): Transitions to Adulthood. 2000

Joshi, Heather; David, Patricia: The Social and Economic Context of Fertility. In: Caselli, Graziella; Vallin, Jacques; Wunsch, Guillaume (Hrsg.): Démographie: analyse et synthèse. Actes et conséquences des évolutions démographique. Actes du Séminaire de Sienna 22-24 avril 1996, vol. 2 Rom, Paris 1996. 89-128.

Klein, Thomas: Zum Einfluß einer verlängerten Ausbildungsphase auf den Prozeß der Familienbildung. In: Zeitschrift für Familienforschung, Jg. 1992, 4, 5-21.

Klein, Thomas; Lauterbach, Wolfgang: Bildungseinflüsse auf Heirat, die Geburt des ersten Kindes und die Erwerbsunterbrechung von Frauen. Eine empirische Analyse familienökonomischer Erklärungsmuster. In: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 46 (1994), 2, 278-298.

OECD: Bildung auf einen Blick. OECD-Indikatoren, 1997. Paris 1997.

Retherford, Robert D.; Luther, Norman Y.: Are Fertility Differentials by Education converging in the United States? In: Genus, LII (1996), 3-4, 13-37.

Rohwer, Götz; Pötter, Ulrich: TDA User's Manual. Bochum Version 1: 1998.

Schott, Jürgen: Zur demographischen Bewertung pronatalistischer Politik. In: Dorbritz, Jürgen; Otto, Johannes (Hrsg.): Demographie und Politik. Ergebnisse der 32. Arbeitstagung der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Bevölkerungswissenschaft (DGBw), Bonn, 20.-22. April 1998. Wiesbaden 1999. (=Materialien zur Bevölkerungswissenschaft, 91) 71-86.

Schwarz, Karl: Umfang der Erwerbstätigkeit nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. In: Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, 14 (1988), 3, 275-294.

Schwarz, Karl: Die Bildungsabschlüsse der Frauen und ihre Bedeutung für den Arbeitsmarkt, die Eheschließung und die Familienbildung. In: Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft, 15 (1989), 4, 361-382.

Schwarz, Karl: Geburtenentwicklung und Familienpolitik in der (früheren) DDR - Beispiel einer pro-natalistischen Politik. In: Zeitschrift für Familienforschung, 4 (1992), 3, 248-262.

## Annex

**Table A1: Education enrolment 1980-1992**

	YEAR	6-11 years			12-17 years			18-23 years			6-23 years		
		MF	M	F	MF	M	F	MF	M	F	MF	M	F
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
WORLD TOTAL	1980	73,3	78,7	67,5	51,1	55,9	46,1	18,8	21,4	16,1	50,0	54,4	45,3
	1985	77,4	82,8	71,8	51,3	55,8	46,5	17,9	19,9	15,8	50,1	54,1	45,9
	1990	79,0	83,3	74,6	52,9	57,3	48,3	18,6	20,3	16,8	51,0	54,5	47,4
	1991	79,2	83,5	74,8	53,6	57,9	49,2	18,8	20,6	17,0	51,5	54,9	47,9
	1992	79,4	83,6	75,0	54,1	58,0	49,9	18,9	20,8	17,0	51,8	55,2	48,3
EUROPE (INCLUDING FORMER U.S.S.R.)	1980	90,2	90,5	89,9	79,8	79,1	80,5	25,9	26,6	25,1	64,5	64,7	64,4
	1985	89,5	89,7	89,2	82,9	82,2	83,6	28,9	28,7	29,1	66,2	66,0	66,4
	1990	88,9	88,9	88,9	81,6	79,7	83,5	33,9	33,6	34,2	67,9	67,2	68,7
	1991	89,1	89,1	89,1	81,3	79,5	83,2	35,0	34,4	35,6	68,4	67,6	69,2
	1992	89,1	89,1	89,1	81,8	80,0	83,6	35,6	34,9	36,3	68,7	67,9	69,6
NORTHERN AMERICA	1980	100	100	100	89,8	89,3	90,2	48,4	47,4	49,5	76,2	75,6	76,9
	1985	100	100	100	98,1	97,9	98,2	53,0	50,5	55,5	80,5	79,5	81,6
	1990	100	100	100	94,4	95,6	93,1	66,8	60,9	73,0	87,2	86,5	88,0
	1991	100	100	100	94,3	95,7	92,7	66,7	61,9	71,8	87,4	87,1	87,8
	1992	100	100	100	95,4	97,0	93,8	66,2	63,0	70,1	87,5	87,2	87,8

Source: UNESCO, edweb @ [www.education.unesco.org](http://www.education.unesco.org)

**Table A2: Duration of school enrolment (all levels) to be anticipated for a child at age 5 (years)**

	years
Australia	16,3
Austria	15,2
Belgium	17,6
Canada	16,0
Czechia	14,1
Danmark	16,3
Finland	15,9
France	16,3
Germany	16,2
Greece	14,0
Hungary	14,2
Ireland	15,2
Japan	14,8
Netherlands	16,9
New Zealand	16,0
Norway	16,2
Portugal	15,7
Spain	16,1
Sweden	15,8
Switzerland	15,4
Great Britain	15,3
USA	15,8

Source: OECD 1997: 10 (Bildung auf einen Blick)

**Table A3: Quota of gainful employment of women at age 20 to 59**

	1983	1986	1990
Belgium	51,5	54,8	55,3
Germany (West)	56,3	59,4	64,5
France	64,2	66,9	68,2
Italy	44,2	46,6	49,6
EUR12	55,6	56,7	60,6

Source: Knauth 1992: 270

Table A4: International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED)

Category	Level	Ages and duration
0	pre-primary	begins at age 3, 4, or 5 and lasts from one to three years
1	primary	not younger than five or older than seven years, in principle six years of full-time schooling
2	lower secondary	entry after some 6 years of primary education
3	upper secondary	begins at the end of full-time compulsory education, entrance age typically 15 or 16 years
4	post-secondary non-tertiary	students are typically older than those in upper secondary programmes, full-time equivalent duration of between 6 months and 2 years
5	tertiary, first stage	cumulative theoretical duration of at least 2 years
6	tertiary, second stage	post graduate

**Table A5: ISCO and own coding of occupations**

	ISCO	occupation
professions	11-34	legislators and senior officials corporate managers general managers physical, mathematical and engineering science pr. life science and health professionals teaching professionals other professionals
clerks	41-74	office clerks customer services clerks personal and protective services workers models, salespersons and demonstrators market-oriented skilled agricultural and fishery workers subsistence agricultural and fishery workers extraction and building trades workers precision, handicraft, printing and related trades workers other craft and related trade workers
operators	81-93	stationary-plant and related workers machine operators and assemblers drivers and mobile-plant operators sales and services elementary occupations agricultural, fishery and related labourers labourers in mining, construction, manufacturing and transport
clerks/operators	01	armed forces

**Table A6: Overview FFS Project (June 1999)**

Sample Design			Fieldwork		
Country file	Women	Men	Age Range	Start	End
<b>Austria</b>	4500	1500	20-54	Dec-95	May-96
<b>Belgium</b>	3200	2200	21-40	Mar-91	Dec-92
<b>Finland</b>	4200	1700	22-51	Aug-89	Jan-90
<b>France</b>	2900	1900	20-49	Jan-94	Apr-94
<b>Germany West</b>	3000	2000	20-39	Jul-92	Jul-92
<b>Germany East</b>	3000	2000	20-39	Jul-92	Jul-92
<b>Hungary</b>	3600	1900	18-41	Nov-92	Dec-93
<b>Italy</b>	4800	1200	20-49	Nov-95	Jan-96
<b>Poland</b>	4200	4300	18-49	Dec-91	Dec-91
<b>Sweden</b>	3300	1700	23-43	Oct-92	May-93
<b>Switzerland</b>	3900	2100	20-49	Oct-94	May-95
<b>Total: 23 countries</b>	95200	42800	15-69	Oct-88	Mar-98

## Austria

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,87***	,00	-4,73***	,01	-4,77***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,14***	,87	-,06	,94	-,07	,93
	Educ.Aspiration	,01	1,01	,00	1,00	-,01	,99
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,39***	,03	-3,24***	,04
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00***	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,64***	1,90
N events			1163		1163		1163
N cases			1705		1705		1705
person years			43769		43769		43769
LL-start			-8274		-8274		-8274
LL-final			-8267		-7160		-7112

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-5,11***	,01	-5,11***	,01	-5,44***	,00
	YoungerCohorts	,13**	1,14	,16***	1,18	,12**	1,12
	Single	-2,89***	,06	-1,65***	,19	-1,74***	,18
	Educ.Aspiration	,08***	1,09	,08***	1,08	,04	1,04
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,46***	,09	-2,23***	,11
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,01***	1,01
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,73***	2,07
N events			994		994		994

N cases	1705	1705	1705
person years	46476	46476	46476
LL-start	-7290	-7290	-7290
LL-final	-6362	-6144	-6019

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

### Belgium (Flanders)

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-4,99***	,01	-4,19***	,02	-4,41***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,37***	,69	-,13***	,88	-,11**	,90
	Educ.Aspiration	-,11***	,90	,09***	1,10	,08***	1,09
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-5,11***	,01	-4,92***	,01
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,42***	1,51
N events			1717		1717		1717
N cases			2456		2456		2456
person years			56124		56124		56124
LL-start			-11961		-11961		-11961
LL-final			-11868		-9123		-9087

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,37***	,03	-3,47***	,03	-3,58***	,03
	YoungerCohorts	-,19***	,83	-,16***	,85	-,16***	,85

Single	-4,95***	,01	-3,27***	,04	-3,28***	,04
Educ.Aspiration	-,12***	,89	-,09***	,91	-,09***	,91
Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,80***	,02	-3,79***	,02
Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00***	1,00
FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,01	1,01
N events		1295		1295		1295
N cases		2456		2456		2456
person years		61027		61027		61027
LL-start		-9498		-9498		-9498
LL-final		-6842		-6721		-6709

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Germany East

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,49***	,00	-4,64***	,01	-4,72***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,22***	,80	-,10**	,90	-,10**	,91
	Educ.Aspiration	-,02	,98	,14***	1,15	,14***	1,15
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,83***	,06	-2,78***	,06
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,80***	2,23
N events			1483		1483		1483
N cases			2072		2072		2072
person years			47918		47918		47918
LL-start			-10319		-10319		-10319
LL-final			-10298		-8992		-8963

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,22***	,04	-3,56***	,03	-3,60***	,03
	YoungerCohorts	-,03	,97	,03	1,03	,03	1,03
	Single	-3,13***	,04	-1,53***	,22	-1,52***	,22
	Educ.Aspiration	-,02	,98	,11***	1,12	,11***	1,12
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,72***	,07	-2,69***	,07
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,29***	1,33
N events			1689		1689		1689
N cases			2072		2072		2072
person years			46894		46894		46894
LL-start			-11471		-11471		-11471
LL-final			-9879		-9083		-9077

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Germany West

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,33***	,00	-4,67***	,01	-4,86***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,33***	,72	-,06	,94	-,08	,92
	Educ.Aspiration	-,17***	,84	-,02	,98	-,04	,96
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,22***	,04	-2,99***	,05
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00*	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,50***	1,64
N events			1077		1077		1077
N cases			2036		2036		2036
person years			50515		50515		50515
LL-start			-7895		-7895		-7895
LL-final			-7833		-6770		-6741

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
 Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,57***	,03	-3,79***	,02	-3,80***	,02
	YoungerCohorts	-,06	,94	,04	1,05	,09*	1,09
	Single	-3,35***	,04	-1,91***	,15	-1,90***	,15
	Educ.Aspiration	-,15***	,86	-,08**	,93	-,05*	,95
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,99***	,05	-3,13***	,04
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00*	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	-,36***	,70
N events			1099		1099		1099
N cases			2036		2036		2036
person years			51441		51441		51441
LL-start			-8023		-8023		-8023
LL-final			-6651		-6248		-6227

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
 Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Finland

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,69***	,00	-4,82***	,01	-5,03***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,40***	,67	-,36***	,70	-,35***	,71
	Educ.Aspiration	,02	1,02	,17***	1,18	,17***	1,19
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,43***	,09	-2,45***	,09
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	-,10***	,91

	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	1,49***	4,42
N events		666		666		666	
N cases		1184		1184		1184	
person years		28852		28852		28852	
LL-start		-4830		-4830		-4830	
LL-final		-4809		-4361		-4333	

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	Model 1 exp(β)	Model 2 β	Model 2 exp(β)	Model 3 β	Model 3 exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,60***	,03	-3,49***	,03	-3,67***	,03
	YoungerCohorts	-,08	,92	-,07	,94	-,05	,95
	Single	-2,99***	,05	-2,41***	,09	-2,37***	,09
	Educ.Aspiration	-,10*	,90	-,08	,92	-,07	,94
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-1,02***	,36	-,96***	,38
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,02**	1,02
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,43***	1,53
N events			527		527		527
N cases			779		779		779
person years			17624		17624		17624
LL-start			-3686		-3686		-3686
LL-final			-3160		-3117		-3107

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## France

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	Model 1 exp(β)	Model 2 β	Model 2 exp(β)	Model 3 β	Model 3 exp(β)
-------------	----------	--------------	-------------------	--------------	-------------------	--------------	-------------------

First marriage	Constant	-5,50***	,00	-4,75***	,01	-4,96***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,27***	,76	-,08	,92	-,11*	,90
	Educ.Aspiration	-,08**	,92	,02	1,02	,00	1,00
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,54***	,03	-3,37***	,03
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	1,00***	2,72
N events		666		666		666	
N cases		1116		1116		1116	
person years		28255		28255		28255	
LL-start		-4661		-4661		-4661	
LL-final		-4637		-3957		-3924	

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-2,98***	,05	-3,12***	,04	-3,37***	,03
	YoungerCohorts	-,18***	,83	-,13**	,87	-,12*	,89
	Single	-4,08***	,02	-2,76***	,06	-2,75***	,06
	Educ.Aspiration	-,20***	,82	-,16***	,86	-,16***	,85
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,45***	,09	-2,40***	,09
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00**	1,00
FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,24*	1,27	
N events		708		708		708	
N cases		1116		1116		1116	
person years		28817		28817		28817	
LL-start		-5095		-5095		-5095	
LL-final		-3883		-3779		-3773	

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Hungary

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,29***	,01	-3,63***	,03	-4,22***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,13***	,88	-,17***	,84	-,13***	,88
	Educ.Aspiration	-,08**	,93	-,06*	,94	-,04	,96
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,99***	,05	-2,56***	,08
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	1,04***	2,83
N events			1290		1290		1290
N cases			1525		1525		1525
person years			33016		33016		33016
LL-start			-8678		-8678		-8678
LL-final			-8666		-7407		-7269

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-2,70***	,07	-2,63***	,07	-2,81***	,06
	YoungerCohorts	-,19***	,83	-,18***	,83	-,19***	,83
	Single	-4,44***	,01	-3,90***	,02	-3,83***	,02
	Educ.Aspiration	-,16***	,85	-,15***	,86	-,15***	,86
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-,83***	,43	-,72***	,49
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,48***	1,62
N events			1359		1359		1359
N cases			1719		1719		1719

person years	39835	39835	39835
LL-start	-9327	-9327	-9327
LL-final	-6749	-6696	-6661

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Italy

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,24***	,01	-4,66***	,01	-4,63***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,23***	,79	-,16***	,85	-,17***	,84
	Educ.Aspiration	-,13***	,88	,09***	1,09	,08***	1,08
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,38***	,03	-3,27***	,04
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00***	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,80***	2,22
N events			1746		1746		1746
N cases			2385		2385		2385
person years			59624		59624		59624
LL-start			-12246		-12246		-12246
LL-final			-12178		-10598		-10547

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,66***	,03	-3,64***	,03	-3,70***	,02
	YoungerCohorts	,03	1,03	,02	1,02	,01	1,01
	Single	-5,14***	,01	-4,68***	,01	-4,67***	,01

Educ.Aspiration	-,09***	,91	-,08***	,93	-,08***	,92
Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-,79***	,45	-,78***	,46
Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,12	1,13
N events		1417		1417		1417
N cases		2388		2388		2388
person years		64245		64245		64245
LL-start		-10335		-10335		-10335
LL-final		-7287		-7263		-7257

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Poland

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,40***	,00	-4,48***	,01	-4,58***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,14***	,87	,07*	1,07	,06	1,07
	Educ.Aspiration	-,08***	,92	,09***	1,09	,07***	1,08
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,52***	,03	-3,37***	,03
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,43***	1,54
N events			1416		1416		1416
N cases			1833		1833		1833
person years			41873		41873		41873
LL-start			-9730		-9730		-9730
LL-final			-7989		-7989		-7989

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-2,61***	,07	-2,77***	,06	-2,80***	,06
	YoungerCohorts	,03	1,03	,10**	1,11	,11**	1,11
	Single	-4,99***	,01	-3,76***	,02	-3,77***	,02
	Educ.Aspiration	-,15***	,86	-,09***	,91	-,09***	,91
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-1,97***	,14	-1,95***	,14
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,05	1,05
N events			1296		1296		1296
N cases			1715		1715		1715
person years			40165		40165		40165
LL-start			-8967		-8967		-8967
LL-final			-5907		-5762		-5760

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Sweden

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	exp(β)	Model 2 β	exp(β)	Model 3 β	exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-6,42***	,00	-5,79***	,00	-5,83***	,00
	YoungerCohorts	-,43***	,65	-,30***	,74	-,33***	,72
	Educ.Aspiration	,01	1,01	,09*	1,10	,09*	1,09
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-1,84***	,16	-1,86***	,16
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00***	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	1,53***	4,60
N events			453		453		453
N cases			1798		1798		1798
person years			48397		48397		48397
LL-start			-3700		-3700		-3700
LL-final			-3675		-3499		-3476

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	1 exp(β)	Model 2 β	2 exp(β)	Model 3 β	3 exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,19***	,04	-2,95***	,05	-2,92***	,05
	YoungerCohorts	-,26***	,77	-,26***	,77	-,29***	,75
	Single	-3,48***	,03	-2,94***	,05	-2,90***	,06
	Educ.Aspiration	-,14***	,87	-,13***	,88	-,14***	,87
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-,97***	,38	-,86***	,42
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00*	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,68***	1,97
N events			706		706		706
N cases			1381		1381		1381
person years			34918		34918		34918
LL-start			-5214		-5214		-5214
LL-final			-4240		-4182		-4167

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001  
Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

## Switzerland

Tab. \_\_: First marriage, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	1 exp(β)	Model 2 β	2 exp(β)	Model 3 β	3 exp(β)
First marriage	Constant	-5,43***	,00	-4,72***	,01	-4,77***	,01
	YoungerCohorts	-,20***	,82	-,06	,94	-,07	,93
	Educ.Aspiration	-,18***	,84	-,02	,98	-,02	,98
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-3,14***	,04	-3,09***	,05
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00

	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,91***	2,48
N events		1134		1134			1134
N cases		2046		2046			2046
person years		55428		55428			55428
LL-start		-8367		-8367			-8367
LL-final		-8333		-7233			-7209

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00

Tab. \_\_: Birth of the first child, women

Destination	Variable	Model 1 β	1 exp(β)	Model 2 β	2 exp(β)	Model 3 β	3 exp(β)
Erstes Kind	Constant	-3,08***	,05	-3,16***	,04	-3,19***	,04
	YoungerCohorts	-,24***	,78	-,24***	,79	-,26***	,77
	Single	-4,05***	,02	-2,83***	,06	-2,80***	,06
	Educ.Aspiration	-,17***	,84	-,11**	,90	-,11**	,90
	Educ.Enrolled	.	.	-2,05***	,13	-2,00***	,14
	Occ.Aspiration	.	.	.	.	,00	1,00
	FullOccupation	.	.	.	.	,49***	1,63
N events			813		813		813
N cases			1386		1386		1386
person years			37912		37912		37912
LL-start			-5972		-5972		-5972
LL-final			-4593		-4473		-4460

β=regression coefficient; exp(β)=relative risk; LL=log-likelihood; \* p<0,05; \*\* p<0,01; \*\*\* p<0,001

Source: Family and Fertility Survey (UN-ECE) 24 Jan 00