

Becoming a parent: material and immaterial consequences in the 90's

Therese Jacobs
University of Antwerp
Department of Sociology

IUSSP
XXV^o International Population Conference

Session 22 Family Formation

Chair: Fransesco Billari

Abstract

Based upon longitudinal data from the Panel Study on Belgian Households (PSBH), this paper explores the impact of childbirth on the living conditions of the parents. The dataset selected panel members, age 20-34, who were childless in 1992. The income situation, satisfaction with three life domains (job, free time and social life) and mental health (depression scale) in 2001 of parents and non-parents, are studied both from a between subjects and a within subjects perspective. The results confirm the thesis of the negative impact on material living conditions. Compensation for these costs by gains in wellbeing is not convincingly proved by these data.

First Draft version June 2005

Introduction

Low and very low fertility patterns in Europe contrast sharply with the patterns in the US. From 1965 to 1980 we observe parallel developments in both regions: a firm decline in fertility levels as measured by TFR. From 1980 until 1995 both regions follow different paths: the transversal fertility figures in the US increase but European figures continue to decrease. From 1995 on we observe some stabilisation in both regions: in Europe far beneath the reproduction level (around 1.6 children per woman), in the US somewhat higher (around 2 children per woman). Fahey and Speder (2004) conclude that during the past two decennia the fertility in the USA was some 40% higher than in Europe (EU-15). The integration of several eastern European countries will not change the picture at all. The fertility has fallen dramatically since 1989 in most of the transition and candidate countries (Billari, 2004).

This development is entering the European policy agenda bit by bit (for example: Communication from the commission of the European communities, Green paper “Confronting demographic change: a new solidarity between the generations”, 2005). Policy papers gradually formulate low fertility in terms of a policy problem. Some European commentators and organisations point to the economic aspects in terms of lower competitiveness (European Foundation for the improvement of living and working conditions, 2004; Esping-Andersen, 2002). Others link the ageing and fertility issue in terms of pressures on the European social regimes (Quintin, 2002). Moreover we observe that the research of the impact of family policy measures on fertility patterns is not a taboo theme anymore (McDonald, 2002; Jacobs, 2002, Schoenmaeckers & Van Peer, 2002, Neyer, 2003, Sleebos, 2003; Ronsen, 2004).

In this context the scientific study of the mechanisms that generate the actual patterns is gaining social relevance again.

Many demographers, sociologists and economists have contributed to improve our understanding of the sustained decrease in fertility levels in Europe (Billari, 2004). *Macro* studies are in majority comparative studies where the differences between countries either are explained by the social regime or by the degree of individualisation, or both. Well-known became the ‘rational actor’ perspectives where the child is considered as a competitor in a field of many wished for goods or time consumption alternatives. These *micro* perspectives focus on the decision process and more specifically on the weighing up of several cost factors. They implicitly make use of the ‘biography of choice’ framework: ‘taking’ a(nother) child is one of many possible life course options.

Research then should shift from the explanation of the number of children (as it is suggested by the TFR-measure) towards the understanding of childlessness. Indeed, the biography of choice hypothesis seems not to be very helpful in understanding the number of children since the empirical variety in these numbers (1 or 2, perhaps 3 children per woman) is not impressive, given a theoretical range of 1 to at least 14. The choice for parenthood however is a crucial choice in a life course, especially for women. There are indications that life long childlessness is increasing, at least in North and West European countries (Billari, 2004). The trend in childlessness is in these countries a crucial factor in determining the risk either of a new/continuing decrease in fertility levels or of a stabilisation in fertility. Therefore, the analysis of the (first) family formation is extremely important for demographic monitoring. Especially the micro study of the mechanisms that lead couples towards parenthood is crucial.

This paper presents an analysis of the living conditions of young adults (20-34 yrs old in 1992) who either have made the transition to parenthood or not in the period from 1992 to 2001. In comparing the living conditions between the two groups (between subjects analysis) and in comparing the living conditions before and after the birth of a child (within subjects analysis), we illustrate some of the consequences – and hence indirectly some aspects of the decision processes- of choosing to become a parent in the last decade of the 20th Century in a European low fertility country (Belgium).

Costs and profits

Material consequences

The mainstream reasoning in fertility research is based on the role played by cost factors: children are expensive in terms of (opportunity) costs and in terms of time costs and hence – it is assumed- avoided when these costs are assessed as too high. Becoming a parent is less obvious when you have to forgo an attractive career and when an attractive career is subjectively felt as extremely important for your wellbeing (Hakim, 2003).

Nevertheless we expect a cost effect of the transition into parenthood. Globally speaking, Belgium is one of the richest countries in the world and thereupon the country has a longstanding tradition in social security provision. From early on childhood benefits and tax reductions according to the number of children are a substantive part of the social regime and recently, financial incentives are accompanied with fiscal incentives (for instance a fiscal deduction for professional childcare) and with

time policies (for instance motherhood and parenthood leaves). The outcome is a country where poverty is relatively low. Moreover Belgian households are two-earner households regardless of the presence of children, especially in the younger generations. We expect however differences in the material living conditions of parents and non parents and in the situation ante and post the birth of the child, because firstly policy measures never compensate for the real costs of children and secondly because motherhood is often accompanied by a reduction of work hours.

Immaterial consequences

The main point of this study however is that we want to add the profit side of the coin: the benefits of becoming a parent. In fact, in a context of increasing childlessness it is as important to explain why a majority of young adults still want to form a family as it is to understand why some do not make the transition. Becoming a parent could be viewed as a rather atypical choice in a highly individualised and de-institutionalised setting. At least for some two decades you freeze your life course if not for all the remaining years of your life. It is moreover a rather unwise choice in the context of growing insecurity on the labour and housing market and in the context of uncertainties of your health condition. And finally family formation seems to become incompatible with personal intimate relations. A personal relationship presupposes permanent reflection on its quality in view of other, better alternatives whereas a family presupposes stability and long term commitments of the parents (Daly, 2004). This kind of reasoning then starts with an assumption of high inertia towards the decision of becoming a parent, especially in the context of highly effective and intensely used contraception. What then has to be explained is the empirical fact that a majority of young adults is nevertheless making the transition.

One answer could lie in the idea that the costs of parenthood are counterbalanced by benefits in wellbeing. This surplus in wellbeing could be generated by the fact that giving birth exceeds the micro cosmos of the couple. By giving birth to a child, your parents become grandparents and thereby the continuation of the family line is guaranteed. Moreover you become a ‘mother’ or a ‘father’, a specific role which is still highly valued in our society.

The scientific research from this perspective is overwhelmingly scarce. Friedman, Hechter and Kanawaza (1994) have argued explicitly in favour of the reversal of research question. They stated the problem as follows: “Models based on instrumental values are effective in explaining the decline of fertility in developed societies, but they cannot explain why anyone under current circumstances would choose to have a child, absent significant state-provided pronatalist incentives. (...) Thus the interesting question for instrumental models of fertility is *why do people in developed countries have any children at all when the prevailing constraints are inconsistent with this choice?* The obvious

answer is that they have children because the value, to them, of having children outweighs the value of the instrumental (time and money) resources that they give up in doing so.” (Friedman et al., pag. 380)

After critically assessing possible non-instrumental motives, most of them stemming from psychological research, the authors conclude that benefits may be subsumed under one single umbrella: the ‘reduction of uncertainty’. This exactly is the opposite of what the choice biography assumes. There childlessness is preferred because parenthood closes freedom of future planning and hence is detrimental for well being. Here parenting is preferred because it gives perspective in life (parenting hypothesis) and/or couples do not see other ways to show their affection (affirmation hypothesis) (Kalmijn & Gelissen, 2002). In sum, Friedman, Hechter and Kanawaza conceptualise the choice for a child in terms of the production of well being in times of high uncertainties. But, in their view, becoming a parent is not the only ‘pathway to happiness’, other paths to close the future are generating well-being as well. They are *‘functionally equivalent’* in view of well being. Following this thinking, we do not expect changes in well being values between the respondents that made and those who did not made the transition to parenthood in the observed period. Longitudinal research however does allow for the study of within subjects changes as well. In the same line of reasoning we should expect persons who finally became parents that their personal levels of wellbeing increase because of the choice they have made.

In an indirect way however, the hypothesis of gains in wellbeing is confirmed in the results of the research into happiness. Most of this research is cross sectional and studies the relationships between socio-demographic characteristics (age, gender, civil status, ...) and satisfaction, happiness or another operationalisation of subjective wellbeing (Diener et al., 1999). The presence of children is nearly never considered as a relevant variable and Veenhoven (2001:1294) states that “*Studies in Western nations showed that ‘children’ do not add to the happiness of married persons*”. This is not that big a surprise since most of these studies were carried out in times when being married and having children were linked very closely. Married persons are in nearly all studies – older and newer studies- found to be happier than their non married counterparts (Wilson, 1967 as quoted in Veenhoven, 2001). If this relationship becomes less strong because of the growing diversity in the group of married and of unmarried persons (marriages of higher order and cohabiting persons), is still under discussion (Lee et al, 1991, Mastekaasa, 1993, Diener, 1999, Waite et al, 2000a, 2000b, Williams, 2003). In recent years life satisfaction is studied in a longitudinal design as well. Lucas et al (2003) confirm for instance that at the end of the observation period married people are more happy than not married people, but that selection effects (happier people tend to marry more) and adaptation effects (the first euphoria evaporates after some time) play a significant role.

On the basis of the theoretical reasoning in this research tradition we could expect an impact of family formation on wellbeing. Apart from the social profits (valued by own parents and community, clear and valued identity) we may suppose that children may counterbalance for difficulties in life and that children are a resource of emotional support for their parents. These gains would '*compensate*' for the costs, parenthood brings about. We may further suppose that there is a selection effect: happier persons make more often the transition to parenthood. Finally we assume that the differences between both groups will be rather big, given that our observation period is short and that we have therefore more respondents in the sample with a short duration of parenthood.

The objective of this study is then to explore these (contradicting) hypotheses using panel data. The data set does not include variables on the motivation patterns of the respondents. In this sense, both hypotheses –the compensation hypothesis and the hypothesis of functional equivalence- can not be tested directly. Instead the data allow the analysis of the consequences of the transition into parenthood. In the first place, we propose a 'between subjects' analysis between parents and non-parents, looking at the impact of the transition on material (income) and immaterial (wellbeing) aspects of their lives. In the second place we look at 'within subject' changes, where we analyse the impact of the transition in the life course of the respondents on income and wellbeing (Lucas et al, 2003).

Methods

The analysis is explorative, based on the secondary analysis of data of the Panel Study on Belgian Households (PSBH). This panel survey started in 1992, was integrated in the ECHP in 1994 and was finalised in 2003.

Data

We selected first all respondents without children in the age group 20-34 yrs (birth years 1957-1971) from the first wave (1992). Thereafter we dismissed all cases that were not in the 2001 data; 60% of the original group is not participating in 2001. The sample (N=479) represents the three regions of Belgium: 15% of the respondents live in Brussels, 47% lives in Flanders and 38% lives in Wallonia.

We are aware of the selectivity in this sample. First we are not dealing with the respondents in this age group who became parent before 1992. Therefore the sample is disproportional composed of respondents with higher educational levels because these persons postpone family formation more

then the others. This effect is amplified by the second source of selection: the attrition during the observation period. We know indeed that persons with a higher educational level are participating longer in the panel study.

The panel is based on a household sample: hence some respondents share the same characteristics. Therefore we include the gender dimension in all final models of our analyses. Although the total group is homogeneous in respect to age, we make a difference between three age groups in order to integrate possible variations according to the timing of the first birth.

Variables and descriptive results (Table 1)

We selected information that was collected in both waves in nearly the same wordings.

The main independent variable: 'transition to parenthood' however is a construction based on the household grid. We decided to measure family formation in terms of household composition in 2001 in order to include the sociological 'fatherhood' of men in reconstituted families. In the rule the variable measures the transition towards biological parenthood, i.e. in 85% of all cases the respondent became a biological parent in the observed period. More than half of the respondents (56%) have passed the transition, 58% of the women and 55% of men. The youngest cohort became less often parent (54%) than the middle cohort (66%) but more often than the oldest cohort (42%). This means that childlessness is a realistic perspective for those who did not make the transition before their 30-ies in 1992.

We operationalize the material living conditions as the mean standardised income of the household per month. In this income all financial transfers (for instance child benefits) are included. The mean income increased in this sample during the observation period, due to the increase of salaries with age and due to inflation. But, in 2002 this mean value is lower for families in all gender and age subgroups. This phenomenon has often been documented in the Dutch literature (Van Praag & Niphuis-Nell, 1997, Nederlandse Gezinsraad, 2001, Latten, 2003)

Wellbeing is measured by two different factors. We constructed an index of satisfaction, composed of satisfaction with job, with social life and with leisure time. We observe no statistical significant relationship between family formation and this scale. This is understandable given the differing effect of each of the composing parts of the scale. There is no significant relationship between family formation and satisfaction with social life; satisfaction with job is significantly higher in the parents group ($p=0.027$) and satisfaction with leisure time significantly lower ($p=0.007$). This last effect

probably is due to the wording of the question, which indicates much more the availability of personal free time and not the quality of the leisure time.

The other wellbeing variable is measured by the answers on a (non medical) depression scale. Depression increased slightly during the period of observation. The differences between the means in both groups are rather small, and statistically not significant ($p=0.083$). Persons with children however are less present in the group with the highest number of depressive symptoms.

Finally, we added some socio-demographic characteristics: age and gender. In the multivariate analyses of wellbeing we integrated a culture variable as well : religious attitude, because religion is known to be associated significantly with family formation (Jansen, 2002).

Analysis tools

In order to estimate the impact of the transition into parenthood from a between subjects perspective, we used a *stepwise OLS regression analysis* to explain the income position in 2001. The analysis controls for other characteristics of the situation in 2001 (presence of partner in the household, number of household members, educational level, number of hours in job and health), for living condition in 1992 (standardised income and still living with parents) and for sex and age. We used the same technique to estimate the impact of the birth of a child on the satisfaction variables. Characteristics of the 2001 situation are the above mentioned variables plus degree of depression and standardised income. We added the degree of satisfaction with the three life domains in 1992 in the model as well as the 1992 degree of depression. Moreover we controlled for sex, age and religion. Finally we used the same variables to estimate the impact of family formation on mental health as measured by the depression variable.

We used a different technique to analyse the within subject changes. The dependent variable is constructed as a dummy variable indicating whether the respondent realised a relevant change in income position (growth of more than 40%, which is the official growth rate in the Belgian population in the period of observation), satisfaction and depression. Therefore the multivariate analysis uses a *logistic regression* looking for the odds to be in one of both groups according to the presence of transitions 1992-2001 (birth, transition towards living with partner, separation/divorce and the obtainment of a higher educational degree, deterioration of health status), according to the characteristics at the start and controlled for by sex, gender and religion.

Results

Both between subjects and within subject analyses show that the birth of a child is accompanied by a relative income deprivation.

Table 2 gives the results of the stepwise regression on the standardised income in 2001. All models are statistically significant. The first model is cross sectional and shows that a child makes a difference after controlling for household composition, educational level, hours of work and health status. After introducing some elements of the living conditions in 1992, the explained variance improves from 22% to 26% and the impact of parenting remains significant. Model 4 shows the best solution: 27% of the variance is explained by 5 variables, and one of the strongest effects is caused by the presence of a child.

Table 3 compares the living conditions of our respondents before and after the arrival of a child. We measure the odds of being a member of the group that realised a more than average income growth in Belgium in the period considered. The odds to realise a better welfare position are in favour of the respondents with a higher educational level (three times as high) and of the respondents who were still living at home at the start of the observation period. On the other side are the respondents who became parents: their odds are four times less than their counterparts to improve their income situation as good as the modal Belgian citizen. This parenthood effect is significant in all models considered: in the first model that takes into consideration other relevant transitions (towards building an own household, towards separation, towards a higher educational level), in the second and third models that control for living conditions at the start, for age and sex. Interesting to see is how the prolonged stay in the parental house proves to be a strategic decision to safeguard a higher income dynamic.

On the contrary, the analyses to test the hypothesis of the impact of parenting on the measures of wellbeing are not convincing. There is no effect whatsoever of an independent effect of becoming a parent on the satisfaction measures, either in the between groups or in the within group analysis. Moreover, we observe nearly no effect of parental status in the comparison of both groups –parents and not parents- on the level of depression. The within subject analysis shows that there is however an effect of becoming a parent on the changes in depression: a child protects against a deterioration of mental health.

We studied the impact of a child in the household on all measures of satisfaction (table 4). The level of explained variance is low. We explain 11% of the satisfaction with the job: the (mental) health status is decisive as well as the welfare position. Also the overall satisfaction in 1992 is contributing to the explanation, but not the parenthood status. The same holds true for explaining the satisfaction with leisure time. Only 8% of the variance is explained. Health and welfare status are crucial; interesting is

that the number of children impacts on the satisfaction with leisure time. The reason is that the question was formulated in order to get an idea of the time respondents have (left over) for themselves, and not in terms of the quality of the leisure time. The satisfaction level at the start again is significantly contributing to the explanation. Finally, we again are not able to explain the satisfaction with social life decently. Only 8% of the variance is explained. The mental health status, the earlier reported satisfaction with social life and –for the first time in the analyses – gender are important factors, but not the parenthood status. The within subjects analyses were overall unsatisfactory and therefore we do not go into depth.

With the data at hand it is slightly more fruitful to understand the variance in depression. The level of explanation is rather good, from 18% in the first model to 28% in the most effective model (table 5). Again this between subjects analysis has been worked out starting with a cross sectional analysis and consecutively controlling for selectivity with variables from the past and some usual socio demographic variables. In neither of the models considered, the status of parenthood is significantly effecting the level of mental health after controlling for current situation (model 1), for the mental health status in the past and for sex, age and religion. Model 4 and model 5 show that the presence of a partner and of a child is substituting for each other. Being involved in a family situation is improving the mental health status, but the partner effect is stronger than the child effect. In analogy with the analysis on the satisfaction variables, we observe that current health status and depression level in the past have strong predictive power. The gender effect is a well known phenomenon in the mental health literature: women are almost always in the higher levels of depression scales.

The within subjects analysis is worked out in analogy with the procedure we used for the income measure. The question is whether the changes in depression during the observed period are effected by the transition into parenthood. We studied the odds of becoming a member of the group with a net deterioration in mental health (table 6). In all models considered, the transition into parenthood indeed makes a significant difference. Parenthood is a protecting shield against a worsening of the mental health. The first model takes other transitions into account. Partnering as well is protective, but the worsening of health status is significantly contributing to the deterioration of the mental health status. The significant effect of becoming a parent and of becoming a partner holds true even after controlling for the living conditions and the mental health status in 1992. And again, both effects survive the controlling with socio demographic variables. Interesting is to observe that gender is not significantly explaining the odds of belonging to the group with an increase in the level of depression. Finally, the fourth model gives the most effective model. The odds of not being in the group of respondents with decreasing mental health are 2.4 for parents and 2 for partners. These effects are significant after controlling for becoming more unhealthy during the period (more then 7 times as much odds to have

to live with a deteriorating mental health) and after controlling for the mental health status at the start (more than 6.5 times as much).

Discussion

This explorative longitudinal study of the consequences of becoming a parent shows that there is a significant impact on the welfare position of individuals, compared to their peers and compared to their personal situation before family formation. Parenthood implies a ‘choice’ for a relatively less comfortable welfare condition even in a country with a rather elaborated family policy. Apparently this ‘cost’ is taken for granted. We tried to understand this behaviour by exploring the other side of the coin: perhaps becoming a parent is gratifying in itself and therefore it gives a relative higher satisfaction and a better mental health.

Grosso modo our analyses are not convincingly confirming the hypothesis. The relative income deficit as a consequence of family formation is empirically corroborated, but the consequences in terms of ‘gains’ are not in line. The analyses are more pointing towards the stable, unchanging character of satisfaction and mental health. It seems they are much more ‘traits’ than ‘statuses’ and hence they vary only slightly during the life course. Given these results it is not a good idea to check more properly for the compensation hypothesis: are those respondents who report (higher) costs also reporting (higher) gains? Rather it is useful to try to understand what brings about our results and to explore other routes of possible gains of parenting in our societies.

One possible reason for the lack of convincing associations between the measures of wellbeing and the parenthood status is that the group of childless persons in our sample is heterogeneous. It is well known that childlessness is not only due to a deliberate choice. At least two other conditions are real: persons with a sub fertile profile because of biological problems and persons who are without a partner at the moment they want to become a parent. Both of these circumstances could have effects on the satisfaction and the depression measures. We do not know how these groups are distributed in our sample; in fact we do not dispose of data on child wish or parenthood motivations or subjective evaluation items of parenthood. Secondary analysis therefore is second choice to study the impact of parenthood on wellbeing.

Another possible reason is that we did not fully exploit the longitudinal data. Although we could dispose of a full range of yearly measures, we analysed only the start and end observation years. If the dynamic theory (Lucas et al, 2003) -that states that subjective indicators only vary during a short period after a transition- is valid, then we could gain some more significant associations in using the full range of the time series. In this analysis we then have to consider carefully the interference of

partnering and marriage. Moreover more sophisticated analytical work could be done in using a multilevel approach: differences between groups and within groups could then be analysed simultaneously.

A third cluster of reasons for the unconvincing results lay in the measurements of the wellbeing factor. The measures of satisfaction are rudimental because they measure life domains that are not directly linked with parenting. Items on satisfaction with the personal relationship with the partner, with the integration in family and community would probably be more adequate. Our depression measure however is qualitatively much better, since its scale has been tested in several analyses and since it is based on a large set of items (Bracke, 1996).

A last route of critically assessing the results lies in reflecting (again) upon the theory of the rational actor. Perhaps the consideration of the pros and cons against each other is not the mechanism that directs the choice to become a parent. It is striking for example that the ample evidence of the impact of marriage on the happiness since years is accompanied with a steady decrease in marriage propensity. Therefore it is possible that a majority of adults chooses to become parents notwithstanding the obvious lack of rewards. A continuous reconsideration of explanations of fertility behaviour hence is crucial.

Conclusion

Before concluding firmly that parenting does not impact the wellbeing of the parents if compared to other lifepaths, thereby agreeing with the Friedman hypothesis that *functionally equivalent* perspectives are leading as well towards parenthood as to childlessness, we still have to explore the data more in depth. The small, but real finding that parenthood is for some respondents a shield to avoid a deterioration of mental health, is certainly a starting point. Nevertheless we end this paper in trying to imagine what it means for our societies if indeed the choice of a child is functionally equivalent to the development of a professional career, to an attitude of keeping the door open for transcontinental adventures and to other more daily driven consumerism. This would mean that a very wealthy society with a well elaborated welfare system (under pressure), with equal opportunities for women and men and a relatively very high proportion of highly educated people would lead nearly automatically towards more childlessness and therefore to the continuation of the decrease in fertility. If this discourse would be validated empirically, then demographers have to focus more explicitly on the macro importance of higher fertility levels. Mc Donald formulates as follows: “*Cela revient à affirmer avec force que les enfants sont une richesse sociale, et pas seulement une satisfaction personnelle et facultative relevant de la vie privée*” (Mc Donald, 2002: 240).

Tables

Table 1

Descriptive results of evolution between 1992 and 2001, according to age and sex (in %)

	Women			Men		
	<i>N</i>	1992	2001	<i>N</i>	1992	2001
<u>Household context</u>						
% still in parents home						
1957-1961	37	8	3	61	16	5
1962-1966	87	16	6	97	31	6
1967-1971	102	61	9	95	86	17
% with partner						
1957-1961		70	62		66	67
1962-1966		64	74		55	79
1967-1971		32	71		13	65
% with child						
1957-1961		0	43		0	41
1962-1966		0	60		0	71
1967-1971		0	62		0	46
<u>Material conditions</u>						
Mean standardised income (in BEF)						
1957-1961		51265	61834		53852	59607
1962-1966		46747	48986		46241	49294
1967-1971		43506	48075		42681	53798
<u>Wellbeing</u>						
% (highly) satisfied with job						
1957-1961		94	91		78	72
1962-1966		90	71		85	81
1967-1971		86	86		80	76
% (highly) satisfied with leisure time						
1957-1961		78	64		61	52
1962-1966		82	59		76	54
1967-1971		78	60		79	67
% (highly) satisfied with social life						
1957-1961		95	81		80	70
1962-1966		89	75		93	74
1967-1971		95	82		91	77
Mean satisfaction scale						
1957-1961		2,65	2,34		2,2	1,95
1962-1966		2,6	2,03		2,56	2,09
1967-1971		2,53	2,28		2,59	2,2
Mean depression scale						
1957-1961		2,08	2,18		1,89	2,03
1962-1966		2,1	2,24		1,87	1,96
1967-1971		2,17	2,35		1,92	1,98
<u>Co-variates</u>						
% with degree higher education						
1957-1961						
1962-1966		51	59		44	41
1967-1971		66	67		42	45
% believing in God						
1957-1961		49	63		34	56
1962-1966		64	59		53	49
1967-1971		65	55		54	38
		55	41		47	36

Table 2

Impact of parenthood on income. Standardised regression coefficients of a stepwise regression

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
		Sign.		Sign.		Sign.		Sign.
Living conditions in 2001								
Child present	-0,21	0,001	-0,25	0,0002	-0,23	0,0004	-0,27	<,0001
partner present	0,05	0,284	0,06	0,248	0,06	0,212		
Household size	-0,12	0,066	-0,11	0,095	-0,1	0,116		
Educational level	0,29	<0,0001	0,26	<,0001	0,27	<,0001	0,27	<,0001
Job hours	0,21	<0,0001	0,19	<,0001	0,18	<,0001	0,19	<,0001
health	-0,04	0,239	-0,04	0,297	-0,06	0,147		
Living conditions in 1992								
In parents home			0,02	0,593	0,1	0,049	0,09	0,075
Stand. Income			0,21	<0,0001	0,2	<,0001	0,2	<,0001
Controle								
sex					-0,01	0,797		
age					-0,14	0,005	-0,14	0,005
R ²	0,22		0,26		0,28		0,27	
Difference in R ³				0,04		0,02		-0,01

Table 3

Logistic regression on the more then average growth in income 1992-2001

	Model 1		Model 2		(Model 3)		Model 4	
	Est.	odd's	Est.	odd's	Est.	odd's	Est.	odd's
Intercept								-0,7
Transitions 1992 - 2001								
birth	-1,5	0,22	-1,6	0,2	-1,34	0,26	-1,38	0,25
Independent with partner	0,54	1,72	0,68	1,98				
divorce	0,24	1,28	0,29	1,33				
Higher diploma			1,07	2,92	1	2,73	1,12	3,06
Situation in 1992								
single			-0,68	0,5				
At home			0,22	1,25	0,35	1,41	0,56	1,76
with partner			0	,				
Standard. Income					-6E-06	1		
Controle								
sex			-0,21	0,8				
age						0		

in vet: significant op <,05

Table 4

Satisfaction: standardised regression coefficients of a stepwise OLSregression (Best model)

	Satisfaction with			
	job	Leisure time	soc.live	index
	N=353	N=354	N=354	N=353
Living situation 2001				
Child present				
partner present			0,09	
Number children	0,09	-0,14		
Educational level			-0,09	-0,05
Job volume		0,09		0,11
depression	-0,11		-0,16	-0,15
health	-0,16	-0,15		-0,15
income	0,12	-0,13		
Living situation 1992				
Satisfaction job				
Satisfaction leisure time		0,15		
Satisfaction social life		0,14		
index satisfaction	0,15			0,19
depression				
Controle				
sex			0,11	
age				
Believing in God				
R ²	11%	8%	8%	13%
sign= p<0,05				

Table 5

Depression: standardised regression coefficients of a stepwise OLS regression

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Living situation in 2001					
Child present	-0,01	0,01	0,02		-0,05
partner present	-0,12	-0,16	-0,15	-0,08	
Number children	0,01	0,03	0,03		
Educational level	0,01	0	-0,04		
health	0,45	0,41	0,42	0,37	0,41
income	0	0	0		
Living situation in 1992					
depression		0,29	0,27	0,27	0,27
Controle					
sex			0,18	0,12	0,18
age			0,01		
Beliefs in God			0,02		
R ²	18%	28%	30%	29%	28%
Difference in R ²		10%	2%	-1%	-1%

Table 6

Becoming more depressive. Logistic regression on the increase in depression 1992-2001

	Model 1		Model 2		(Model 3)		Model 4	
	Pearson=0,881		Pearson=0,009		Pearson=0,048		Pearson=0,082	
	Est.	OR	Est.	OR	Est.	OR	Est.	OR
Intercept							2,33	
Transitions 1992-2001								
birth	-0,7	0,49	-0,69	0,5	-0,74	0,48	-0,86	0,42
Independent with partner	-0,65	0,52	-0,71	0,49	-0,76	0,47	-0,67	0,51
divorce	0,03	1,03						
higher diploma	0,26	1,3						
Worsening in health	1,65	5,22	2	7,41	1,87	6,47	1,99	7,31
Higher income	-0,42	0,65					-0,51	0,6
Situation in 1992								
At home depression			0,06	1,06				
			-1,87	0,15	-1,88	0,15	-1,9	0,15
Controle								
Less religious					-0,11	0,89		
sex					0,49	1,62		
age					0,12	1,01		

in bold: significant op <,05

Literature

Billari F. C. (2004), *Choices, opportunities and constraints of partnership, childbearing and parenting: the patterns in the 1990's*. Background paper presented at the European Population Forum 2004: Population challenges and policy responses. UNECE, Geneva

Bracke P. (1996), Geslachtsverschillen in depressiviteit en de sociale ongelijkheid van mannen en vrouwen. Een structuralistische benadering. In *Archives of Public Health*, 54 (7-8), 275-300

Commission of the European Communities (2005), Green paper "Confronting demographic change: a new solidarity between the generations. Communication from the Commission, COM 94 final

Daly M. (2004), *Unmet needs and risks: the significance of changing family life for social policy in Europe/EU*. Paper voorgesteld op de conferentie 'Families, change and social policy in Europe', georganiseerd door het Iers Voorzitterschap 13-14 mei

Diener E., E.M.Suh, R.E.Lucas and H.L.Smith (1999), Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. In *Psychological Bulletin*, vol 125,2: 276-302

Esping-Andersen G. (2002), A child-centred social investment strategy. In Esping-Andersen G, with D.Gallie, A.Hemerijck and J.Myles. *Why we need a New Welfare State*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 26-67

European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (2004), *Perceptions of living conditions in an enlarged Europe*, Luxemburg: Office for Official publications of the European communities

Fahey T. & Z. Spéder (2004), *Fertility and family issues in an enlarged Europe*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin

Friedman D., M. Hechter and S. Kanazawa (1994), A theory of the Value of children, in *Demography*, vol. 31, 3: 375-401

Hakim C. (2003), A new approach to explaining fertility patterns: Preference theory. In *Population and Development Review*, 29, 3 : 349-374

Jacobs T. (red), (2002), The impact of policies on family formation and division of labour, Nieps, Centre for Population and Family Study, CBGS-Werkdocument, Brussel

Jansen M. (2002), Religiositeit en relatie- en gezinsvorming in Nederland nader beschouwd. In *Bevolking en Gezin*, 31,1:125-150

Kalmijn M. en J.Gelissen (2002), Kinderen krijgen in tweede huwelijken: bevindingen op basis van Nederlandse levensloopgegevens. In *Bevolking en Gezin*, 31,1 : 51-77

Latten J. (2003), Dynamiek in relaties en welvaart: over singleplateau, stellenberg, gezinsdal en ouderravijn. In *Bevolking en Gezin*, 32, 2: 35-56

Lee G.R., K. Seccombe and C.L. Shehan (1991), Marital status and personal happiness: an analysis of trend data. In *Journal of Marriage and the family*, 53: 839-844

Lucas R.E., A.E. Clark, Y. Georgellis and E. Diener (2003), Reexamining adaptation and set point model of happiness: reactions to changes in marital status. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol 84, 3 : 527-539

Mastekaasa A. (1993), Marital status and subjective well-being: a changing relationship? In *Social Indicators research*, 29: 249-276

McDonald P. (2002), Les politiques de soutien de la fécondité: l'éventail des possibilités. In *Population-F*, 57(3),423-456

Nederlandse Gezinsraad (2001), *Gezin: beeld en werkelijkheid*. Signalement 1, Den Haag

Neyer G. (2003), *Family policies and low fertility in Western Europe*, MPIDR Working paper n° 21, Rostock

Praag (van) C.S. & M. Niphuis-Nell (1997), *Het gezinsrapport*. Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Rijswijk

Quintin O. (2002), Towards a new architecture for social protection in Europe? A broader perspective of pension policies. In *Belgisch tijdschrift voor sociale zekerheid*, 44, nr 3: 483-488

Ronsen M. (2004), *Fertility and family policy in Norway – A reflexion on trends and possible connections*. In Demographic Research, vol10, article 10, www.demographic-research.org

Schoenmaeckers R.C, E.Lodewijckx en C.Van Peer (2002), Sociale verschillen in het krijgen van kinderen: een reden voor beleidsmaatregelen? In *Bevolking en Gezin*, 31,1,3-50

Sleebos J. (2003), *Low fertility rates in OECD countries: facts and policy responses*, OECD Social, employment and migration working papers, n° 15

Veenhoven R. (2001), Happiness in Society. In Allmendinger J. (Hrsg) *Gute gesellschaft?* Verhandlungen des 30. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Köln, 2000: pp 1264-1314

Waite, L. J., C. Bachrach, M. Hindin, E. Thomson, and A. Thornton, ed. 2000. *The ties that bind: Perspectives on marriage and cohabitation*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Waite, L. J., and M. Gallagher. 2000. *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*. New York: Doubleday

Williams K. (2003), Has the future of marriage arrived? A contemporary examination of gender, marriage and psychological well-being. In *Journal of health and social behaviour*, 44: 470-487