Consequences of changing partnership behaviour on fertility carrier – Hungary as an example of transformed post-communist societies

Zsolt Spéder,
Demographic Research Institute, Budapest
E-mail: speder@mailop.ksh.hu

This is a preliminary and incomplete draft prepared for submission to IUSSP 2005 conference in Tours, France

Please do not quote!

(Comments are welcomed, English edition will be done.)

Abstract

Our research investigates the interrelation of the two basic processes of family formation: partnership and fertility behaviour. The stress will be on the influence of changing partnership behaviour (the diffusion of cohabitation) on starting fertility carrier (becoming parent). A cohort specific use of the retrospective data of the Hungarian panel survey "Turning points of the Life Course" from 2001/2002 enables us to show two type of postponement: firstly the well known postponement of entering motherhood (first child) and signs of lowering propensity to receive the second child. The focus on the first partnership context (the diffusion of cohabitation) enables us to detect how changes in partnership behaviour, namely the rapid increase of starting the partnership carriers in cohabitation could contributed to fertility decline. The influence of education will be taken into consideration and enables us to formulate some hypothesis about the relation of demographic change and social structure.

1. Introduction

Fertility decline and changing childbearing behaviour in the post-socialist countries are since years leading topics not only in demography, but in neighbouring social science disciplines as well. Innumerable papers and articles describes the different features of this changes: declining period fertility rate, postponement, ageing of fertility, later fertility, increased share of non-marital births, changing parity distribution, etc. (cf. Frejka, Sardon, 2003, Kamarás, 2003, Kohler, Philipov, 2001, Lesthaeghe, Moors, 2002, Macura, 2001, 2002, Philipov, Dorbritz, 2004, Richterikova, 2001, Sobotka, 2002, Zapf, Mau, 1994., and several other article from the book edited by Józwiak, Kotowska,2003). Hand in hand with the descriptive reports and analyses emerged a broad range of explanations: the "crisis hypotheses", the integration of the changes into the "second demographic transition", the "disorderness" assumption (Lesthaeghe, Moors 2002. Lesthaeghe, Surkyn, 2004, Macura, 2003, Philpov, 2003). Other papers revealed the role of educational expansion, the influence of changing labour market relations, effects of the privatisation of housing, etc. This paper would like to follow the first type of studies. Our aim is to document some well-known processes and reveal some new details based n a very recent survey.

The first part of the paper follows in the wake of *postponement behaviour* (Lesthaeghe, Moors, 2002., Kohler, at.al., 2002., Sobotka,2002). After and besides the documentation of the well-known postponement in entering motherhood, we will concentrate on the second births. Two type of cohort perspective will be employed: the birth cohorts of the mothers and that of receiving the first birth at the same time.

Postponement is on the one side (perhaps only) a simple shift in the time when the couples receive their wished children, the first, the second and perhaps the next. On the other side the postponement is a process when people and social groups *adjust* their childbearing decisions to new circumstances, to new realities of the life, to new rules organising the function of the economy and social life. Because what was the societal transformation stating around 1990, if not a complete change of functioning mechanism of production, labour market, power rules, institutional changes, especially changes in family and child related policies (Adamski, et.al., Kornai, 1992., Offe, 1994). Of course both structures and everyday practices has inertia, and the changes was not such apparent

as in case of a revolution. But all in all the changes since 1990 in post-socialist countries cannot be described otherwise as a system changes: a replacement of the redistribute economy by the market organised production.

This understanding of the system change seemingly overstress the importance of structures and institutions at the expense of the ideational change. But that was not our aim! We assume, that ideational changes were strongly present during the state socialism, quite before the system change. Hankiss strikingly revealed the strong individualisation in Hungary at the beginning of the 80s, as using Rokeach method in a comparison of the Hungarian and the American value system (Hankiss, et.al, 1983). Taking also into consideration the high prevalence of post-material cohabitation around 80s in Hungray (Carlson, Klinger, 1987), and the diffusion of cohabitation started clearly before the system change (Spéder, Pongrácz, 2004) we can only reinforce, that some kind of modern values were present during state socialism as well. The stress on the system change in spite of this is appropriate, because the system change enabled the operation/functioning of the yet available values, and made it easier the diffusion of new values as well.

Postponement in this context obviously could not mean a simply shift, but should understood as a way into the new model of childbearing behaviour. As the system change is often characterised as a simple "take over" of the configurations from Western Europe, we can be inclined to understand demographic changes as a "take over" as well. But which model will be taken over? And can we leave out of consideration the past development of the former socialist countries ("path dependency") and some functioning leftover institutions? Of course childbearing behaviour of post-socialist countries converge to western European pattern, but the new reproductive pattern is far not evolved.[i] This "being in motion" situation and the aim unfolding possible differences call the attention to describe the process of change and taking into consideration possible differentiations (de-standardisation).

Of course postponement is present overall in the society, but we assume, that different social groups perceiving different pressures and owing different values will adjust with different pace and perhaps will develop childbearing behaviour different to some extent. We assume, the new structure has had not only essentially different pressures, but opened different options for the well off and the poor, for those highly and

low educated, for employed in the public or in the private sector, for employed, self-employed and the non-employed. On the other side we agree with Hakim and others, who call the attention to the fact, that it is rarely assumed, that woman has different preference structure, and they differs in the directions and stability of their value system (Hakim, 2001). Of curse, the variation in fertility from the point of view of the completed fertility can not be very huge, but timing, partnership context, reconciliation family and work, can have some variations. All that calls the attention to study *differences according to social status*. In our study we will be able to detect two of them: level of education and partnership context.

The strong, but sometimes contradicting influence of the level of education on fertility was studied in several studies (Hoem, Hoem, 1987, Rindfuess…). Unfortunately at this time of the first wave of the survey we have only the level of education at the time of the interview, and the time window for a clear effect of education, especially among those completing university degree is quite short. Additionally, we cannot take into consideration the mother's labour market position before births, nor the partner's social position around the time of births. And as Kreyenfeld showed it can modify the strength of the influences (Kreyenfeld, 2002b). However we hope to detect signs of differences, which could be tested in later analyses.

We understand changing partnership formations, mainly the starting partnership in different form, in cohabitation or in direct marriage, and the transition from cohabitation into marriage or its survival as a manifestation of cultural values and structural differences. Changing partnership forms are, per definition elements of childbearing behaviour (Vg. Lasthaeghe, Moors, 2002, Macura, 2003, Philipov, Dorbritz, 2004). The overall increase of extra-marital births in all societies called the attention to the de-touchment of marriage and childbearing. There is a huge literature about fertility consequences of the diffusion of cohabitation (Carlson, 1985., Pinelli, et.al, 2002., Billari, et., al, 2002, Baizan, et.al., Smock, 2002., Toulemon, 1997). The research about the fertility consequences of living in cohabitation as first union, stresses the delaying effect. It is important to mention, but we do not consider it in our study, that post-marital cohabitation showed a positive effect on fertility in Hungary (Carlson, Klinger, 1987).

In our study we show the increasing share of cohabitation according to first and second births, than go to compare the consequences of different partnership trajectories defined by the beginning and by the status in a given year (5 or 7) after. At least a careful time-series analysis gives us surprising result regarding the "traditional" trajectories, that started direct marriage and being in marriage after a given period.

2.Data and methods

For our analysis we mainly used the data set of the longitudinal research "Turning points in the Life-course" but some of our calculations are based on the vitals statistics data sets of the Hungarian Statistical Office. The *"Turning points in the Life-course"* project was developed and carried out by the Demographic Research Institute Budapest in very close relation to the international research cooperation "Generation and Gender Program" launched by the PAU in Geneva.[ii] The *"Turning points…"* became a kind of "zero wave", or experimental survey of this international co-operation. The research questions, going "hands in hand" with the international research co-operation, covers a broad range of demographic problems, and aim to understand changing demographic behaviour in Europe. Panel design, the parallel usage of the objective and subjective variables, strong prevalence of the attitudinal variables shapes the special feature of the GGP and the Hungarian survey.[iii] However the closing down the operationalising phase of the research and starting the field work in 2001, quite far before the readiness of core questionnaire of the international endeavour gives some speciality to the Hungarian survey. Not in the basic frame, but in constructing target and explaining variables.

A panel survey can be fully utilised after the second wave at last, but cross-sectional status variables can give an accurate description of present status, and partnership histories and fertility history can be used after the first wave describing changes in behaviour in the close and moderate past. In this study we would like to utilise the retrospective questions supplemented with some status variables. [iv]

The *"Turning points in the Life-course"* is a representative survey for the 18-74 years old population in 2001. At the turn 2001 and 2002 16394 persons were asked about social, economic, demographic and ideational components of their life. The field work

was closed at the mid of 2002, the cleaned datasets became available in. The Hungarian report about the basic domains was published.

As mentioned, for this study we use the partnership and fertility history questions and educational attainment at the time of the interview, but with focus fertility outcomes. In order to size changes in demographic behaviour we use the cohort approach: we concentrate to describe the change in fertility behaviour of different cohorts (Frejka, Sardon.2003). As usual we grouped together women born at the same time, 5 years interval. These are generations formed during the same historical time and experiences, facing similar opportunities and pressures during their ageing. Abrupt social developments, historical upheaval affects generations at the same times of their life course. All that has especial importance during the understanding behavioural change in the former state socialist societies, as in Hungary. To understanding differences it is advantageous to see the cohorts age at the historical marks, namely in 1990.

The time of birth, age at the interview and age at 1990, at the start of the societal transformation of the respondents in the sample

Birth	Age groups at the time of the field work, 2001-2002	Age at 1990
1947-1951	50-54	39-43
1952-1956	45-49	34-38
1957-1961	40-44	29-33
1962-1966	35-39	24-28
1967-1971	30-34	19-23
1972-1976	25-29	14-18
1977-1981	20-24	9-13
1982-1983	18-19	7-8

We will use other kind of groupings of the respondents during the analyse. In case analysing the development of probability second births (3.2. section), we will group the mothers around the time their first birth (Koschin, 2003), we could name them as "cohorts of entering motherhood"[v]. In the fourth section in our study, when we aim uncover influences of partnership differentiation we will use cohorts formed around the time their first partnership. These are cohorts of starting partnership carriers at the same time. Summing up: besides the main line of description, analysing the behaviour of women born in the same time, we will use different other cohorts as well.

3. Postponement behaviour of the post-socialist generations

3.1. An introduction: measuring postponement using mean age of mother at birth (in vital statistics)

The mean of the mother obtained from yearly vital statistics enables us to get a rapid glance over postponement-behaviour and to define basic developments. Not only general trends, but some disaggregated processes, eg. marital and non-marital births, the level of education of the mothers, could uncovered. On the other side, exactly in time of changing behaviour, the changing structure of the non-births among women can distort the real modifications. However the trends measured by vital statistics gives us a good departure.

During two decades, from 1980 to 2002 the mean age of mothers increased by 2,7. The mean age of child birth in 1980, characterising the time of state socialism, resided at 24,9 in 1980, and increased to 27,3 year until 2002 (*Table 3.1.)*. The most considerable part of the increase felled on the 90s, and there is no halt until today. We experienced a 0.6 years increase in the last two years under investigation. In understanding postponement the first birth appears most important. The increase shows the same increase regarding entering motherhood. As long mean age at second births do not reveal different development as first birth order, higher birth other act considerably otherwise. Although mean age at third births increased, but most of the increase fall on the eighties, and there is no considerable postponement to find between mother higher birth order. Needles to say that most of the third and higher order birth are elements of fertility carrier started before 1990 on the one side, and that three and more children are often distinguishing of special social groups and milieus in a society (Pinelli, at., al, 2002). These, and the fact we have only very seldom third births in fertility carriers started after 1990 in our sample, are the main reason, that we will refrain us taking into consideration third and higher order births. !! On the other side, the increasing ration of the third and higher order births have an important meaning for possible differentiation in childbearing behaviour. There is a not small fraction of the society, where in the time of massive fertility decline there is no any sign of level off.

Differences and divergences among social groups in mean age of childbirth can signalise the different diffusion of postponement and/or emergence of distinctive childbearing behaviours. Vital statistics enables us taking into consideration of the marital relations (partly) and the level of education of the mothers. In 1980 the difference between the mean age of *marital and non-marital birth* was 1,3 year *(Table 3.2.)*. Although the mean age increased in both groups, but the increase in marital birth was more pronounced: the difference increased to 3 years. At the same time the variance of the mothers age in non-marital birth decreased signalising a kind of homogenisation. On the other side, there was no much change in the variance in marital birth. (They are dispersed clearly in the life course today as before.) Differences among different *level of education* of the mothers became more pronounced as well *(Table 3.3).* The mean age of those getting a child as a very low educated (les than 8 completed class) do not rose but fall by 0.8 years. Those having somewhat higher, but a very low education (completed 8 classes) experienced a very moderate increase, 1.5 year during the period under consideration. The most pronounced increase of mean age (3.3 year) could be found between vocation level (lower-middle), and not among those with university level as expected. Childbearing women having secondary and tertiary(university) completed education show a very similar, around the grand mean increase (2.6 and 2.8 years respectively). Consequently the postponement and perhaps other structural changes could be found among vocationally educated woman.

The rapid glance over the vital statistical trends of the mean age childbearing woman gave us clear evidence about postponement of birth in the life course of woman in the last two decades, especially after 1990. The dis-aggregation according to marital relation and the level of education call the attention to possible structural changes in the fertility behaviour what will followed in the next sections.

Table 3.1.
Mean age of women by the live birth order, 1980-2002, Hungary

Year	All	Live birth ordeer			
		1	2	3	4+
1980	24,9	22,8	25,7	28,1	30,8
1985	25,5	23,1	26,5	28,9	31,0
1990	25,7	23,0	26,4	29,4	31,7

1995	26,0	23,4	26,5	29,2	31,6
2000	27,0	25,0	27,5	29,4	31,4
2002	27,6	25,7	28,2	30,0	31,6
Change in years (1980-2002)	2,7	2,8	2,5	1,9	0,6

Source: own calculation, vital statistics data, Hungarian Central Statistical Office

Table 3.2.
Mean age of women by marital and non-marital births, 1980-2002, Hungary

Year	All	Partnership cotnext of birth	
		Marital	Non-marital
1980	24,9	25,0	23,7
1985	25,5	25,6	24,4
1990	25,7	25,9	24,4
1995	26,0	26,3	24,5
2000	27,0	27,7	25,3
2002	27,6	28,5	25,5
Change in years (1980-2002)	2,7	3,4	2,2

Source: own calculation, vital statistics data, Hungarian Central Statistical Office

Table 3.3.
Mean age of women by level of education of the mothers,1980-2002, Hungary

Year	All	Level of education				
		<8 classes	8 classes	vocational	secondary	tertiary
1980	24,9	25,0	24,2	23,6	25,7	27,7
1985	25,5	24,8	24,6	24,3	26,3	28,4
1990	25,7	24,4	24,7	24,5	26,3	28,8
1995	26,0	24,2	24,7	24,8	26,8	29,5
2000	27,0	24,1	25,5	26,0	27,7	30,2
2002	27,6	24,2	25,7	26,9	28,3	30,5
Change in years (1980-2002)	2,7	-0,8	1,5	3,3	2,6	2,8

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.2 Identifying cohort specific postponement

3.2.1. Arrival of the first and the second child until a specific age of the mother - different cohorts

Analysing cohort-specific differences in the arrival of the first child we should define a time window, that enables cohorts to get the same number of children, in other words, to standardize our data to the exposure period. Thus, with regards to the first child, we shall

examine the ratio of women in birth cohorts who had started their childbearing careers (i.e. they have given birth to at least one child) by a certain age (20, 25 or 30). These numbers at the same time also measures the extent of childlessness by a certain age.

As a starting point we should reveal the childbearing behaviour of the female cohorts/generations who grew up, became adults, got married and had children under state socialism. We treat women born before 1966 as belonging to this category. In 1990, they were 24 (and over) and in 2001, at the time of the interview, 35 (and over). Women being erlier in their twenties, the four older cohorts in our table, and especially those born 1957-1961 and 1962-1966 are characterised by a very similar pattern of entering motherhood *(See Table 1).* Those, a majority of women (84%-88%) became mothers before the age of 30, starting their childbearing careers in their twenties. In other words, childlessness was at 12%-15% among those aged 30. In these cohorts, two-thirds of the women already had one child by the age of 25. The 50-year-olds, born between 1947 and 1951 (who are now in the 50-54 cohort) had a ratio below that of the other cohorts (66%) and thus lagged behind the 71%-73% of the other cohorts. Lastly we should mention that in these birth cohorts, one-quarter of the women became mothers before the age of 20. If we want to indicate differences between the four cohorts, we should point out that the "youngest fertility" describes the group born between 1957 and 1961. Over one quarter of them (27.5%) were mothers by the age of 20 and over two-thirds of them (73.1%) by the age of 25. An overwhelming majority (88.5%) were mothers by the age of 30. The presented patterns describe the well known "early childbearing" characterising women's childbearing under state socialism.

The first signs of changes occurred in the cohort of women born between 1967 and 1971. As opposed to the women born just a few years earlier, "only" 16.5% of them were mothers by the age of 20 (this rate is 25% in the adjacent older group) and as for motherhood at 25, they are even "more behind": 57% of them were mothers by the age of 25 as opposed to the 72% of the other cohort. By the time they reached 30, they "made up" some ground, but only 74.8% of them became mothers, as opposed to the nearly 90% of the other group. Whether this cohort will eventually catch up with the formers, we could find out only in the near future, since it is not at all unthinkable that some women will opt for their first child after the age of 30.

Considering the data from the point of the childlessness it is too early say anything about it. Women under state socialism practiced such an early childbearing, that there is quite long time to "catch up". Of course life style inertia, biological ageing can confine of a late start in the childbearing, but we can only to point the research from Frejka and Sardon, who estimate, that the childlessness in the former socialist countries will stay at a moderate level (Frejka, Sardon, 2003).

The cohorts born later, after 1971 show an unambiguous further decline in the risks entering motherhood at all cut points. There is no stabilisation of the ratio's characterising different cohorts entering motherhood signalising, that the modification in childbearing behaviour in 2001/2002, at the time of the survey, in Hungary was over.

Using the same concept we are able to calculate the ratios of those get the second child until the mentioned cut points of the life course (Table 2). As expected the development of this measures shows the same pattern regarding the different group of women born 1962-1966 there is a clear stable pattern of the probability getting the first child until a given age. The postponement of the second child, the lowering rate is to find between the 1967-1971 cohorts. As long as in the previous (5 years older) generation half of the woman have given birth to at least two children at by age 30, the proper number in the "behaviour changing" 1967-1971 born generation is 37,8%. The subsequent cohorts show successively lower numbers by all cut points.

These figures however do not give clear insights whether there is no change of the childbearing behaviour if the fertility carrier started yet, or there is a modification in the propensity to have the second child. Before that let us summarise about the time of the "take of" in behavioural development.

The historical changes appeared first in the cohort whose members was born 1967-1971, were in their very early twenties (19-23) in 1990, people who at the time of the political regime change have not started their childbearing careers. From the cohort perspective, regarding to the timing of the first births the change in the fertility behaviour seems to be strongly linked to the societal transformation from the state socialism to the market economy.

Table 3.4
The ratio of women who had at least one child prior to a specific age, by age group

Year of women	Birthdates	1947-1951	1952-1956	1957-1961	1962-1966	1967-1971	1972-1976	1977-1981
	Age group	50-54	45-49	40-44	35-39	30-34	25-29	20-24
Prior to 20		18,8	23,3	27,5	25,0	16,5	13,9	9,1
Prior to 25		66,1	71,2	73,1	72,3	57,2	43,4	-
Prior to 30		84,0	86,3	88,5	87,7	74,8	-	-

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Table 3.5
The ratio of women who had at least two children prior to a specific age, by age group

Year of women	Birthcohorts	1947-1951	1952-1956	1957-1961	1962-1966	1967-1971	1972-1976	1977-1981
	Age group	50-54	45-49	40-44	35-39	30-34	25-29	20-24
Prior to 20		1,2	1,7	1,9	2,8	1,3	1,7	1,3
Prior to 25		14,1	19,2	20,8	21,3	15,7	10,6	-
Prior to 30		43,9	48,0	48,9	50,3	36,8	-	-
Prior to 35		63,2	61,6	63,6	62,0	-	-	-

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.2.2. The changing chances for the birth of the second child

From the perspective of postponement deciding for the second child can not compared with the first child becoming a parent (LIT). As long becoming a mother/parent clearly close several options from the possible trajectories, the decision for the second do not shape the opportunity structures as strong. Becoming a parent does not amount to the abandonment of alternative goals and preferences, but it does restructure the options and filters the available choices. For example it does not mean that "we must give up" all other goals, but it does create a new interpretative framework for our lives. The choice "work or family" if only temporarily, becomes irrelevant and obsolete, for the choice from this point on is between the different combinations and degrees of "work *and* family." Therfore is there is a postponement in the start in the fertility carrier, it do not affect consequently further postponement.

During the 1990s, the ratio of second-child-births among the total number of childbirths dropped somewhat. While their ratio in 1990 was 35.7%, this figure dropped

to 32.4% by 2000 and to 32.1% by 2002. As mentioned, the inquiry into the chance for the birth of the second child in an unstable, transitory period can only be carried out by projecting the chances for a second child onto those who already have one. This is done by ascertaining the rate at which women entered motherhood in a given time interval became mothers of two ('cohorts of entering motherhood').

In order to measure the behaviour after the first birth we decided to construct groups of mothers based on the time when the first child was born. We thought, just as historical time puts children born in the same year in the same class in schools or brings together people experiencing similar events in similar ages into a generation, the date of the birth of the first child puts people of divergent ages into a similar life situation offering similar experiences. And as we will see, circumstances that are changing fast with regards to childbearing decisions will undoubtedly influence childbearing willingness.

Regarding the understanding historical changes we can assume a divide between thse started their fertility carrier before the 1990 and after that. Of course, we should not forget the inertia directing everyday behaviour. So the crating "time entering of motherhood" besides the analytical purpose can have content element as well.

We should keep in mind that almost three-quarters (74.5%) of the children born first into the family between 1961 and 1991 ended up with a brother or a sister when the 5-year constraint was removed. The five-year time window indicates that during the time under consideration 55% of the first born children received siblings, and over two-thirds of the second births occur in the 5 year period.

Analyses of our data should again take as a starting point the samples from the pre-1990 period. Our table clearly shows that the 1970s and 1980s were characterised by a relatively stable pattern: nearly 60% of those who ever had a child, also had a second one within 5 years. *(Table 1.4)* There is hardly any fluctuation of the ratios in question. The variation between the lowest (55.4%) and the highest (58.3%) is less than 3%. At the same time, after the change of the political regime, women were palpably less likely to have a second child after the first. Less than half (48.4%) of those who gave birth to their first child between 1992 and 1996 opted for a second child within a five-year period. The

decrease, when compared to the previous period, is 10% and is 7% less than the lowest ratio.

The first child births data broken down into 3-year periods must of course indicate the same tendency, and will hopefully offer new information on the nature of the transition, since the firstborns delivered in 1992 were conceived before the start of the recession of transformation. Will the 48.4% ratio also hold if we look at the period of the last applicable three years? The data seem to suggest that the ratio calculated on the basis of the three-year periods is an average of a declining tendency, since 45.% of the firstborns delivered between 1994 and 1996 had a sibling within 5 years *(Table 1.5)* In other words, it is conceivable that the willingness to have a second child has declined further after the mid-1990s. We have to exercise caution, however, since the more detailed the breakdown of data are, the less reliable they become: it is apparent that in the three-year periods, the instability was also growing in the 1970s and 1980s, though the greatest variance here hardly exceeds 4%.

Summarising the results of the cohort perspective we could show two components of the postponement behaviour after 1990, during the time of societal transition. As the increase of the mean age of the first child, the arrival of the first child by a definite age of he women confirms *the general postponement in starting fertility carrier*, in becoming mother. On the other side we could demonstrate another type of postponement: we found a *delay in receiving the second child* after the first. This second element of the postponement, in case its further development, sign us qualitative changes in childbearing behaviour: the new behaviour is not a simple shift in staring the childbearing carrier. Partnership context and educational differences are dimension at this stage of the study suitable to look after new characteristics in childbearing behaviour.

Table 3.6
The likelihood of the birth of the second child five years after the birth of the first one, by the birth dates of the first child, 5-year groups, female responses only

Birth of the first child (‘cohort of entering	Ratio of women giving birth to a second child five years after the	Total number of first births in the sample

motherhood')	birth of the first one in the given periods	
1972-1976	56,9	829
1977-1981	56,0	794
1982-1986	55,4	630
1987-1991	58,3	576
1992-1996	48,4	535

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Table 3.7
The likelihood of the birth of the second child seven years after the birth of the first one, by the birth date of the first child, 5-year groups, female responses only

Birth of the first child ('cohort of entering motherhood')	Ratio of women giving birth to a second child three years after the birth of the first one in the given periods	Total number of second births in the sample
1973-1975	58,3	496
1976-1978	56,1	485
1979-1981	54,7	309
1982-1984	55,4	316
1985-1987	59,1	350
1988-1990	58,1	344
1991-1993	52,8	362
1994-1996	45,5	303

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.3. Partnership and births – the first glance

Notwithstanding the change in demographic behaviour of former socialist countries do not limited itself to fertility, but partnership relations undergo through profound changes as well (Macura et.al, 2002, Sobotka, 2002., Lesthaeghe, Surkyn, 2004., Spéder, Pongrácz, 2004, Kantorova, 2004). For everybody was clear that behind the rapid increase of non-marital birth hide a speedy diffusion of cohabitation. As long during the state socialist time marriage and fertility were linked closely, the growing importance of non-marital birth indicate an en evolving detachment of fertility from marriage at the first glance. The closer look of the fertility consequences of changing partnership relations will task of the last section, now we would like only to show the partnership context of the first and second births.

3.3.1. The partnership context of the first and second birth

Our database enables us to differentiate between cohabitation, marriage, and single status at the time of the birth. This result helps us to estimate the shares of non-marital birth in vital statistics by birth order.

As expected, the rapid dispersion of cohabitation lies mainly behind the increase of non-marital birth. As long around the turn of the seventies and eighties 2-3% of the first birth occurred in cohabitation, and twice as high was the ratio of births where the mother did not have any partners, at the last measured time (at the end of the 90s) the ratio of first birth in cohabitation was 14,5%, and those of lone parent birth 12,3%. *(Table 3.8.)* Although the rapid increase of the ratio first birth in cohabitation is obvious, the increase so do not limited itself to this partnership context: the ratio of lone parenthood nearly doubled.

Non-marital birth is more seldom between higher order birth, and if it the case than more probably it occurs in cohabitation, often in after-marriage cohabitation. The development of the distribution of the second birth order in our sample is adequate to the former research results *(Table 3.9).* At the time of state socialism around 95% percent of the second order birth occurred in marriage, the remaining 5% dispersed between cohabitation and lone parenthood. The situation changed at the end of the time under investigation: the ratio of birth occurred in cohabitation clearly increased, those in lone parenthood slightly. (Note, we employed the used 5 years time window from the first births!)

First and second births have clearly different partnership context today as at the time of state socialism: differentiation of living arrangement among the population in childbearing age, especially among those started their partnership-carrier around the end of the eighties and later, caused profound changes in partnership context of births.

Table 3.8
The first order live birth by partnership relations at the time of the birth, 1967-2001, Hungary

Birth of the first child ('cohort of entering motherhood')	Partnership context of the first			All	
	Married	Cohabitation	Alone	%	No

1967-1971	93,3	1,3	5,4	100	718
1972-1976	91,3	1,1	7,6	100	819
1977-1981	92,2	2,6	5,3	100	780
1982-1986	89,4	2,8	7,8	100	616
1987-1991	86,9	4,4	8,7	100	564
1992-1996	75,9	13,7	10,5	100	526
1997-2001	73,1	14,5	12,3	100	413

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Table 3.8
The first order live birth by partnership relations at the time of the birth, 1967-2001, Hungary

Birth of the first child ('cohort of entering motherhood')	Partnership context of the second child within 5 years			All	
	Married	Cohabitation	Alone	%	No.
1967-1971	95,6	2,1	2,4	100	338
1972-1976	95,1	1,5	3,4	100	472
1977-1981	95,3	2,7	2,0	100	444
1982-1986	95,4	0,9	3,8	100	345
1987-1991	92,2	4,2	3,6	100	335
1992-1996	87,9	8,9	3,8	100	257

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.3.2. A short detour – partnership of the (yet) childless woman

Childlessness emerged and increased in several countries and could contribute essentially to declining fertility (Dorbritz, 2002, LIT). The accurate examination of childlessness could be done, especially in the time of postponement, after passing preparative ages (completed fertility rate). However estimations using simulations could give insights about possible measures earlier (eg. Frejka, Sardon, 2003). Although the cohorts started their fertility carriers at the nineties, during post-socialism are far form the completion of their propagative ages, a look to the characteristics on the women without children can give some insight into the topic, possible emergence of childlessness as a consequence to rearmament postponement. Here we will only show the partnership relation of those, not having at least one child.

The three age groups of woman (20-24, 25-29, 30-34), mainly responsible for the fertility in a society are classified into childless women and mothers categories. A cross-sectional look at the figures enables us to ascertain easily, that between those do not have

at least one child and those entered motherhood the partnership relation make the difference. It is very expected that among those 20-24 years old the vast majority of the woman do not have permanent partner, but the ratio "partnerless" of those being in the late twenties, and did not enterer the motherhood yet, is striking. We know, that in this age group union formation do not lag much behind earlier generations (around 70% of them lived in a partnership yet), but in case of earlier cohorts, perhaps the lastingness of the first partnerships were stronger.

Of course those did not enter motherhood have other relevant differences as well, not only their partnership relation, so it would be unjustified and too rush to underscore the importance of the partnership relations. However we assume, the influence of the impediments in partnership-formation and the fragility of partnership can not be overseen.

Table 3.9
Partnership relation of women being childless or having at least one child, different age groups, 2001, Hungary

Age group	20-24		25-29		30-34	
Partnership-relation	Childless	Mother	Childless	Mother	Childless	Mother
Single	79,6	16,2	59,2	14,1	66,5	13,8
Cohabitation	12,3	29,6	19,4	13,4	8,7	10,6
Marriage	8,2	61,2	21,4	72,5	23,5	75,6
All together (No)	661	142	387	448	132	587

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.4. Educational differences

We were also inquiring if postponement procedure equally describes all social groups or some social groups stand out in this respect. To be able to formulate a precise and clear reply to this, we should be in possession of certain structural variables (such as labour market status, occupation, income, education, place of residence etc) pertaining to the period before childbirth. Unfortunately, the majority of these structural variables described respondents in the 2001-2001survey period in our data-set. In other words, it described the parents in a post-childbirth (often times much later) point in time and their differences are measured in a varying time-point after the childbirth. We are

unambiguously aware that these variables are subject to change nearly without exception during one's life course. This is why the characteristics in 2001 can hardly describe the structural context of childbearing propensities, especially in the case of the older cohorts. There is one variable that may be an exception to this. Because in Hungary, the level of education changes very little in the latter phase of the life course -- i.e. after graduation and completion of studies the level of education changes but in a few cases -- this is why we are justified in regarding the *level of education* recorded at the time of survey taking to also be a variable applicable to the time of childbirth.[vi]

Of course the level of education of women describes the women position in the social structure to a limited manner. Although education always plays a crucial role, it is only one possible factor in working. Other characteristics could influence robustly the time if and when to become a parent (Hobcraft, Kiernan, 1995). And lastly, we should not forget the strong influence of the spouse social status in entering motherhood.

3.4.1 The first birth and the level of education of the mother in 2001

We accomplished our analyse with differentiating the life tables for first birth *(Table 3.4.)* according to level of education of the mothers at the time of the interview. In doing so we define the ratio of women belonging to a specific educational group (level of education) and entered motherhood until the given ages. As former, the cut points are age 20, 25,30. Table 3.11. shows us the ratios by cohort and level of education.

Let us start by describing the childbearing strategy adopted by the older (who are now middle-aged) cohorts. With the rise of the education level —mainly because the longer persistence in the educational system—, people timed the birth of their first child at a later age. A significant difference can be shown between those with low level education (primary school or less) or medium level education (secondary or vocational education) and those with a higher education.

One-third of the low-educated people born between 1957 and 1966 became mothers before the age of 20. This describes 10% of those with secondary education. If we look at the education breakdown of those who became mothers by the age of 25, prior to 1990, we shall see obvious differences among the above-mentioned groups. Nearly

two-thirds of the lower educated women are mothers already – which is true for a little over half of the secondary educated and a little over one-third of the higher educated. Of course when we take into consideration that those with a secondary education had 7 to 8 years to become mothers, since they graduated from school at the age of 17 or 18 – while women with a higher degree only had 3 to 4 years to become mothers, the difference between the two is not at all that large. By the time they reached the age of thirty, women with higher education especially those born between 1952 and 1966, "caught up" with their lower-educated ones in terms of entering motherhood. They lag behind by a mere few percentage points. To put it another way, we could say that the ratio of childless women at the age of thirty is not differentiated according to level of education.

Did pattern of entering motherhood change at all after the change of the political regime? Our data shows that women with different education reacted to the changes differently as far as postponement of having children is concerned – at the same time we cannot ignore the possibility that these differences would even out at an age level beyond 30, since the starting date of childbearing careers are being pushed further and further back these days. The data actually shows that becoming a mother "spreads around" according to level of education. Let us look at this step by step.

Compared to the period before the change of the political regime, the behaviour of the group with the lowest education can hardly be said to have changed. A moderate postponement can be found among women belonging to younger cohort (1972-1976) regarding the cut point age 25. On the other end of the educational hierarchy a clear and abrupt postponement can be found. During five years the ratio of mothers entering motherhood until the age 25 halved, it dropped from 35% to 16,5%. The delay among those having the medium level education degrees started more gradual and then seems to speeded up. There are signs of divergence between the two middle groups. Those owning secondary degree show a somewhat stronger decline in the rate s those accomplished vocational education. (This result seems to be in contradiction with those shown in the section 3.1. using vital statistics. But here we use difference measures as in the former section: first vs. all children, entering motherhood vs. mean age of births. However further research should identify the (in)homogeneity of this medium educated group.)

We cannot carry out a detailed analysis of the ratios of those who become parents before the age of 30, because some people in the group born between 1976 and 1971 had their first child born before the change of regime. Thus for them the questions "*should we have a child at all*?" and "*when should we have a child?"* had been settled prior to the turning point of 1990.

The data seems to unequivocally show that people with different levels of education reacted differently to the changes in circumstances after the change of regime. This process of adapting to the new circumstances was far from being over by 2001-2002, the time of the survey taking. In other words, not enough time had passed for a new pattern of distribution by education to emerge. The data foster the assumption that in the future, childbearing patterns will be more differentiated by education levels than they used to be, especially with regards to childlessness and the timing of the birth of the first child. At the same time, it may well be that our data describes a period of transition and by the time the pattern stabilizes, there will be a general levelling off differences, naturally, when the respondents reach older ages. All what our data really tells us with regards to the direction of development is that people with higher education reacted to changes more readily and the process of postponement varied among groups with different education levels.

Table 3.11.
The ratio of women who gave birth prior to a specific age, by age group and education level

Born between	1947-1951	1952-1956	1957-1961	1962-1966	1967-1971	1972-1976	1977-1981
Prior to age 20							
primary	24,9	27,9	34,1	35,4	26,9	27,5	26,4
vocational	8,8	14,8	14,6	13,6	11,0	8,6	7,3
secondary	6,2	7,9	11,4	10,1	4,3	4,3	1,0
Higher	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prior to age 25							
Primary	67,1	66,6	66,8	62,7	65,0	55,6	-
Vocational	53,9	56,9	52,3	58,3	49,8	35,5	-
Secondary	48,3	56,7	57,7	58,7	42,2	25,5	-
Higher	36,6	36,3	37,8	35,0	16,5	12,2	-
Prior to age 30							
Primary	83,3	82,1	79,3	77,7	75,1	-	-

Vocational	82,9	78,0	78,9	73,8	68,3	-	-
Secondary	76,0	78,5	81,8	78,3	62,9	-	-
Higher	66,4	75,7	77,4	73,4	50,2	-	-

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.4.2 The second births within 5 years after the first

In the debate over childbearing becoming a later event in people's lives, it is often asked whether the postponement of the birth of the first child will result in fewer people opting to have a second one. An affirmative answer to this question has been supported by the declining ratio of second births within the five-year periods. The look at the partnership context clearly suggests that new forms of partnership forms play a role in both kind of postponement (see detailed late in the *4. section*). Could social hierarchy play a role in postponement? Now let us turn to the analyse whether and if yes, how the level of education of women effect the probability getting the second after the first within a definite time (in 5 years as usual) period?

During the time of state socialism there were no vast differences according to the level of education of the woman (c.f. Klinger,). We could detect some lag of the upper secondary educated, if any. But the differences were not outstanding. High educated lag not behind of any other group. If they started their fertility carrier they inclined the second as other woman, if not earlier. All in all during socialism educational differences were not noteworthy.

Among those entering motherhood (first child) quite around, but rather just before the political regime change (1987-1991) the low educated has clearly the highest propensity to get the second child within 5 years. Their leading position seems to be not threatened in the 90s, thought their propensity declined somewhat during the latest period. The ratios describing those with a secondary education lag behind the figures for the lowest educated. The willingness among higher educated women to have a second child within a certain period of the first birth is rather high and seems above-the-average in the 1990s. (However caution is well-advised since in this period their sub-sample included only 70 cases.) If these figures remain in case of a larger sample, or in case controlling other variables, than we can prove that higher educated women, if they opted

for a second child at all, had a second child born to them with an average or higher likelihood.

Table 3.12.
Ratio of women giving birth to a second child within 5 years, by birth date of first child, age group of mother, partnership type and education level.

Level of education of the mother	Time of the first birth				
	1972-1976	1977-1981	1982-1986	1987-1991	1992-1996
Primary	59,9	58,8	58,2	65,8	58,0
Vocational	58,4	62,3	49,7	58,2	45,9
Secondary	52,0	50,2	55,3	55,8	41,2
Higher	60,0	56,0	60,4	55,1	(55,8)

() case number s between 50-100
Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

3.5. Summary (Zwischenbilanz)

In this section we elaborate postponement of fertility in Hungary, as a case society for former socialist countries. Not surprisingly, using different approaches we could clearly describe the emergence and the further development of the postponement of the first birth started around 1990. Additionally we could clearly detect the later start of entering motherhood in the life course is followed a further postponement: the declining propensity getting the second child after the first. Because of the sample size and the assumed divergent behaviour of those having the third and highest order births we could not analyse that woman. Taking into consideration the increased share of the third and higher order births revealed in the vital statistics[vii] we can unambiguously conclude: The decrease in the number of births is a double consequence of postponement: *the first child is born later in the parents' lives and thus the likelihood of the birth of the second child also decreases.*

For the timing of the birth of the first child, we have concluded that the process was not over yet and new, the stabilisation of patterns has not been formed yet. What also follows is that the stable patterns for having second and further children have not had a

chance to develop as well. Our data collection found the transition "in working." There are a number of assumptions that can be formed with regards to future patterns. Here, we only speak to the timing and probable ratio of the birth of the second child.

A.) It is conceivable that the lower figures for having a second child is but a temporary phenomenon, true for such age cohorts whose childbearing plans have been halted or interfered by the change of the political regime, generally he societal transformation. This assumption permits a rising number of second births in the future.[viii]

B.) Postponement can also result in a decreased number of second children born after the later-born first child. In this case, we cannot expect to see the rate of second children born after the first ones rise in the future.

Finally, we must emphasize that our analysis treated the second child born within five years of the first. It is highly, though not absolutely, improbable that the ratio of second children born five years after the first would go on the increase. This would lengthen the child-raising period, which is an unlikely commitment in a period in which rationality grows, in which increased time spent in motherhood indicate higher opportunity costs, longer everyday boundedness.

Regarding possible structural differences in postponement and/or new behaviour we could accomplish a very limited description, and could not incorporate into the analyse very important factors (e.g. partner's social status). However this limited analyse showed a clear influence of partnership relations what we will analyse more detailed in the next section.

The level of education of women seemed to be not indifferent at all. Higher educated started most rapidly adjust their behaviour, employing a very speedy postponement entering motherhood, and perhaps opting for upholding of alternative life goals. On the other side, if they start their fertility carrier, they do not seems to lag behind other educational groups of mothers. On the contrary, it is not unlikely they will speed up, and perhaps concentrate their fertility for a shorter period (cf. Hoem, 1987). But we could not retrieve into the analyse the partner's social characteristics. The low educated on the other end of the educational hierarchy adjusted only very moderately, if any. They show the highest probability to get their first and succeeding births. If anywhere, some sign of early fertility can be found among them. The most contradicting

group is the middle: postponement and some inertia characterise their pattern entering motherhood, and at the same time the strongest decline of the propensity to second birth. Our former analyse suggested their "fragile" existence at the labour market and its negative impact on fertility (Spéder, 2002), but the cohort analyse using the data of the "Turning points in the life course" could not accomplish a clear picture of their behaviour. Perhaps other structural factors and partner's status will have to arrive to a clearer picture. All in all, to the answer whether and which kind of differentiation can and will be found according to childbearing behaviours need more complex analyses as have done (e.g. Kreyenfeld, 2002b).

4. The influence of changes in partnership-relations on fertility – a closer examination

Works concerned with the decline of fertility, gives a detailed treatment to the transformation of partnership types, more specifically, the spread of cohabitation (Frejka, Sardon 2003, Frejka, Ross 2001, Kamarás 2001). A review of relevant considerations often result in the conclusion that cohabitation, because its lower level of commitment and higher degree of dissolubility, acts as a deterrent in childbearing decisions (Pinelli, et.al., 2002). This, in turn, contributes to lower fertility rates. Some will of course argue that the phenomenon is more differentiated than as described above, since the propensity to bear children is showing a declining tendency in both marital and long-term cohabitative relationships. (Kohler, et.al, 2001:644) Then there is a position which argues that in the right kind of institutional environment, it is precisely extramarital childbirth, especially children born into cohabitation, that can actually improve fertility rates (Jensen 2002).

Previously, we have pointed out that the differentiation of partnership relations contributed to the decline in the number of childbirths. The specific fetures of that changes we are referring to here are the facts that lasting relationships are being formed at later stages in life, that many of the childless women in the second half of their twenties have no partners and that if the first child was born into a cohabitation, there was a decreased chance for the birth of a second child.

In this present section we will again analyse these issues from a different point and try to discover whether the form of the first partnership (*the start of one's partnerships career*) has any relevance to the childbearing career of the person in question. As far as the circumstances will permit, we will also look at what impact the events of one's *partnership trajectories* will have on the commencement of one's childbearing activity. The analytical tools used in this chapter owe a lot to the methods of *Wu et. al.* who developed different fertility trajectories in the course of their analysis of extra-marital childbirths. (Wu et. al. 2002)

A separate section will be devoted to the examination of changes in historical time, as we cannot ignore the point in time on which the start of the partnership careers fell: whether it was prior to, during or after the period of the political regime change, the societal transformation.

The need to understand changes in historical time and the application of the cohort-approach imposes constraints in the given sample size. Even though we had set out to analyse the influence of partnership carriers on childbearing behaviour of women, because of the low case numbers. In some analyse we will also rely on data computed for the entire population (male as well as female). In this particular chapter, this presents less of a problem than it usually does, because in our approach we only look at births in partnerships and cohorts not by age group but by 'cohorts entering partnership carrier'. (However in some analyse we can not avoid the biased data.)

To be able to register changes in historical time, we have created the groups to be analysed on the basis of the *time* of the formation of the first partnership, the *time when the respondents commenced with their partnership careers (entering)*. As former, due to the sample size, we divided up our data into 5-year cohorts.

This kind of analysis, of course, has several limitations. First we exclude those first births, where the mother received her child before the first partnership. Not all, but some of the out of union first births are excluded. Secondly, the grouping of the females (and males) according to their start in time their first partnership, bring together individuals being in different age. We are aware of these limitations, but our aim understanding the impact of changing partnership forms on entering motherhood, as well its change in time needs the kind of limitations we made.

Before starting our analysis, let us quickly review the ratio of people who had started their first partnership in a cohabitation versus those who opted for immediate marriage. Our table clearly shows that in the 1970s, one-tenth of the respondents commenced their partnership careers in cohabitations, which rate went up to 25% in the 1980s and crossed the 50% mark sometimes in the early 1990s. By the end of the 1990s, roughly one-third opted for marriage, while two-thirds for cohabitation, in their first partnerships. The development is relevant according to both sexes.

Table 4.1
Distribution of first relationships (cohabiting or marriage) by partnership formation period and gender

Period of first partnership formation	**Female**		**Male**	
	Marriage	Cohabitation	Marriage	Cohabitation
1997-2001	38,9	61,0	35,3	64,7
1992-1996	32,3	47,7	48,0	52,0
1987-1991	64,6	35,4	63,8	66,2
1982-1986	77,9	22,1	75,4	24,6
1977-1981	88,9	11,1	85,9	14,1
1972-1976	91,3	8,7	90,6	9,4
1967-1971	94,3	5,1	95,1	4,9
1962-1966	96,3	3,7	95,5	4,5
1957-1951	98,3	1,7	96,7	3,3
1952-1956	97,6	2,4	98,7	1,3
-1951	97,7	2,3	96,2	3,8

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

4.1 General patterns – taking aside changes over time

In the first stage we will examine whether the type of the first partnership has an effect on the timing of births and the extent of fertility. The extent of fertility outcome is measured by the fact whether the respondents had a child born to them 5 or 7 years after the formation of the first lasting partnership.

The type of the first partnership has an unequivocal bearing on whether the people in question will decide to have a child or not within a determined period of time. A large majority (88.5%) of those who opted for marriage in their first partnership had a child within the first five years. If we extend the period of analysis to 7 years then this ratio goes up to 90.3%. *(Table 4.2).* Of the women who had started their partnership career in

cohabitation, 67.2% had at least one child within 5 years. This group shows an increased fertility when the time period is extended from 5 to 7 years, as 77% of them had at least one child within the first 7 years. Further extension of the time period would increase the ratio of those with a child in a cohabitation but the figure still would not reach that of those living in a marriage. There is a two-fold explanation for the increase: for a given period of time, the childbearing chances increase with the duration of partnership (cumulative probability) and in time, many will get married and -- as we have seen and will still see -- this contributes to the willingness to have children. On the other hand, it will not reach marriage-level figures since as we have seen, the first partnership is more unstable and the chances for childbearing in the solitary period following a break-up decrease dramatically.

Table 4. 2
Family status 5 years after the first partnership formation, by type of partnerships, among females*

Child(ren) born…	First partnership	
	Marriage	Cohabitation
within 5 yrs	85,8	67,2
within 7 yrs	90,3	77,0

*Partnerships formed before 1996 and 1994
Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

As we have indicated earlier, the partnership trajectory accounts for a great deal. People who often changed partners and/or had longer periods of partnerlessness in between partnerships had a lesser likelihood of becoming parents than those who had the same spouse or partner for an extended period of time at a given stage in their lives. Before turning to the examination of these kinds of trajectories, let us review the partnership situations of the respondents 5 and 7 years after the formation of their first partnership. A majority of them live in marriages, but the ratio of those living in cohabitation is not negligible either. The ratio of those living alone is comparable to the figure for the latter group. If we extend the time period to 7 years, the only ratio that will increase is that of those living singly. Their group is "fed" by divorces and terminations of cohabitation.

Those who had started out on their partnership careers will after a time be living in one of three kinds of partnership arrangements: *in marriage, in cohabitation and*

singly. The highest ratio of women with children is to be found among those living in a marriage. Those living without a partner follow them and the group of people living in cohabitation exhibits the lowest number of children. For the 5-year period, the actual figures are 85.8%, 69.2% and 53.2% respectively *(See Table 2.3)*

Table 4.3
Ratio of women bearing children 5 or 7 years after the formation of first partnership, by the partnership status of 5 or 7 years later

Child(ren) born…	Partnership status 5 or 7 years after the formation of first partnership		
	Married	Cohabiting	Single
within 5 yrs	85,8	53,2	69,2
within 7 yrs	90,6	58,9	79,1

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

We get the same order of groups if we extend the time period of analysis to 7 years. The ratios, however, will be significantly altered: the ratio of those living in marriages and cohabitations grows by 5 percentage points, but the difference between the two groups remains at 30%. The ratio of those living alone grows significantly, by 10% -- which is probably due to the occurrence of divorce. The difference then is clear if we look at childbearing at *a given period* in the partnership career, i.e. 5 or 7 years after starting marriage or cohabitation as first partnership. It seems that it is because of the different propensities for childbearing that we cannot declare marriage and cohabitation interchangeable partnership forms.

A comprehensive analysis of the fertility consequences of the *partnership trajectory* could only be carried out if we could examine the given time periods, (the 5, 7 or any other number of years) differentiated by every single significant event. This would require a huge sample, for a relatively short time period can witness a very high number of changes: partners might move out or back in, start up new relationships, they can marry or divorce their partners or others. Unfortunately -- especially if we aim to shed light on the characteristics of the 1990s -- we will be able to scrutinise only a few *select types* of changes and possible trajectories.

In our analysis of the partnership trajectory types we only took the start and the end of the relationship into account, thus arriving at four types of measurable sample size:

1. *married-married* These are the people who started their partnership career in a marriage and 5 or 7 years later they are still living in a marriage. (Those few who changed from one spouse to another in the meantime were also included here.)
2. *cohabitation-marriage* These are the people who had started their partnership career in a cohabitation but got married in the period under analysis. An overwhelming majority of them actually married the person they had been cohabiting with, still there are those (10%) who got married to a person other than their first cohabiting partner.
3. *cohabitation – cohabitation* These are the people who had started their partnership careers in cohabitation and 5 or 7 years later they were still cohabiting. Most of them with the same partner, though quite a lot of them (one-third) had switched partners in the given time period. Whereas there is a significant difference between these two groups in terms of partnership careers, we could not take these differences into account due to the low number of cases.
4. *marriage – singlehood* Marriages have been turning increasingly fragile in recent decades and divorce is not a rare phenomenon in the early stages of marriages. After divorce, many stay single for some time or even permanently. The people in this group had started their partnership careers in marriage but 5 or 7 years later they were living alone. Those who remarried after their divorce belong to Group 1 and those who entered a cohabitative relationship will be ignored because of the low number of such cases.

In keeping with expectations and earlier analyses, childbearing probabilities are very different on these four different partnership trajectories. With regards to the 5-year span, 86.8% of the women living in marriage decided to have children. *(Table 4.4)* While the figure for those who started their partnerships in cohabitation but became married, lags behind somewhat, the difference is only 10%. As we have seen earlier, people who start out their partnership careers in cohabitation are less likely to have children within a certain time period than those who get married the first time around. As we expected, those cohabiters, who later got married, will exhibit a higher rate of childbearing. Actually, if we extend the time period under investigation, this rate will approach that of those who got married immediately. Does this enable us to say that if the cohabitation preceding marriage, this would have little or no negative consequences on fertility? A comprehensive answer to this of course could only be provided at the close of childbearing carrier, based on the information of the completed fertility data. We suspect that those trajectories that start out in cohabitation and turn into marriage are going to be -

- in terms of number of childbirths -- but a little bit behind those that started out as marriages. As we have seen in earlier chapters, the postponement may result in a decreased probability of the births of the planned number of children.

If, however, the first cohabitative relationship is not followed soon enough by a marriage, we will encounter a dramatically different scenario. While we know that especially during the 1990s, the number of extramarital childbirths – especially children born into cohabitative relationships -- have risen dramatically, our data suggests that the propensity for childbearing in cohabtiative partnerships lags far behind the same in marriages. If a woman continues to live in a cohabitative relationship five years after forming the first such relationship, she was 50.9% likely to give birth in that time period. The chances rise rather reluctantly with time spent in cohabitation: 56.1% of the women living in cohabitation seven years after forming the first such relationship had become mothers. *(Table 4.4)*

Table 4.4
Ratio of childbearing women in the 5 or 7 year periods by type of partnership trajectories.

Partnership trajectories	Time elapsed since the formation of partnership	
	5 years	7 years
Started out married, still married 5/7 yrs later ("traditional")	86,8	91,2
Started out cohabiting, married 5/7 yrs later	76,2	84,3
Started out cohabiting, still cohabiting 5/7 yrs later	50,9	56,1
Started out married, now single ("divorce")	72,0	80,9

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Women living in lasting cohabitation are less likely to become mothers and as we saw in the previous chapter, they are less likely to have a second child as well. The childbearing consequences of the fourth trajectory – staring in marriage then breaking off in divorce – are rather contradictory. On the one hand, they exhibit a rather high ratio of women with children, which is actually close to that of those who had been living in a marriage all along. This of course, is no surprise, since women in the fourth trajectory group had lived in a marriage for a shorter or longer period of time. The extension of the time period under investigation actually brings these figures closer together, since the time spent in a marriage also grows. At the same time, to arrive at a full picture of fertility consequences

of partnership types and partnership trajectories, we should have been looked at the births of higher order too.

Our data makes it obvious that partnership trajectories have a demonstrable bearing on the *fact* of the birth of the first child and the *timing* of childbirths. In partnerships that start and continue in marriages, there is a high likelihood of childbirth and a relatively early one as well. Those partnership that start out in a "trial marriage," that turn into formal ones, exhibit a rather high probability for the birth of the first child – though it is lower than in the previous case and the birth of the child will probably occur later. The propensity for childbearing of people living in cohabitation fails to reach two-thirds of that of those living in marriages. Cohabitation, as a type of partnership, can *impede* and *delay* the start of the women's childbearing careers.

4.2.Consequences of changing partnership behaviour in time

Until now we have not distinguished according to emergence of first partnerships in historical time. However, we have every right to assume that premarital cohabitation had a different meaning and fertility consequences in the 1970s than they do now. The same could be true for cohabitation as an alternative form of lifestyle. Finally, should not we assume also that partnership trajectories starting out with a marriage have different fertility consequences than they did 20 years ago? These are the questions we will be attempting to answer when examining the fertility consequences of partnership types and trajectories according to partnership cohorts. We shall be adopting the same logic as we did in the previous section: we will look at the fertility consequences of partnership types on the basis of the first date and the ones 5 or 7 years later, separately and simultaneously, but with the data broken down by cohorts.

First of all, however, we must pause to point out certain methodological considerations. So far, and indeed dominantly in the course of this study, we based our analysis on responses provided by women. The reason for this primarily is that the fertility of women – especially in these times of a growing number of extramarital births – is a clear concept, more so than the childbirth decisions by males or the number of births projected for the whole population. We would have been content to continue to rely on their responses in the time-dependent analysis of the changes occurring in

partnerships, but we could not do this. The number of cases in the various categories often dropped below 50. We have thus been forced to *also examine* results projected for the entire population, including males and females alike. In other words, we are presenting data for the women and for the entire population side by side. In our opinion, this presents no problems whatsoever, since this chapter examines the fertility consequences of certain partnership types. The object of the analysis is that part of the population that had already been involved in a partnership. We can assume of those who ever lived in a partnership that the men and the women also represent the partnership careers of their partners as well. Even though there is no complete similarity in this respect between males and females, in the majority of analyses applied here, we can presume certain symmetry.[ix] All this we have taken into consideration in the course of the analysis and the data on the women and the entire population (males and females) will be treated subsequent to the analysis of the time series data. Additionaly, because of the low sample size, we can not show the time-variant changes in the influence of the "divorce" trajectory ("married→single").

Can we detect any differences between the fertility consequences of partnerships launched in the different historical periods? When examining the temporal sequences of partnerships starting with a marriage or cohabitation we should turn our attention to *marriages*. As we have seen earlier, partnerships starting in a marriage are more likely to produce children than in those starting in a cohabitation – but only time series data shows that changes in historical time did not leave marriages unaffected either. While within five years of starting their first partnership in the form of a marriage in the late 1980s, 90% of the women became mothers, the corresponding ratio in the case of partnerships launched in the early 1990s is only around 80%. *(Table 2.5)* A similar decrease is detectable among those who started their partnership careers in cohabitation. The drop is around 10% here too: in the case of women, the figure drops from 70.1% to 60.1%. But instead of jumping to overhasty conclusion, we should look at the situation 7 years after starting the partnerships *(Table 2.6)* Even though a decrease is detectable here too, it is not as steep, for it is a mere 4% in the case of trajectories starting in a marriage. These are due to two reasons: first, a longer time period elapsed after forming the first partnership,

thus the chances of childbearing are increased, secondly, people in our last cohort are "older" therefore the new kind of behaviour is less widespread among them.

Table 4.5
The ratio of childbearing women and those respondents (male, female) who became parents within 5 years of forming their first partnership, by the type of first partnership, in the various partnership cohorts (%)

Cohorts of entering partnership	Female		Female and male together	
	started their partnership in		started their partnership in	
	marriage	cohabitation	marriage	cohabitation
1992-1996	80,3	60,1	80,6	57,3
1987-1991	87,6	66,5	85,4	62,6
1982-1986	88,1	70,1	88,1	65,1
1977-1981	89,6	(63,1)	88,6	62,4
1972-1976	88,5	(78,7)	86,6	75,5
1967-1971	85,4	-	85,1	(68,1)

( ) case numbers between 50-100, ;- case numbers below 50

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Table 4.6
The ratio of childbearing women and those respondents (male, female) who became parents within 7 years of forming their first partnership, by the type of first partnership, in the various partnership cohorts (%)

Cohorts of entering partnership	Female		Female and male together	
	started their partnership in		started their partnership in	
	marriage	cohabitation	marriage	cohabitation
1990-1994	88,8	74,5	88,1	69,8
1985-1989	92,9	72,9	90,4	71,6
1980-1984	91,7	69,6	90,8	71,9
1975-1979	92,4	(88,6)	91,5	81,3
1970-1974	89,9	(82,0)	88,6	78,1
1965-1969	87,4	-	87,7	(80,6)

( ) case numbers between 50-100, ;- case numbers below 50

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

We skip to show and describe the development of first child propensity from the endpoint of the 5 and 7 years period partnership history, and jump to see possible new insights from the partnership trajectories, incorporating both the start and end of the partnership relations during the investigated historical time, and the chosen time interval. Before doing so let have a look at their changing share last decades.

If we look at the initial situations and the partnership status 5 or 7 years later together – in other words, if we examine the specific types of partnership trajectories – the above will be reinforced. From the 1980s, there was a powerful transition in the structures of partnership trajectories *(Table 4.7):* there was an increase in the ratio of partnerships starting in cohabitation and turning into marriage as well as the number of those that started out in cohabitation and five or seven[x] years later still functioned in cohabitation. (In the youngest cohorts it is 27.9% and 18.7% respectively). There is a significant decline in the ratio of trajectories that start in a marriage and 5 or 7 years later still continues in a marriage (49%). According to our data, the ratio of those starting out in a marriage and ending up singly shows no variation -- however, macro-data indicates an increase in the ratio of this type of partnership.

Table 4.7
Distribution of 5-year partnership trajectories in cohorts created on the basis of the first partnership formation date, females

Period of first partnership	Partnership trajectories				Total N=
	Married→ married	Cohabiting →married	Cohabitating →cohabiting	Married→single	
1992-1996	49,0	27,9	18,7	4,4	545
1987-1991	59,9	21,7	12,3	6,1	608
1982-1986	74,7	15,3	5,1	4,8	641
1977-1981	84,0	8,6	1,8	5,5	757
1972-1976	86,4	5,6	2,0	6,0	844
1967-1971	89,9	3,7	1,1	5,2	804

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Earlier we have shown that trajectories of the 2nd and 3rd types exhibit much lower ratios of the first birth than the 1st, "traditional" type (Table 4.4.). Remembering on the different fertility feature of the different trajectories, on the ground of changing distribution of that, we can easily conclude: *The fundamental reason then of the decline of fertility is the restructuring and shifting of the trajectories.* At the same time, a change could be detected in the fertility indicators of the "traditional" type of trajectories – which starts out and continues being a marriage -- as well. Regarding the 5-year period, the 1990s show, even in this category, a decrease in the propensity to the first birth and there

seems to be a detectable change among those on the 2nd trajectory (from cohabitation to marriage). Along with the shifts in structure, the first child propensity of this trajectory closest to the traditional one has also declined. *(Table 4.9)* Of course, if we look at the trajectories over the 7-year period, the temporal changes are going to be less conspicuous. As we have explained already, the 7-period is a longer one and provides a greater chance for the birth of the first child.

Unfortunately we cannot say too much about the trajectory permanent cohabitation, because its low presence in the time series data. We can only assume, not to perceive strong changes if looking at the data of males as well. But it is a question in future, in case of it stabilisation, which kind of fertility pattern the women in permanent cohabitation would have.

Table 4.9
The ratio of childbearing women and men who became fathers (males and females) 5 years after the formation of the first partnership, according to parenthood trajectory, in the specific partnership cohorts

Period of first partnership	Female			Female+male together		
	Married/ married	Cohab/ married	Cohab/ cohab	Married/ married	Cohab/ married	Cohab/ cohab
1992-1996	83,1	74,4	45,5	83,7	68,6	44,1
1987-1991	89,6	77,1	(53,3)	87,3	74,7	47,4
1982-1986	90,2	81,6	-	90,4	79,6	(29,2)
1977-1981	90,7	(67,7)	-	90,3	70,3	-
1972-1976	89,3	-	-	87,6	(83,8)	-
1967-1971	86,6	-	-	86,5	(74,1)	-

( ) case numbers between 50-100, ;- case numbers below 50

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

Table 2.10
The ratio of childbearing women and men who became fathers (males and females) 7 years after the formation of the first partnership, according to parenthood trajectory, in the specific partnership cohorts

Period of first partnership	female			Female+male together		
	Married/ married	Cohab/ married	Cohab/ cohab	Married/ married	Cohab/ married	Cohab/ cohab
1990-1994	91,7	82,2	(60,8)	91,3	78,9	55,9
1985-1989	93,4	84,7	(49,1)	91,4	81,5	50,0
1980-1989	93,8	(77,4)	-	92,8	80,2	-

1975-1979	92,9	(86,8)	-	92,4	86,2	-
1970-1974	90,6	-	-	89,6	(83,3)	-
1965-1969	89,0	-	-	89,3	(83,6)	-

( ) case numbers between 50-100, ;- case numbers below 50

Source: own calculation, "Turning points of the life course", DRI, 2001

4.3 Summary: the delaying effects of the changing partnerships forms and the shifts between partnership trajectories

The transformation of partnerships had started as early as the 1980s, when more and more people started out their partnership careers with cohabiting with their partners. By today, more people do this than enter into marriage straight away. Of course we are aware that a many of the cohabitations will eventually turn into a marriage (Pongrácz and Spéder, 2004), but some of them will certainly dissolve and some will stay in a cohabitative state. In this chapter, we attempted to find out whether partnership transformations have an impact on fertility and if so, in what manner. We focussed on one, but perhaps the most important, of the fertility consequences: will the first child be born within a certain period of time, and whether there is a change in the propensity to entering motherhood (parenthood) within a period.

Our analysis unequivocally showed, that changes in partnership relations played a decisive part in the decline of fertility throughout the 1990s. We could demonstrate, that in cohabitation there is a lower propensity to get the first child, within a certain period of time. Furthermore, that the low propensity to entering fertility carrier can be found between those who started their partnership trajectory in cohabitation and were in cohabitation after 5 or 7 years later as well. This type of trajectory showed an unequivocal increasing share among partnership trajectories, and this increase could contribute massively to fertility decline. The change seemingly did not leave the traditional (permanent marriage) trajectory as it was. The propensity to the first child showed a decline, if a flat, between those chose the direct marriage and sayed in it at leas 5 to 7 years.

5. Concluding remark

We do not wish to repeat all of our statements, the results and hypotheses worked out, and all presented in the 3.5. and 4.3. section. We are aware that some of our results will change as a consequence of further moving in of the adaptation; others will be modified by multivariate analyses. But we hoped to enlighten some well-known rudiments of the changes in Hungary and in post-socialist societies, hope to recover some new elements of the change and formulate some hypotheses for further research.

References

Adamski, W., P. Machonin, and W. Zapf, eds. (2002): *Structural Change and Modernisation in Post-Socialist Societies*. Hamburg

Andorka, R., (1987): *Determinants of fertility in Advanced Societies*. London: Meuthen

Baizán, P., A. Aassve and F.C. Billari (2003): Cohabitation, Marriage and First Birth: The Interrelationship of Family Formation Events in Spain. *European Journal of Population* 19:147-169.

Billari, F.C., M. Castiglioni, T.C. Marin, F. Michelin and F. Ongaro (2002):Household and Union Formationin a Mediterean Fashion: Italy and Spain. In Kijzing,E. and M. Corijn (eds): *Dynamics of fertility and partnership in Europe. Insights and lessons from comparative research.* Vol.2. New York, Geneva: 15-42.

Bukodi Erzsébet (2004): Ki kivel (nem) házasodik? Párválasztás Magyarországon. Budapest: Andorka Rudolf Társadalomtudományi Társaság-Századvég kiadó

Carlson, E. and A. Klinger, (1987): Patterns in Life: Unmarried Couples in Hungary. European Journal of Population. 3. 85-59.

Csernák Józsefné, Pongrácz Tiborné, S. Molnár Edit, 1992: Élettársi kapcsolatok Magyarországon. NKI Kutatási Jelentések 46, Budapest:KSH NKI

Csernák Józsefné, 1996: Házasság és válás Magyarországon, 1870-1994. Demográfia, XXXIX. Évf. 2-3 szám, p. 108-135.

Dorbritz, J., (2002): Kinderlosigkeit. In. Dorbritz Deutsche FFS rsults Leske+Budrich

Frejka, T. and J. Ross, (2001): Paths to Subreplacement Fertility: The Empirical Evidence. In.: Bulatao, R.A., Casterline, J.B. (eds). *Global Fertility Transition*. A

Supplement to Vol. 27. Population and Development Review, New York: Population Council, p.213-254.

Frejka, T. and J.-P. Sardon, (2003): Fertility trends and prospects in Central and Eastern Europe: the cohort perspective. In: Kotowska, I. E., J. Jozwiak, (eds). *Population of Central and Eastern Europe: Challenges and Opportunities.* Statistical Publishing Establishment, Warsaw. pp. 91-116.

Hankiss, E., R. Manchin, L. Füstös, and Á. Szakolczai (1983): Interaction between Socio-Economic Factors, Way of Life and Value Orientations. Institute of Sociology, Working Papers of Center for Value Sociology. Budapest

Hakim,C., (2003): A New Approach to explaining Fertility Patterns: Preference Theory. *Population and Development Review*, 29(3):349-374.

Hoem, B.–Hoem, J. M. (1988): The Swedish Family. Aspects of Contemporary Developments. *Journal of Family Issues*. Vol. 9. No. 4. pp. 397–424.

Jensen, A.-M., (2002): /Prague lecture/

Kamarás, F., (2003a): Fertility preferences versus actual behavior in Hungary. In: Kotowska, I. E., J. Jozwiak, (eds). *Population of Central and Eastern Europe: Challenges and Opportunities.* Statistical Publishing Establishment, Warsaw. pp. 165-188.

Kamarás Ferenc, *(*2003b): A termékenység irányzatai és jellemzői Európában. in: Spéder (szerk.) Család és néprsség – itthon és Európában. Budapest:Századvég, p. 19-64.

Kantorová, V., (2004) Family life transitions of young women ina changing society:first union formation and birth of first child in the Czech Republic, 1970-1997. Unpublished Thesis, Charlses University Prague

Koschin, F., (2003): Another way of describing the development of fertility and what emerges in Europe. In: Kotowska, I. E., J. Jozwiak, (eds). *Population of Central and Eastern Europe: Challenges and Opportunities.* Statistical Publishing Establishment, Warsaw. pp. 189-200.

Kiernan, K., (2001): European Perspectives on Nonmarital Childbearing. In.: Wu,LL._B. Wolf (ed.): *Out of Wedlock. Causes and Consequences of Nonmarital fertility*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, p. 77-108.

Kotowska, I. E. And J. Jozwiak, (eds). *Population of Central and Eastern Europe: Challenges and Opportunities.* Statistical Publishing Establishment, Warsaw.

Kreyenfeld, M. (2002a): Crisis or adaptation reconsidered: A comparison of East and West German fertility patterns in the first six years after the ‚Wende'. MPIDR Working Paper WP 2002-032, July, p. 40.

Kreyenfeld, M. (2002b): Time-squeeze, partner effect or self-selection? An investigation into the positive effect of women's education on second birth risks in West Germany. *Demographic Research*. Volume 7., Article 2. www.demographic-research.org

Lesthaeghe, R. And G. Moore (2000): Recent trends in fertility and household formation in the industrialised world. *Review of Population and Social Policy* 9., 121-170.

Lesthaegeghe, R. and J. Surkyn (2004): When History moves on: The Foundations and Diffusion of a Second Demographic Transition. Conference draft. www.vub.ac/SOCO p. 34.

Kohler,H.-P., F.C.Billari and J.A.Ortega (2002): The Emergence of Lowest-Low Fertility in Europe During the 1990s. Population and Development Review (28(4): 641-680.

Macura, M. and Y. Mochizaki-Sternberg (1999): Fertility decline in the transition economies, 1982-1997: Political, economic and social factors. *Economic Survey of Europe 1999*. No. 1. New York and Geneva

Macura, M., A. Kadri, Y. Mochizaki-Sternberg and J.L.Garcia (2000): Fertility decline in the transition economies, 1989-1998: Economic and social factors revisited. *Economic Survey of Europe 2000.* No. 1. New York and Geneva

Macura,M., Y. Mochizaki-Sternberg and J.L.Garcia (2002): Eastern and Western Europe's Fertility and Partnership Patterns: Selected Developments from 1987 to 1999. In: Macura,M., Beets,G. (eds). *Dynamics of fertility and partnership in Europe.Insights and lessons from comparative research.* Vol.l. New York, Geneva: 27-55.

Merton, R.K., (1980): *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe: Free Press

Oláh, Sz. L., (2003): Gendering fertility: Second births in Sweden and Hungary. *Population Research and Policy Review* 22:171-200.

Offe, C., (1994): Der Tunnel am Ende des Lichts. Erkundungen derpolitischen Transformation im Neuen Osten. Frankfurt (Main): Campus

United Nations (2000) fertility Decline in the Transition Economics, 1988-1998: Economic and Social Factors Revised. *Economic Survey for Europe*. 2000. New York and Geneva.

Philipov, D. (2003): Fertility in times of discontinuous societal change. In: Kotowska, I. E., J. Jozwiak, (eds). *Population of Central and Eastern Europe: Challenges and Opportunities.* Statistical Publishing Establishment, Warsaw. pp. 665-690.

Philpov, D. and J. Dorbritz (2004): Demographic consequences of economic transition in countries of central and eastern Europe. Population studies , No. 39. Council of Europe Publishing.

Pinelli, A., A. De Rose, P.Di Gulio and A. Rosina (2002): Interrelationship between partnership and fertility behaviour. In: Macura,M., Beets,G. (eds). *Dynamics of fertility and partnership in Europe.Insights and lessons from comparative research.* Vol.l. New York, Geneva: 77-98.

Pongrácz, T. (2003): Birth out of wedlock. *Demográfia Special English Edition,* Budapest:DRI, p.

Ranjan, P. (1999): Fertility Behaviour under Income Uncertainty, *European Journal of Population,* Vol.15,pp. 25-43.

Rychtarikova, J.,(2001): The second demographic Transition and the transformation of fertility and partnership in the Czech Republic and other East European countries. Paper presented in Bad Herenalb, June

Sobotka, T. (2002) Ten years of rapid fertility changes in European post-communist countries: evidence and interpretation. Working Paper Series 02-1.University of Groningen: Population Research Centre p. 53.

Sobotka, T., (2003): Understanding lower and later fertility in Central and Eastern Europe. In: Kotowska, I. E., J. Jozwiak, (eds). *Population of Central and Eastern Europe: Challenges and Opportunities.* Statistical Publishing Establishment, Warsaw. pp. 691- 724.

Spéder Zsolt (2001): Életünk fordulópontjai. Az NKI társadalmi és demográfiai panelfelvételének kutatási koncepciója és kérdőívének vázlatos ismertetése. [Turning points of the life-course. Concept and design of the Hungarian socio-demographic panel survey at the DRI] *Demográfia,* XLIV.(2-3):305-320.

Spéder, Zs., (2002): Fertility and Structural Change in Hungary. Demographic Research Institute. *Working Papers on Population, Family and Welfare*, No.4, Budapest

Spéder, Zs. and M. Pongrácz, (2004) Cohabitation and Marriage – Facts, Trends Opinions. Paper Presented at the 2004 Annual Meeting of the Population Assotiaion of America, Boston, 3April, 2004., Session 148.

Tomka, B., (2002) Demographic diversity and convergence in Europe. *Demographic Research on line.* Volume 6., Article 5. www.demographic-research.org

Toulemon, L. (1997): Cohabitation is here to stay. *Population:An English Selection*, Vol.9. p.11-46.

Wu, L.L.,-LL. Bumpass and K. Musick (2001): Historical and Life Course Trajectories of Nonmarital Childbearing. In.: Wu,LL.-B. Wolf (ed.): *Out of Wedlock. Causes and Consequences of Nonmarital fertility*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, p. 3-48.

Zapf, W. and S. Mau (1993): Eine demographische Revolution Ostdeutschland? In. Informationsdienst Soziale Indikatoren. 10. p.1-5.

---

[i] Long run converging and diverging demographic Hungarian development in relation to the Western Europe is analyzed by Tomka (2002).

[ii] The members of the international consortium are: PAU/ECE Geneva, London School of Economics, NIDI The Hague, INED Paris, Max Planck Institute of Demographic Research, Rostock, University „la Sapienza" Rom, Statistics Canada, HCSO Demographic Research Institute, Budapest.

[iii] During working out the concept we intensively studied the American longitudinal surveys as the Survey of Households and Families (NSHF) and the Intergenerational Panel Survey (IPS) and we take advantages from the European panel surveys as the German SOEP, the British BHPS and the Hungarian Household Panel Survey (HHPS).

[iv] Our paper about "Concept and Design of the Hungarian Social and Demographic Panel Survey 'Turning points…' gives an overview about the alignment of retrospective, cross-sectional and prospective (panel) methods approaches. Spéder (2002) About constructing the sample and response see the work of Kapitány (2002) www.ksh.hu/nki

[v] Of course, there was a great overlap between cohort of birth date and cohorts of delivery date.

[vi] The process of "lifelong learning" involves a negligible few.

[vii] The ratio of the third and higher order birth were in the different years as followed: 1980: 15.5%, 1990:20.1%, 1995: 22.5%, 2000: 22.5%, 2002:22.8%. Source: Vital statistics, Hungarian Central Statistical Office.

[viii] The reality of this hypothesis could be supported by the inclusion of all the children already born (and not just those born within five years). Furthermore, the number of the second children, yet to be born, can be estimated through the *planned number of children*. Having done these, 84,2% of the women who had their first child born between 1992 and 1996 could have a second child. This rate is the same or higher, if we compare it to the final ratio of mothers giving first births between 1982 and 1986 (79.5%). At the same time, plans are more difficult to realize the older one gets.

[ix] We are of course aware that there is no perfect symmetry, since for instance the partnership careers of a male and a female who end up single after a marriage can be very different after the divorce.

[x] The table with 7 years not shown here.