

The influence of parental SES on cohabiting and single parenthood across Europe¹

J.C. (Judith) Koops (*), A.C. (Aart) Liefbroer (**), and A.H. (Anne) Gauthier (*)

(*) Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague (NIDI/KNAW) and University of Groningen, The Netherlands

koops@nidi.nl

gauthier@nidi.nl

(**) Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute, The Hague (NIDI/KNAW), University Medical Centre Groningen & VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands

liefbroer@nidi.nl

Paper prepared for 40th Chaire Quetelet Conference, Louvain-la-Neuve, November 5-7, 2014.

FIRST DRAFT, DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS²

Abstract. The current research looked at the influence of parental socio-economic status on the chance of having a first child within a cohabiting union, within marriage, or while being single. We analysed this effect for 13 Eastern and Western European countries for both men and women. Our results appear to be more in line with the Pattern of Disadvantage perspective than with the Second Demographic Transition theory. In many Eastern European countries a lower parental SES is related with a higher chance to become a single or a cohabiting parent. In Western-European countries no link was found between parental SES and partnership context at first birth, possibly because in these countries children are able to overcome childhood disadvantage. One exception is France where women are less likely to become a single parent if their parents had a higher SES.

Keywords: single parent; cohabiting parent; Second Demographic Transition; Pattern of Disadvantage

¹ The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP/2007-2013) / ERC Grant Agreement n. 324178 (Project: Contexts of Opportunity. PI: Aart C. Liefbroer).

² The presented results are preliminary. Direct all correspondence to J.C.Koops, koops@nidi.nl

Introduction

Over the past decades there has been an increase in the percentage of children born outside marriage (nonmarital births) in Western societies. In the US the percentage of all births to unmarried women increased from 18 percent in 1980 to 41 percent in 2009 (Martin et al., 2011). And among the 28 states of the European Economic Area, the proportion of births outside marriage increased from 9% in 1980 to 32% in 2004 (Eurostat, 2006). ‘Nonmarital births’ is an umbrella term including births within a cohabiting union and to persons without a residential partner. Since these are two very different situations some researchers have studied these two phenomena separately from each other. This research has shown that the increase in nonmarital births is mostly due to an increase in births taking place in the context of cohabitation, while the frequency of births to single women stayed relatively constant (Kiernan, 2004; Raley, 2001). As a consequence, nowadays births to cohabiting parents make up the lion’s share of the nonmarital births in most developed countries. Norway and France have a high proportion of births within cohabiting unions, in these countries almost half of first births are to cohabiting couples. Other countries show a lower proportion; for example in Italy only one in ten first births took place within cohabitation (Noack, Bernhardt, & Wiik, 2013). The percentage of births to single mothers is relatively high in English speaking countries (Canada, New Zealand, US) and German speaking countries (Germany, Austria), compared to other Western European countries (Heuveline, Timberlake, & Furstenberg, 2003).

A key issue in the recent literature is whether nonmarital childbearing is a phenomenon especially common among the higher or instead among the lower socio-economic strata. Research in fact shows that the prevalence of nonmarital childbearing and the relationship with social class differs between countries. For example, while in Northern European countries nonmarital childbirth mostly occurs among stable cohabiting couples (Sobotka & Toulemon, 2008), in the US unions of cohabiting couples with children are often less stable than that of married couples (Wu & Wolfe, 2001). Furthermore, studies on the educational gradient (as a reflection of social stratification) of childbirth within cohabitation found that in many European countries the educational gradient for childbirth within cohabitation was significantly more negative than for childbirth within marriage, while this pattern was not found in Austria, France, and Germany (Mikolai, 2012; Perelli-Harris et al., 2010).

The current paper will build upon this research but instead of focusing on characteristics of the respondent, we will answer the question how the socio-economic status (SES) of the respondent's parents influences the chance of becoming a cohabiting or a single parent. The reason for focusing on parental SES is that it gives us information on the extent to which social background influences family choices of the next generation. As such, it gives us information on the reproduction of social differences in a society. Previous research found that men and women who grew up in higher social classes have lower levels of nonmarital births while children who grew up in poor economic circumstances are more likely to start their families outside marriage later in life (Aassve, 2003; Hofferth & Goldscheider, 2010; Hognas & Carlson, 2012; Wu, 1996). However, these studies only used data from one country. The current cross-national study is important since the transmission of socio-economic status from parents to children is likely to differ between countries depending on differences in the level of social mobility, institutional arrangements, family policies, general social policies, etc. Another contribution of this study is that it includes both men and women. Many fertility studies only include women because men tend to underreport children, especially if they are not part of the household of their child, and are considered to be less accurate in providing dates that make up partnership and fertility histories (Rendall, Clarke, Peters, Ranjit, & Verropoulou, 1999). As a consequence many theories used to explain fertility behaviour are only tested using a female sample. In this paper we will instead test our hypotheses separately for men and women to see if the theories explain the fertility behaviour of men and women equally well.

Theory and hypotheses

In this paper, hypotheses from two different theoretical perspectives – Second Demographic Transition theory and the Pattern of Disadvantage perspective – will be juxtaposed. The Second Demographic Transition theory (SDT) postulates that the increase in nonmarital parenthood over the past decades is mostly due to attitudinal change which led to a decrease in marriage and an increase in cohabitation and divorce (Lesthaeghe, 2010; Van de Kaa, 2001). Scholars further argue that the SDT did not start everywhere at the same time. The general idea is that the SDT started in Western and Northern European countries in the late 1960s (Sobotka, 2008) and in Eastern Europe after the collapse of the state socialist systems (Frejka, 2008). The theory furthermore proposes that cohabitation initially was a marginal

phenomenon adopted by the higher educated in society. However, over time more people followed this example and cohabitation became more common and accepted as an alternative to marriage. This led to the general belief that cohabitation is an acceptable context for childbearing, as is currently the case in some Nordic countries (Kiernan, 2001). Based on the SDT, we hypothesize that *children from higher SES parents are more likely to opt for childbearing within cohabitation than children from low SES parents*. This hypothesis is based on the argument that high SES parents will be more favourably inclined towards alternative living arrangements than low SES parents and will transmit these kind of attitudes to their children. However, in countries which are further advanced in the transition, SDT-like attitudes have diffused to all social strata, leading parents from all social strata to be less strongly opposed to childbearing within cohabitation. We therefore expect that *in countries which are further advanced in the transition (e.g. most Western European countries), young adults are not (or only slightly) more likely to have their first birth within cohabitation if they grew up with parents with a higher SES*.

In contrast, the Pattern of Disadvantage perspective claims that the increase in nonmarital births is not due to an attitudinal change but is instead caused by an increase in economic hardship and technological changes over time which hit people with a lower socio-economic status disproportionately (Perelli-Harris et al., 2010). This perspective therefore suggests that nonmarital childbearing is more common among people with a lower socio-economic status. Several explanations have been given for this relation, for example that a lower socio-economic status is related to lower marital prospects (Anderson, 1990) which in turn increases the chance of a nonmarital birth. Or that SES influences attitudes and preferences as women with low SES are more often found to hold positive attitudes towards childbearing outside of marriage (Cherlin, Cross-Barnet, Burton, & Garrett-Peters, 2008; Edin & Kefalas, 2005; Mollborn, 2009). Based on the Pattern of Disadvantage perspective, we hypothesize *that young adults are more likely to have their first birth within cohabitation or while they are single if they grew up with parents with a lower SES*. At the same time, in countries with more beneficial social policies and where social mobility is high, children can overcome their childhood disadvantage with help of the state. Therefore we expect that *in countries with more beneficial social policies and where social mobility is high, young adults are not (or only slightly) more likely to have their first birth within cohabitation or as a single parent if they grew up with parents with a lower SES*.

Data and method

Data

The hypotheses will be tested using data from the first wave of the Generations and Gender Survey (GGS) which contains information on 19 European and non-European Western societies. The data holds a wide range of information, a.o. retrospective information on partnership history, fertility history, and parental background. For this paper we were able to use data of 13 Western and Eastern European countries³. This data was collected between 2004 and 2011 among respondents aged 17 to 85. In total 139,788 respondents took part in the survey, ranging from 5000 in Austria to almost 20,000 in Poland. Due to values missing for gender, fertility history, partnership history, and parental SES, information on 113,967 respondents were available for analysis.

Variables

Partnership context at first birth. The dependent variable partnership context at first birth in a given month was measured with a categorical variable differentiating between no biological child (0), marriage (1), cohabitation (2), and single (3). Being single means here that a person did not live with a partner in the same household and was not married at the time of the birth. The variable was created by combining the information on the year and month of birth of the first biological child and information on the year and month of the start and end of cohabiting relation(s) and marriage(s). The French data contains information if cohabiting couples have registered their union, called *pacte civil de solidarité* (PACS). We have regarded these couples as cohabiting couples.

Parental SES. Parental SES was measured using the information on the highest education level of the respondent's father using the International Standard Classification of Education 97 (ISCED-97). Since this is an ordinal variable, we differentiated between low (ISCED 0-2), middle (ISCED 3-4), and high (ISCED 5-6) SES.

Own SES. A respondent's own SES was measured using the information on respondent's highest educational level using the ISCED-97. The variable was coded as missing if respondents were still in school at the moment of the interview. In the future we

³ The countries are: Austria (AUS), Belgium (BEL), Bulgaria (BUL), Czech Republic (CZE), Estonia (EST), France (FRA), Georgia (GEO), Germany (GER), Hungary (HUN), Lithuania (LIT), Poland (POL), Romania (ROM), and Russian Federation (RUS). Insufficient information on fertility history, partnership history or father's education was available for Italy, Japan, and the Netherlands. Access to the data has not yet been granted for the first author for Australia and Norway, while data for Sweden has not yet been released.

want to include the respondent's own SES as a time-varying covariate, since entering ultimate educational attainment can inflate the effects on fertility outcomes (Hoem & Kreyenfeld, 2006)

Cohort. To include change over time, a categorical variable was included differentiating people born before 1955, between 1955 and 1975, and after 1975. Data of Austria only includes information on respondents below the age of 50. For this country only cohorts '1955-1975' and '>1975' were valid.

Age. This is a time-varying covariate which refers to the respondents age in months at any moment between the age of 15 and the timing of entry into parenthood (or the timing of the interview if a respondent did not have a biological child at the time of the interview). For easier interpretation the variable is divided by 12 to show the age in years. Both age and age-squared are included to correct for the non-linear effect of age on the risk of having a first child.

Gender. We ran all models separately for men and women.

Analysis

A discrete time competing risk model is used to test the influence of parental SES on the chance of having a first child while being single or within cohabitation as compared to having a child within marriage. A multinomial logistic regression on a person-period (in months) dataset was used. These analyses were run separately for countries and the results were reported in relative risk ratios. A relative risk ratio greater than 1 indicates that an increase in the independent variable increases the risk of becoming a cohabiting or single parent compared to becoming a married parent. A relative risk ratio smaller than 1 indicated that an increase in the independent variable decreases the risk of having a first child within cohabitation or while being single compared to having a first child within marriage. Although the model also compares the risk of having no biological child with having a child within marriage, we will not discuss these results in this paper since they are not of interest for answering the research question.

Results

We will start with discussing the descriptive results. Table 1 shows an overview of the distribution of first births among married couples, cohabiting couples and single men and women. These results show that in all countries younger cohorts have their first child less often while being married. In the Western European countries this change is already visible when comparing people born before 1955 and people born between 1955 and 1975. However for most Eastern European countries this change is only visible for the cohort born after 1975. As a result, the youngest cohorts in Eastern European countries have a higher percentage of first births within marriage than the youngest cohorts in Western European countries. A clear exception is Estonia where the decrease in first births to married people already started in cohort 1955-1975. Most of the decrease in first births within marriage is due to an increase in births to cohabiting couples over time. Especially in Western European countries many first births happen to people in cohabiting unions. In the youngest cohorts in Austria, Belgium, and France more than 40% of first births are within cohabitation. Again Estonia stands out from the other Eastern European countries, in this country about half of the first births are within cohabitation in the youngest cohort, which is even higher than in the Western European countries. First births within cohabitation is also relatively high in Georgia. We cannot observe a clear pattern for births to single men and women. One thing that does stand out is the high percentage of first births to singles in Germany.

[TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Table 2 shows the results for the competing risk model comparing people who had their first child within cohabitation with people who had their first child within marriage (reference category). This model only contains the control variables age, age² and cohort. Overall, older people have a lower chance of having a child within a cohabiting union than within marriage, however the strength of this effect decreases over age. As was already visible in Table 1, younger cohorts are significantly more likely to have a first child within a cohabiting union compared to having a child within marriage. This effect is strongest in France, Hungary, and Belgium and weakest in Romania Georgia, and Russia. Table 3 shows similar results but this time people who had their first child without having a residential partner were compared with people who had their first child within marriage (reference category). Again older people

DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

have lower odds of having a first child while being single (compared to having a child while being married), and this effect decreases over age. In some countries respondents in younger cohorts have a relatively lower chance of having a child while being married which increases their relative risk of becoming a single parent.

[TABLES 2 & 3 ABOUT HERE]

The first half of tables 4 and 5 show the results for the analyses including father's education (without respondent own education), while the second half of these tables show the results for the analyses including respondent's own education (without father's education). The effects are controlled for the influence of age, age² and cohort (results not shown). We will start with discussing the results of the first half of Table 4 which compares people who had their first child within a cohabiting union, with people who had their first child within marriage.

When comparing countries on the effect of father's education we find that in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Russia, Estonia, and Georgia people are less likely to have a first birth while cohabiting compared to having a child while being married if their father had a higher educational level. For the last three mentioned countries this was only the case for women, while for men no effect was found. Interestingly, men in Germany and Austria are more likely to have a child in cohabitation if their father had a higher education. For Czech Republic, Lithuania, Poland, Belgium, and France no significant effects were found for father's education.

Comparing people who had their first child while being single with people who had their first child within marriage (Table 5), we find that in 6 out of 9 Eastern European countries women whose father had a higher education have lower odds of having a first birth while being single. In most Western European countries we don't find an effect of father's education level. An exception is France, in this country women are less likely to have a child while being single when their father was higher educated. In none of the countries we find an effect of father's education on having a first birth while being single for men.

We will now turn to discuss the second half of tables 4 and 5 which shows the effects of respondent's own educational level. In most countries men and women with a higher educational level are less likely to have their first child within a cohabiting union (compared to having a child within marriage). This effect is strongest in Eastern European countries and is least strong in Germany and France, and non-existent in Belgium. Only in Austria we find a positive effect: men with a medium educational level are more likely to have a child within

cohabitation than within marriage compared to men with a low educational level. Comparing people who had their first child while being single with people who had their first child within marriage, we find that in all countries (except Georgia) people with higher educational levels have a lower chance of having a child while being single.

[TABLES 4 & 5 ABOUT HERE]

Discussion

The current research looked at the influence of parental socio-economic status on the chance of having a first child within a cohabiting union or while being single, compared to having a first child within marriage. We analysed this effect for 13 Eastern and Western European countries for both men and women. This study is important because so far cross-national research has not paid much attention to the influence of parental SES on the partnership situation at the time of a person's first birth. Moreover, fertility research often only focused on women.

Overall, our results appear to be more in line with the Pattern of Disadvantage perspective. In six out of nine Eastern European countries young adults are more likely to have a first birth within cohabitation or while being single if they grew up with parents with a low SES. As expected, in Western-European countries where children are more likely to overcome childhood disadvantage, no link was found between parental SES and partnership context at first birth. One exception is France where women are less likely to become a single parent if their parents had a higher SES.

However, the results also show some support for the Second Demographic Transition theory, since men in Austria and Germany are more likely to have a first child in a cohabiting relationship if their parents had a higher socio-economic status. We are however somewhat cautious in interpreting the results of Germany, since other scholars have revealed problems with the validity of the fertility histories of the GGS data for this country (Kreyenfeld, Hornung, Kubisch, & Jaschinski, 2010). This could also explain why the percentage of first births to singles is much higher in Germany than in the other countries. We did not find support for the hypothesis that in countries which are not very far advanced in the transition, young adults are more likely to have their first child within cohabitation than in marriage if their parents had a higher SES. What the results instead show is that in Eastern European

DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

countries, where first births within cohabitation is less common, people are more likely to have their first child within cohabitation if parental SES is low.

The effects of respondent's own educational level are also more in line with the Pattern of Disadvantage perspective. Respondent's with a lower educational level had a higher chance of becoming a cohabiting parent (in ten out of thirteen countries), and a higher chance of becoming a single parent (in twelve out of thirteen countries). Only in Austria do medium educated men have a higher chance of becoming a cohabiting parent than low educated men. Overall the effects of a respondent's own education on becoming a nonmarital parent appear to be stronger than the effects of parental SES. As mentioned in the data and method section, we included respondent's own educational level as ultimate educational attainment. Previous research has found that this may inflate the effects of own education on fertility outcomes especially in countries where people do not complete their education before they have children, or where they are likely to re-enter the educational system after they had their first birth (Hoem & Kreyenfeld, 2006). Moreover, in many countries younger cohorts are often higher educated than older cohorts; as a result children are likely to obtain a higher education than their parents did. This makes it hard to compare the effect of both variables because a low educational level of the respondent is a clearer sign of social disadvantage, then a low education level of this person's parent.

Most research on nonmarital births has focused on women because the fertility and partnership histories they provide are in general more accurate than that of men (Rendall et al., 1999). In our study we found differences between men and women, however the trends over cohorts and in age are fairly similar. When testing the influence of parental SES we also find less significant effects for men than for women. This is especially the case when comparing singles with married people. This is not surprising since especially the frequency of male respondents reporting to have had their first child while being single is very low. However, overall the results appear to be fairly similar for men and women in a country.

Before to draw firm conclusions from our results, we want to make some improvements to the current paper. Firstly, we want to add data of Southern European countries, Nordic countries, and Anglo-Saxon countries. Secondly, we want to improve the measure for parental SES, for example by including information on the occupational status of the father and information of mother's SES. Thirdly, we want to include the respondent's own SES as a time-varying covariate, because entering ultimate educational attainment can inflate the effects on fertility outcomes (Hoem & Kreyenfeld, 2006).

Reference

- Aassve, A. (2003). The impact of economic resources on premarital childbearing and subsequent marriage among young American women. *Demography*, 40(1), 105-126. doi: 10.2307/3180814
- Anderson, Elijah. (1990). *Streetwise : race, class, and change in an urban community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cherlin, A., Cross-Barnet, C., Burton, L. M., & Garrett-Peters, R. (2008). Promises They Can Keep: Low-Income Women's Attitudes toward Motherhood, Marriage, and Divorce. *J Marriage Fam*, 70(4), 919-933. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00536.x
- Edin, Kathryn, & Kefalas, Maria. (2005). *Promises I can keep : why poor women put motherhood before marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Eurostat. (2006). *Population Statistics. 2006 Edition*. Luxembourg: Office for official Publications of the European communities.
- Frejka, T. (2008). Determinants of family formation and childbearing during the societal transition in Central and Eastern Europe. *Demographic Research*, 19, 139-170.
- Heuveline, P., Timberlake, J. M., & Furstenberg, F. F. (2003). Shifting childrearing to single mothers: Results from 17 western countries. *Population and Development Review*, 29(1), 47-71. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2003.00047.x
- Hoem, Jan M, & Kreyenfeld, Michaela. (2006). Anticipatory analysis and its alternatives in life-course research Part 1: ducation and first childbearing. *Demographic Research*, 15(16), 461-484.
- Hofferth, S. L., & Goldscheider, F. (2010). Family Structure and the Transition to Early Parenthood. *Demography*, 47(2), 415-437.
- Hognas, R. S., & Carlson, M. J. (2012). "Like Parent, Like Child?": The intergenerational transmission of nonmarital childbearing. *Social Science Research*, 41(6), 1480-1494. doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.05.012
- Kiernan, Kathleen. (2001). The rise of cohabitation and childbearing outside marriage in Western Europe. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 15(1), 1-21.
- Kiernan, Kathleen. (2004). Unmarried cohabitation and parenthood: Here to stay? European Perspectives. In D. P. Moynihan, T. Smeeding & L. Rainwater (Eds.), *The Future of the Family* (pp. 66-95): Russell Sage Foundation.

DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

- Kreyenfeld, Michaela, Hornung, Anne, Kubisch, Karolin, & Jaschinski, Ina. (2010). *Fertility and union histories from German GGS data: some critical reflections* (Vol. 23).
- Lesthaeghe, R. (2010). The Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition. *Population and Development Review*, 36(2), 211-251.
- Martin, J. A. , Hamilton, B. E. , Ventura, S. J. , Osterman, M. J. , Kirmeyer, S., Mathews, T. J., & Wilson, E. C. . (2011). *Births: final data for 2009. National vital statistics reports: from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. National Center for Health Statistics: National Vital Statistics System.
- Mikolai, Júlia. (2012). With or without you: partnership context of first conceptions and births in Hungary. *Demográfia*, 55(5), 37-60.
- Mollborn, S. (2009). Norms About Nonmarital Pregnancy and Willingness to Provide Resources to Unwed Parents. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 71(1), 122-134. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00584.x
- Noack, Turid, Bernhardt, Eva, & Wiik, Kenneth Aarskaug. (2013). Cohabitation or marriage? Contemporary living arrangements in the west. In A. Abela & J. Walker (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Family Studies: Global Perspectives on Partnerships, Parenting and Support in a Changing World* (pp. 16-30). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Perelli-Harris, B., Sigle-Rushton, W., Kreyenfeld, M., Lappegard, T., Keizer, R., & Berghammer, C. (2010). The Educational Gradient of Childbearing within Cohabitation in Europe. *Population and Development Review*, 36(4), 775-801. doi: 10.1111/j.1728-4457.2010.00357.x
- Raley, R Kelly. (2001). Increasing fertility in cohabiting unions: Evidence for the second demographic transition in the United States? *Demography*, 38(1), 59-66.
- Rendall, Michael S, Clarke, Lynda, Peters, H Elizabeth, Ranjit, Nalini, & Verropoulou, Georgia. (1999). Incomplete reporting of men's fertility in the United States and Britain: A research note. *Demography*, 36(1), 135-144.
- Sobotka, T. (2008). The diverse faces of the second demographic transition in Europe. *Demographic Research*, 19, 171-224.
- Sobotka, T., & Toulemon, L. (2008). Changing family and partnership behaviour: Common trends and persistent diversity across Europe. *Demographic Research*, 19, 85-138.
- Van de Kaa, Dirk J. (2001). Postmodern fertility preferences: from changing value orientation to new behavior. *Population and Development Review*, 290-331.

DO NOT CITE OR DISTRIBUTE WITHOUT PERMISSION OF THE AUTHORS

Wu, L. L. (1996). Effects of family instability, income, and income instability on the risk of a premarital birth. *American Sociological Review*, *61*(3), 386-406. doi: 10.2307/2096355

Wu, L., & Wolfe, B. (Eds.). (2001). *Out of wedlock: Causes and consequences of nonmarital fertility*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Table 1. Percentage of respondents having a first child within marriage, cohabitation and without a partner per country cohort, and gender.

Country	Cohort	<i>Women</i>			<i>Men</i>		
		Married	Cohabiting	Single	Married	Cohabiting	Single
Austria*	1955-1975	59.71	28.2	12.1	58.0	30.3	11.7
	>1975	46.4	42.0	11.7	49.7	39.5	10.8
Belgium	<1955	86.6	3.0	10.4	91.4	2.8	5.8
	1955-1975	79.5	13.0	7.5	83.1	11.8	5.1
	>1975	53.9	40.0	5.7	51.1	41.8	7.1
France	<1955	80.3	4.0	15.7	88.4	4.5	7.1
	1955-1975	62.1	30.3	7.6	62.3	32.5	5.2
	>1975	39.1	48.2	12.7	39.3	51.2	9.5
Germany	<1955	63.0	3.9	33.1	78.4	3.0	18.6
	1955-1975	70.9	14.1	15.0	73.9	12.1	14.0
	>1975	53.9	22.0	24.1	58.1	31.4	10.5
Bulgaria	<1955	87.2	4.0	8.8	90.2	4.5	5.4
	1955-1975	88.3	7.2	4.5	86.1	10.7	3.2
	>1975	65.6	27.7	6.7	57.5	40.3	2.2
Czech Republic	<1955	84.4	2.8	12.8	89.3	1.6	9.1
	1955-1975	80.7	6.3	13.0	83.1	7.5	9.4
	>1975	68.0	14.1	18.0	61.4	27.3	11.4
Estonia	<1955	85.0	7.3	7.7	87.2	8.0	4.8
	1955-1975	68.6	20.7	10.7	69.0	26.7	4.3
	>1975	36.1	52.0	11.9	31.7	62.7	5.6
Georgia	<1955	85.6	11.5	5.9	83.1	12.4	4.5
	1955-1975	79.5	16.5	4.1	73.2	22.8	4.0
	>1975	58.8	36.6	4.6	54.1	40.8	5.1
Hungary	<1955	94.4	1.1	4.6	92.7	1.3	6.0
	1955-1975	87.0	6.9	6.2	84.7	9.4	6.0
	>1975	70.7	20.3	9.0	65.3	29.5	5.2
Lithuania	<1955	87.9	2.4	9.7	89.5	1.8	8.7
	1955-1975	86.7	3.7	9.6	89.7	3.6	6.7
	>1975	76.3	13.0	10.7	81.5	12.9	5.6
Poland	<1955	88.4	2.5	9.2	91.5	1.7	6.9
	1955-1975	88.2	4.2	7.6	89.5	4.3	6.2
	>1975	76.2	13.2	10.6	76.7	15.7	7.6
Romania	<1955	86.3	3.5	10.2	90.5	3.2	6.3
	1955-1975	88.4	7.2	4.4	89.6	6.6	3.8
	>1975	79.9	15.3	4.7	79.9	19.0	1.1
Russia	<1955	79.6	8.2	12.2	86.3	6.4	7.3
	1955-1975	82.1	8.43	9.5	85.6	8.9	5.5
	>1975	74.1	14.0	11.9	76.6	19.6	3.8

* The Austrian data does not contain information on respondents born before 1955

Table 2. Results of the multinomial logistic regression, relative risk ratios comparing first births within cohabitation with births within marriage (ref.). Results are separately presented for men and women.

	FRA	HUN	BEL	EST	BUL	POL	CZE	GER	LIT	ROM	GEO	RUS	AUS
<i>Women</i>													
Age	0.86***	0.64***	0.80***	0.77***	0.66***	0.72***	0.71***	0.79***	0.72***	0.72***	0.89***	0.76***	0.90**
Age2	1.01***	1.02***	1.01***	1.01***	1.02***	1.02***	1.02***	1.01***	1.02***	1.01***	1.01***	1.02***	1.00*
Cohort													
<1955 (ref.)													
1955-1975	9.43***	7.07***	4.76***	3.38***	1.81***	1.89***	2.56***	3.28***	1.81**	2.07***	1.47***	1.18	#
>1975	35.66***	28.20***	27.7***	16.6***	8.79***	7.58***	7.50***	6.86***	5.87***	4.59***	4.37***	2.34***	1.91***
<i>Men</i>													
Age	0.78***	0.61***	0.80*	0.71***	0.60***	0.61***	0.77***	0.71***	0.90	0.64***	0.94	0.74***	0.84*
Age2	1.01***	1.02***	1.01***	1.02***	1.02***	1.02***	1.01***	1.01***	1.01***	1.02***	1.00	1.01***	1.00
Cohort													
<1955 (ref.)													
1955-1975	11.55***	8.29***	5.27***	4.15***	2.55***	2.27***	3.79***	4.34***	1.78*	2.18***	2.12***	1.27	#
>1975	40.34***	32.55***	39.74***	21.57***	11.25***	10.34***	21.72***	14.36***	10.38***	5.37***	5.49***	2.31***	1.40

* p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; # The Austrian data does not contain information on respondents born before 1955

Table 3. Results of the multinomial logistic regression, relative risk ratios comparing first births to singles with births within marriage (ref.). Results are separately presented for men and women.

	EST	HUN	POL	FRA	ROM	BUL	GEO	RUS	CZE	LIT	BEL	GER	AUS
<i>Women</i>													
Age	0.71***	0.73***	0.70***	0.72***	0.79***	0.76***	0.84***	0.81***	0.65***	0.75***	0.65***	0.67***	0.70***
Age2	1.02***	1.01***	1.02***	1.01***	1.01*	1.02***	1.01***	1.01***	1.02***	1.01***	1.02***	1.01***	1.01**
Cohort													
<1955 (ref.)													
1955-1975	1.66***	1.50**	0.88	0.76**	0.45***	0.52***	0.70*	0.75**	1.06	0.88	0.94	0.86	#
>1975	3.95***	2.52***	1.61***	2.33***	0.49**	1.05	1.00	1.10	1.58	1.18	1.03	0.79	1.06
<i>Men</i>													
Age	0.68***	0.54***	0.56***	0.56***	0.59***	0.78**	0.74***	0.71***	0.76***	0.66***	0.65***	0.82***	0.90
Age2	1.01**	1.02***	1.02***	1.02***	1.02***	1.00	1.01**	1.01**	1.01***	1.01***	1.02***	1.00*	1.00
Cohort													
<1955 (ref.)													
1955-1975	1.13	1.15	0.98	1.22	0.62**	0.66*	1.15	0.77	1.09	0.76	1.07	0.43***	#
>1975	2.86*	1.05	1.36*	3.69***	0.21**	0.64	1.53	0.65	1.80***	0.69	2.56**	0.73*	1.43

* p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001; # The Austrian data does not contain information on respondents born before 1955

Table 4. Results of the multinomial logistic regression, relative risk ratios for father's education and own education comparing first births within cohabitation with births within marriage (ref.). Results are separately presented for men and women. Effects of control variables (age, age² and cohort) are not shown.

	Father's education (ref. is low educational level)					Own education (ref. is low educational level)			
	Women - Medium	Women - High	Men - Medium	Men - High		Women - Medium	Women - High	Men - Medium	Men - High
GER	1.13	1.05	1.21	1.70*	AUS	1.03	0.79	1.88*	1.50
AUS	1.05	1.06	1.44*	0.70	BUL	0.19***	0.14***	0.22***	0.18***
BUL	0.30***	0.32***	0.31***	0.25***	LIT	0.30***	0.11***	0.41***	0.25***
ROM	0.52**	0.52	0.54**	0.47	ROM	0.33***	0.18***	0.33***	0.07***
HUN	0.77	0.53*	0.58**	0.59	HUN	0.36***	0.21***	0.29***	0.18***
RUS	1.00	0.60*	0.87	0.95	CZE	0.41***	0.23***	0.40***	0.32***
EST	0.83	0.62**	0.78	0.68	EST	0.43***	0.24***	0.52***	0.28***
GEO	0.88	0.71*	1.05	0.77	RUS	0.46***	0.32***	0.85	0.43***
CZE	0.66	0.48	0.67	0.55	GEO	0.47***	0.43***	0.77	0.61**
LIT	0.76	0.49	1.09	0.51	POL	0.50***	0.32***	0.50***	0.26***
POL	1.10	0.74	1.02	1.03	GER	0.68*	0.63*	0.59*	0.38***
BEL	0.88	1.14	0.95	1.11	FRA	1.00	0.84	0.91	0.61**
FRA	1.11	0.91	1.27	1.19	BEL	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.76

* p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Table 5. Results of the multinomial logistic regression, relative risk ratios for father's education and own education comparing first births to singles with births within marriage (ref.). Results are separately presented for men and women. Effects of control variables (age, age² and cohort) are not shown.

	Father's education (ref. is low educational level)					Own education (ref. is low educational level)			
	Women - Medium	Women - High	Men - Medium	Men - High		Women - Medium	Women - High	Men - Medium	Men - High
FRA	0.41***	0.56*	1.15	1.19	EST	0.36***	0.30***	0.62	0.29**
ROM	0.49**	1.07	1.00	-	HUN	0.48***	0.30***	0.51***	0.44**
EST	0.66**	0.58*	0.98	1.35	CZE	0.50***	0.33***	0.61**	0.54*
CZE	0.72*	0.56*	0.79	0.64	BUL	0.50***	0.48***	0.62*	0.58*
LIT	1.24	0.41*	1.01	0.80	POL	0.51***	0.27***	0.69**	0.36***
HUN	0.85	0.55*	0.87	0.75	LIT	0.58***	0.41***	0.71*	0.43***
RUS	0.80	0.59**	1.07	1.28	FRA	0.59***	0.31***	0.65*	0.50**
BUL	0.79	1.00	1.04	0.96	ROM	0.59***	0.40**	0.58**	0.35**
GEO	0.90	1.04	1.27	0.61	RUS	0.61***	0.42***	0.77	0.64*
POL	1.03	1.03	0.85	0.73	GER	0.61***	0.53***	0.88	0.60*
AUS	0.75	0.46	0.94	1.23	AUS	0.68*	0.26***	0.74	0.45
BEL	0.81	0.67	0.52	0.87	BEL	0.68*	0.39***	0.60*	0.40***
GER	0.91	0.89	1.10	0.89	GEO	0.81	0.96	0.71	0.57

* p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001