# **Cross-national differences in continuing childbearing in** re-partnering – the role of partnership context

# Paulina Gałęzewska, University of Southampton, UK

# **Background and motivation**

• • •	Given that cohabiters may differ from their married counter individual characteristics, such as gender-role and family attitud who have experienced dissolution of cohabiting union may continuing childbearing behaviour than divorcees. <b>Fious research on continuing childbearing after union dissolu</b> lew established unions often produce an additional child. The majority of studies have mainly analysed continuing fertility ivorcees. Less is known about childbearing within new partre issolution of cohabiting union. Most of the previous research on childbearing after union dissolu- tepfamilies) is based on data from the United States. While there are some studies on continuing childbearing after union on European countries, only a few of them aim at cross-nation sing comparative data and methods.
	Objective of the study
•	earch questions: What is the role of partnership context on fertility decisions a eparation? Does the union status at first birth and the one of a subsequent u ontinuing childbearing? Do people cohabiting at first birth differ in their continuing chi nion dissolution from their counterparts married at first birth? Do currently married people differ in their fertility decisions a eparation from their currently cohabiting counterparts?
Fig	e 1. Conceptual framework.
	Partnership context at first birth A new union (Re-partnering)   Married at first birth Currently married   Married having first birth in premarital cohabitation Currently cohabit   Cohabiting at first birth Single (No union)   First birth Union dissolution   Divorce Separation
Autł	illustration.
	Data – Harmonized Histories
	que and powerful cross-national data set containing cleaned an ership and fertility histories collected from individuals within var

surveys: the British Household Panel Survey, the Dutch Fertility and Family Survey, the Swiss Household Panel Survey, the Polish Employment, Family and Education Survey, the Spanish Fertility Survey, and the Generations and Gender Surveys in Belgium, France, Germany, Austria, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, and Russia

It enables a broad cross-national comparison of numerous family demographic processes, such as marriage, cohabitation, childbearing and union dissolution.

### rparts in their les, individuals show different

# ution:

of re-partnered ership after a

tion (mainly in

ion dissolution al comparison

fter divorce or nion matter for ildbearing after fter divorce or

## d standardised rious European

# Sample, variables and method

#### Table 1. Description of the data set. Partnership context at first birth and at birth after union dissolution.

Country in Harmonized	Number of Partnership women withfirst birth			Union dissolution (separation or	-partnering	Child after	Partnership context at birth after union dissolution (in%)			. Excluded from the
Histories	first birth within a union	in cohabitation	in marriage	divorce) before age 50 (*)	Re-part	union dissolution	Being single	in cohabitation	in marriage	analyses because of
Austria	1,035	31.7	68.4	22.7	51.4	23.7	21.3	45.1	33.6	Small and young sample
Belgium	1,561	8.9	91.1	20.1	59.4	19.7	23.2	47.5	29.3	Small sample
Bulgaria	4,087	6.1	93.9	8.6	34.3	22.2	19.4	27.8	52.8	Less union dissolutions
Estonia	3,241	14.1	85.9	30.9	65.4	37.5	15.3	37.3	47.5	INCLUDED
France	3,139	17.6	82.4	16.2	<b>56.0</b>	24.7	28.6	45.4	26.0	INCLUDED
Hungary	4,352	3.2	96.8	20.2	55.5	26.9	23.0	17.1	60.0	INCLUDED
NDL	2,626	9.1	90.9	15.2	47.2	16.8	43.4	13.3	43.3	Less union dissolutions
Norway	3,794	27.8	72.2	27.3	<b>55.2</b>	25.2	26.6	45.1	28.3	INCLUDED
Poland	1,195	5.2	94.8	8.7	26.9	34.6	52.8	33.3	13.9	Small and young sample
Romania	4,048	5.4	94.6	10.0	40.6	20.9	19.2	27.4	53.4	Less union dissolutions
Russia	4,383	9.2	90.8	30.6	48.9	25.3	13.3	25.9	60.8	INCLUDED
Spain	4,538	4.9	95.2	6.9	36.6	15.8	36.2	36.6	27.1	Less union dissolutions
UK	2,436	9.2	90.8	20.0	62.6	25.6	29.1	26.8	44.1	INCLUDED

Note: (\*) Union dissolution of women who had a first birth within partnership; percentage whose unions dissolved. Weights were applied if available. Sources: Harmonized Histories, author's calculations.

#### Sample selection:

- Women who had a first birth within partnership (marriage, cohabitation) and experienced union dissolution (divorce or separation) before age 50.
- Women age 15 to 50 years born before 1975.

#### Main covariates:

• Time after union dissolution, Union status at first child, Current union status, Women's age at union dissolution, Age of the youngest child at union dissolution, Number of children at union dissolution and Women's education.

#### **Dependent variable:** Birth of a child after union dissolution.

- Start of the process: 9 month after union dissolution.
- End of the process: birth of a child after union dissolution or censoring (if no birth within 15 years after union dissolution, age 50 or interview).

**Method:** Discrete time hazard model:  $log\left(\frac{P_{it}}{1-P_{it}}\right) = \propto_t + \beta_1 x_{it1} + \dots + \beta_k x_{itk}$ 

# **Results (1)**

#### Table 2. Relative risks (odds ratios) of having a child after union dissolution. Main effect.

	France	UK	Norway	Russia	Estonia	
Union status at first birth						
Married at first birth	1	1	1	1	1	
Cohabiting at first birth and afterwards	<mark>2.366***</mark> (-0.53)	1.140 (0.27)	1.075 (0.17)	0.717 (0.18)	0.962 (0.18)	
Cohabiting at first birth and subsequently married	1.285 (-0.53)	1.842 (0.76)	1.495 (0.35)	0.938 (0.33)	1.284 (0.36)	
Current union status						
Currently single	<mark>0.071***</mark> (-0.02)	<mark>0.115***</mark> (0.03)	0.065*** (0.01)	<mark>0.020</mark> *** (0.00)	<mark>0.046***</mark> (0.01)	
Currently married	1	1	1	1	1	
Currently cohabiting	0.511** (-0.13)	<mark>0.514**</mark> (0.11)	<mark>0.465***</mark> (0.08)	<mark>0.372***</mark> (0.06)	<mark>0.480***</mark> (0.07)	
Person-months	45260	50799	76989	94298	67782	
Number of women	553	585	940 218	1039	789	
Number of events	108	139	218	226	259	

# Southampton



Sources: Harmonized Histories, own alculations.

Interaction e	ffect.								
	France	UK	Norway	Russia	Estonia	Hungary			
Interaction between union	on between union status at first birth and current union status							Partnership context	
Currently single	<mark>0.182***</mark> (-0.05)	<mark>0.260***</mark> (-0.06)	<mark>0.166</mark> *** (-0.04)	<mark>0.051***</mark> (-0.01)	<mark>0.094***</mark> (-0.02)	<mark>0.209***</mark> (-0.06)		matters for the risk of continuing childbearing after union dissolution.	
Cohabiting at first birth and afterwards – Currently cohabiting	1.746 (-0.58)	1.913 (-0.68)	1.291 (-0.29)	0.668 (-0.29)	0.835 (-0.21)	1.637 (-0.84)			
Cohabiting at first birth and afterwards – Currently married	<mark>6.253***</mark> (-2.54)	2.080 (-0.83)	2.973*** (-0.84)	<mark>2.207*</mark> (-0.76)	<mark>2.548**</mark> (-0.80)	<mark>4.107*</mark> (-2.64)		Being currently married matters the most for the risk of continuing	
Married at first birth – Currently married	1.596 (-0.48)	<mark>2.320**</mark> (-0.59)	2.448*** (-0.52)	2.630*** (-0.43)	1.950*** (-0.31)	<b>2.671***</b> (-0.67)		childbearing after union dissolution.	
Married at first birth – Currently cohabiting	1	1	1	1	1	1			
Cohabiting at first birth and subsequently married – Currently cohabiting	1.770 (-0.81)	a.	<mark>1.884</mark> * (-0.55)	0.860 (-0.45)	1.328 (-0.52)	a.		In most cases, transition from cohabitation to marriage after first birth	
Cohabiting at first birth and subsequently married – Currently married	2.283 (-2.39)	a.	1.178 (-0.87)	2.561 (-1.37)	<mark>3.053*</mark> (-1.34)	a.		does not matter for the risk of continuing childbearing after union dissolution.	
Person-months Number of women Number of events	45260 553 108	50799 585 139	76989 940 218	94298 1039 226	67782 789 259	53665 615 150			

Controlled for: Time after union dissolution, Age at union dissolution, Age of the youngest child at union dissolution, Number of children at union dissolution and Women's education; Standard errors in parentheses; Significance level: \*\*\* p<0.001, \*\* p<0.01,\* p<0.05 Note: a. For the UK and Hungary, the categories "Cohabit at first birth and subsequently married – Currently married" and "Cohabit at first birth and subsequently married – Currently cohabit" are assigned to the categories "Married at first birth – Currently married" and "Married at first birth – Currently cohabit", respectively, due to a small number of observations. Sources: Harmonized Histories, author's calculations.

# for continuing childbearing:

- Subsequent union status has a much stronger impact on fertility after union dissolution than the partnership context at first birth.
- Generally, women married and cohabiting at first birth do not differ in their childbearing after union dissolution.
- Currently cohabiting women have a significantly lower risk of continuing their childbearing after union dissolution than their currently married counterparts.
- Marriage to the next partner is important for continuing childbearing, even or especially for women who had their first birth in cohabitation that did not transition into marriage.
- union dissolution for those who are currently cohabiting.

The author has a European Research Council funded studentship for the project "Non-marital childbearing in comparative perspective: trends, explanations, and life-course trajectories". The study presented here is a part of author's doctoral dissertation investigating 'Changing family life-courses: Re-partnering and continuing childbearing in new partnerships across Europe' under the supervision of Dr Brienna Perelli-Harris and Dr Ann Berrington at the University of Southampton, UK.



Contact E-mail: pbg1e11@soton.ac.uk

# **Results (2)**

## Table 3. Relative risks (odds ratios) of having a child after union dissolution.

# Conclusions

In all studied European countries we found similar patterns of partnership context

Partnership context at first birth does not matter for continuing childbearing after

# Acknowledgments