

# Appendix

**Table A.1** Short description of the surveys mentioned throughout the study

---

*Employment, Family and Education Survey* is a Polish retrospective survey conducted in October and November 2006 on a representative sample of 3,000 women born in 1966–1981 and their partners. The survey was prepared at the Institute of Statistics and Demography (Warsaw School of Economics) under the project ‘Cultural and structural conditions of female labour force participation in Poland’ financed by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education and coordinated by Professor Irena E. Kotowska. Instead of the traditional method of collecting retrospective data, a life history calendar method was applied. The dataset contains respondents’ education, employment, partnership, fertility, and migration histories from the age of 15, recorded on a monthly basis.

*European Labour Force Survey (ELFS)* is conducted in the 27 EU member states, Norway and Switzerland. It is a large household survey providing quarterly data on labour force participation of people aged 15+. Persons carrying out obligatory military service are not covered. In each quarter the interviews are spread uniformly over all weeks. The institutions responsible for running the survey are the national statistical institutes. The survey started in 1983 in the Western European countries. The new EU member states joined the ELFS at the beginning of the 1990s, but the data for these countries is available in the ELFS harmonized micro-files since 1997.

*European Social Survey (ESS)* is designed to illustrate and explain ‘the interaction between Europe’s changing institutions and the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviour patterns of its diverse populations’. The survey aims also at developing a set of attitudinal social indicators that can be considered alongside existing economic and behavioural indicators. So far four rounds of the ESS were conducted, in 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008. In the present study, we used data stemming from the third round. It covers 23 countries: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Sweden, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, Ukraine, and United Kingdom. The data are freely available online through the ESS website: <http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/>.

*European Values Study (EVS)* is a cross-national survey that provides insight into the ‘ideas, beliefs, preferences, attitudes, values, and opinions of citizens all over Europe’. It was initiated in 1981. Every nine years, the survey is repeated in an increasing number of countries. The fourth wave in 2008 covers 47 European countries. <http://www.europeanvaluesstudy.eu>

---

**Table A.1** (continued)

---

*International Population Policy Acceptance Study (IPPAS)* was conducted in 14 European countries in the years 2000–2003 under the DIALOG project ‘Population Policy Acceptance Study – The Viewpoint of Citizens and Policy Actors Regarding the Management of Population Related Change,’ funded by the European Commission. The project was coordinated by the Federal Institute for Population Research in Wiesbaden, Germany. The database covers Austria, Belgium(Flanders), Cyprus, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Hungary, Finland, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, and Slovenia.

*International Social Survey Programme (ISSP)* is an annual programme of cross-national collaboration on surveys covering such topics as role of government, social networks, social inequality, religion, environment, citizenship, national identity, gender roles, etc. Currently the programme covers 43 nations. Opinions on gender roles were investigated in three waves of the ISSP: in 1988, 1994, and 2002. The 1988 ISSP wave covered Austria, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, the United States of America, and West Germany. In 1994, the country coverage was extended to Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, East Germany, Ireland, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the United States of America. The 2002 ISSP wave covered Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Belgium(Flanders), France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Norway, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, United States of America. The data are freely available online through the Zentralarchiv für Empirische Sozialforschung in Cologne via the website: [http://www.gesis.org/en/data\\_service/issp/index.htm](http://www.gesis.org/en/data_service/issp/index.htm).

*Reconciliation of family and work* was conducted in 2005 EU member states, Norway and Switzerland under the recommendation of Eurostat. The survey was carried out as a module of the European Labour Force Survey and covered persons aged 15–64. The Polish sample covered 37,849 individuals. The objectives of the survey were as follows: (1) to establish whether people participate in the labour force to the extent they wish to do and how this is related to their family responsibilities, (2) to collect information on the degree of flexibility at the workplace, (3) to assess the parental leave take-up rates as well as the frequency of absence from work due to care duties.

*Reconciling work, family and education* is a Polish survey designed to extend the standard ‘Reconciliation of family and work’ questionnaire. It was conducted in 2005 on the LFS sub-sample of individuals aged 18–64 ( $N = 5,564$ ). The survey questionnaire was developed within the project ‘Economic activity, education and family duties’ financed by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and carried out at the Gdansk Institute of Market Economies, Institute of Statistics and Demography (Warsaw School of Economics) and Warsaw University.

---

**Table A.2** Effects of motherhood on women's employment, EMPRs of women aged 25–40 by the number of children

	No children below age 15	One child	Two children	Three children	Effect of one child	Effect of two children	Effect of three children
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)–(2)	(1)–(3)	(1)–(4)
<b>2004</b>							
<b>CEE</b>							
<b>Low-LFP</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<b>61.4</b>	<b>60.4</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>20.5</b>	<b>52.1</b>
Hungary	80.9	61.4	60.4	28.8	19.5	20.5	52.1
<b>Medium-LFP</b>	<b>77.6</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>12.6</b>	<b>28.4</b>
Czech Republic	84.3	60.1	62.2	46	24.1	22.1	38.3
Estonia	77.8	78.3	60.9	51.3	–0.5	16.9	26.5
Poland	70.2	64.8	61.8	52.5	5.4	8.5	17.7
Latvia	78	75.3	74.4	53	2.7	3.6	25
Slovakia	77.8	64.5	65.8	43.5	13.3	12	34.3
<b>High-LFP</b>	<b>77.9</b>	<b>81.0</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<b>–3.1</b>	<b>–5.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>
Lithuania	74.8	75	78.6	67.9	–0.2	–3.8	6.9
Slovenia	80.9	86.9	88.3	81.4	–6	–7.3	–0.4
<b>Western Europe</b>							
<b>Low-LFP</b>	<b>76.2</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>24.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>
Greece	71.1	57.8	53.2	49	13.3	17.8	22
Ireland	88.7	70	57.2	42.6	18.7	31.5	46.1
Italy	70.4	60.3	47.4	33.3	10	23	37.1
Spain	74.6	60.5	51.1	39.9	14.1	23.5	34.7
<b>Medium-LFP</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>51.1</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>30.3</b>
Belgium	81.3	74.5	76.6	48.8	6.8	4.7	32.5
France	79.2	75	68.2	48.3	4.1	11	30.8
Portugal	80.4	81.1	74.7	62.9	–0.7	5.7	17.5
Austria	83.7	80.6	71.8	54.1	3.1	11.8	29.6
Germany	82.2	69.2	61	41.2	13.1	21.2	41
<b>High-LFP</b>	<b>84.5</b>	<b>76.1</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>61.6</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>22.9</b>
Denmark	80.6	79.7	83.3	65.6	1	–2.7	15.1
Finland	85.2	71.2	72.3	62.3	14	12.9	22.9
Netherlands	87.6	77.5	71.7	57	10.1	15.9	30.7
Sweden	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
<b>1985</b>							
<b>CEE</b>	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
<b>Western Europe</b>							
<b>Low-LFP</b>	<b>65.4</b>	<b>45.4</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>33.8</b>	<b>39.9</b>
Greece	63.7	46.3	39.7	38.4	17.3	24	25.2
Ireland	76.4	38.2	20.7	13.5	38.2	55.7	62.9
Italy	64.4	53.8	37.9	27.6	10.6	26.5	36.8
Spain	56.9	43.1	27.9	22.4	13.8	28.9	34.5
<b>Medium-LFP</b>	<b>75.2</b>	<b>60.2</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>15.1</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>40.4</b>
Belgium	73.4	64.2	54.6	34.2	9.2	18.7	39.2
France	79.9	74.5	62.8	34.5	5.5	17.1	45.4
Portugal	71.3	68.5	60.2	49.4	2.8	11.1	21.9
Austria	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

**Table A.2** (continued)

	No children below age 15	One child	Two children	Three children	Effect of one child	Effect of two children	Effect of three children
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)–(2)	(1)–(3)	(1)–(4)
Germany	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Netherlands	76.3	33.5	29.8	21.2	42.8	46.5	55.2
<b>High-LFP</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>10.3</b>
Denmark	80.2	78.5	81.4	69.8	1.7	-1.2	10.3
Finland	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
Sweden	na	na	na	na	na	na	na

Source: Author's calculations on European Labour Force Survey

**Table A.3** Effects of motherhood on women's employment, EMPRs of women aged 25–40 by age of the youngest child

	No children	Youngest child 0–5	Youngest child 5–10	Impact of children aged 0–5	Impact of children aged 5–10
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)–(2)	(1)–(3)
<b>2004</b>					
<b>CEE</b>					
<b>low-LFP</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>9.3</b>
Hungary	80.7	28.2	71.4	52.5	9.3
<b>medium-LFP</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>43.6</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Czech Republic	85.1	26.8	79.4	58.2	5.7
Estonia	79	45.8	77.8	33.2	1.2
Latvia	80	57.1	78	22.8	1.9
Poland	70.5	51	64.2	19.5	6.3
Slovakia	78.5	37.2	71.9	41.4	6.7
<b>high-LFP</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>-4.1</b>
Lithuania	77.3	71.1	80	6.2	-2.7
Slovenia	81.6	85.6	86.9	-4.1	-5.4
<b>Western Europe</b>					
<b>low-LFP</b>	<b>75.7</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>55.9</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>19.8</b>
Greece	70.3	50.9	56.4	19.4	13.8
Ireland	88.3	54	60.1	34.3	28.2
Italy	69.9	52.9	51.1	17.1	18.8
Spain	74.2	52.1	56.1	22.1	18.2
<b>medium-LFP</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>6.4</b>
Belgium	78.8	66.3	75.4	12.5	3.4
France	79.1	60.8	76.5	18.3	2.6
Portugal	80.4	77.5	77	2.9	3.5
Austria	83.6	64.9	77.2	18.7	6.4
Germany	82	53.1	65.8	28.9	16.1
<b>high-LFP</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>na</b>
Denmark	80.5	75.4	80.8	5.1	-0.3

**Table A.3** (continued)

	No children	Youngest child 0–5	Youngest child 5–10	Impact of children aged 0–5	Impact of children aged 5–10
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(1)–(2)	(1)–(3)
Finland	85.7	59.4	83	26.3	2.6
Netherlands	87.1	71.2	72	16	15.2
Sweden	77.4	77.1	na	0.3	na
<b>1985</b>					
CEE	na	na	na	na	na
<b>Western Europe</b>					
<b>low-LFP</b>	<b>63.8</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>31.2</b>	<b>31.7</b>
Greece	61.1	39	40.1	22.1	21
Ireland	74.9	19.5	17.8	55.3	57.1
Italy	63.5	41.4	40.8	22.1	22.7
Spain	55.7	30.4	29.6	25.3	26
<b>medium-LFP</b>	<b>72.9</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>52.2</b>	<b>25.6</b>	<b>20.7</b>
Belgium	69.4	55	52.1	14.4	17.3
France	79	52.9	63.3	26.1	15.7
Portugal	69.1	58.7	64	10.4	5.1
Austria	na	na	na	na	na
Germany	na	na	na	na	na
Netherlands	74.2	22.7	29.5	51.5	44.6
<b>high-LFP</b>	<b>84.8</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>na</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>na</b>
Denmark	80.4	75.3	80.3	5.1	0.1
Finland	na	na	na	na	na
Sweden	89.4	83	na	6.4	na

Note: For Sweden, the age categories of children are different: 0–6 years and no child younger than 16, the data refer to women aged 25–44

Source: Author's calculations based on the European Labour Force Survey and for Sweden on the LFS aggregate data obtained from Statistics Sweden

**Table A.4** Papers used in the meta-analysis*Employment entry*

- Bernardi, F. (2001). The employment behaviour of married women in Italy. In H.-P. Blossfeld & S. Drobnič (Eds.), *Careers of couples in contemporary societies* (pp. 121–145). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blossfeld, H.-P., Drobnič, S., & Rohwer, G. (2001). Spouses' employment careers in (West) Germany. In H.-P. Blossfeld & S. Drobnič (Eds.), *Careers of couples in contemporary societies* (pp. 53–76). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buchholz, S., & Grunow, D. (2006). Women's employment in West Germany. In H.-P. Blossfeld & H. Hofmeister (Eds.), *Globalisation, uncertainty and women's careers: An international comparison* (pp. 61–83). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- De Graaf, P., & Vermeulen, E. (1997). Female labour market participation in the Netherlands: Developments in the relationship between family cycle and employment. In H.-P. Blossfeld & C. Hakim (Eds.), *Between equalization and marginalization: Women working part-time in Europe and the United States of America* (pp. 191–209). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Table A.4** (continued)

- 
- Drobnič, S. (2000). The effects of children on married and lone mothers' employment in the United States and (West) Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 16(2), 137–157.
- Drobnič, S., Blossfeld, H.-P., & Rohwer, G. (1999). Dynamics of women's employment patterns over the family life course: A comparison of the United States and Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(1), 133–146.
- Giannelli, G. C. (1996). Women's transitions in the labour market: A competing risks analysis on German panel data. *Journal of Population Economics*, 9(3), 287–300.
- Grimm, M., & Bonneuil, N. (2001). Labour market participation of French women over the life cycle, 1935–1990. *European Journal of Population*, 17(3), 235–260.
- Grunow, D., & Leth-Sørensen, S. (2006). Danish women's unemployment, job mobility and non-employment, 1980s and 1990s: Marked by globalization? In H.-P. Blossfeld & H. Hofmeister (Eds.), *Globalisation, uncertainty and women's careers: An international comparison* (pp. 142–170). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Grunow, D., Hofmeister, H., & Buchholz, S. (2006). Late 20th century persistence and decline of the female homemaker in Germany and the United States. *International Sociology*, 21(1), 101–132.
- Hendrickx, J., Bernasco, W., & de Graaf, P. M. (2001). Couples' labour market participation in the Netherlands. In H.-P. Blossfeld & S. Drobnič (Eds.), *Careers of couples in contemporary societies* (pp. 77–98). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hunt, J. (2004). Convergence determinants of non-employment durations in Eastern and Western Germany. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17, 249–266.
- Kalmijn, M., & Luijckx, R. (2006). Changes in women's employment and occupational mobility in the Netherlands: 1995 to 2000. In H.-P. Blossfeld, & H. Hofmeister (Eds.), *Globalisation, uncertainty and women's careers: An international comparison* (pp. 84–114). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Leth-Sørensen, S., & Rohwer, G. (2001). Work careers of married women in Denmark. In H.-P. Blossfeld & S. Drobnič (Eds.), *Careers of couples in contemporary societies* (pp. 261–279). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCulloch, A., & Dex, S. (2001). Married women's employment patterns in Britain. In H.-P. Blossfeld, & S. Drobnič (Eds.), *Careers of couples in contemporary societies* (pp. 175–200). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ollikainen, V. (2006). Gender differences in transitions from unemployment: Micro evidence from Finland. *Labour*, 20(1), 159–198.
- Transition to childbirth*
- Aassve, A., Burgess, S., Propper, C., & Dickson, M. (2006). Employment, family union and childbearing decisions in Great Britain. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 169(4), 781–804.
- Baizán, P., Aassve, A., & Billari, F. C. (2003). Cohabitation, marriage, and first birth: The interrelationship of family formation events in Spain. *European Journal of Population*, 19, 147–169.
- Baizán, P., Aassve, A., & Billari, F. C. (2004). The interrelations between cohabitation, marriage and first birth in Germany and Sweden. *Population and Environment*, 25(6), 531–561.
- Berinde, D. (1999). Pathways to a third child in Sweden. *European Journal of Population*, 15, 349–378.
- Bernardi, F., & Nanio, T. (2005). Globalization and the transition to adulthood in Italy. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 349–374). London: Routledge.
- Bygren, M., Duvander, A.-Z., & Hultin, M. (2005). Elements of uncertainty in life courses: Transitions to adulthood in Sweden. In H. P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 135–158). London: Routledge.
-

Table A.4 (continued)

- 
- Corijn, M. (2001). Transition to adulthood in Flanders (Belgium). In M. Corjin & E. Klijzing (Eds.), *Transition to adulthood in Europe* (pp. 103–130). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- De La Rica, S., & Iza, M. (2005). Career planning in Spain: Do fixed-term contracts delay marriage and parenthood? *Review of the Economics of the Households*, 3, 49–73.
- Francesconi, M., & Golsch, K. (2005). The process of globalization and transition to adulthood. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 249–276). London: Routledge.
- Garcia, T. M. (2006). *Women's education and fertility in Spain: The impact of educational attainment and the educational choice on first, second and third births*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales, 56.
- Kantorová, V. (2004). *Family life transitions of young women in a changing society: First union formation and birth of first child in the Czech Republic, 1970–1997*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Charles University Prague.
- Kravdal, Ø. (1992). The emergence of a positive relation between education and third birth rates in Norway with supportive evidence from the United States. *Population Studies*, 46, 459–475.
- Kravdal, Ø. (1994). The importance of economic activity, economic potential and economic resources for the timing of first births in Norway. *Population Studies*, 48, 249–267.
- Kreyenfeld, M. (2001). *Employment and fertility: East Germany in the 1990s*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rostock, Germany.
- Kreyenfeld, M. (2004). Fertility decisions in the FRG and GDR: An analysis with data from the German Fertility and Family Survey. *Demographic Research*, Special Collection 3, 275–318.
- Kurz, K., Steinhage, N., & Golsch, K. (2005). Case study Germany: Global competition, uncertainty and the transition to adulthood. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 51–82). London: Routledge.
- Liefbroer, A. C. (2005). Transition from youth to adulthood in The Netherlands. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 83–104). London: Routledge.
- Liefbroer, A. C., & Corijn, M. (1999). Who, what, where, and when? Specifying the impact of educational attainment and labour force participation on family formation. *European Journal of Population*, 15, 45–75.
- Meron, M., Widmer, I., & Shapiro, D. (2002). Unemployment leads women to postpone the birth of their first child. *Population*, 57(2), 301–330.
- Olah, L. Sz. (2003). Gendering fertility: Second births in Sweden and Hungary. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22, 171–200.
- Pinnelli, A., & Di Giulio, P. (2003). Genere e determinanti della fecondità nei Paesi sviluppati. In A. Pinnelli, F. Racioppi, & R. Rettaroli (Eds.), *Genere e demografia* (pp. 281–310). Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Róbert, P., & Bukodi, E. (2005). The effects of the globalization process on the transition to adulthood in Hungary. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 176–214). London: Routledge.
- Santow, G., & Bracher, M. (2001). Deferment of the first birth and fluctuating fertility in Sweden. *European Journal of Population*, 17, 343–363.
- Simó Noguera, C., Martin, T. C., & Soro Bonmati, A. (2005). The Spanish case: The effects of the globalization process on the transition to adulthood. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 375–402). London: Routledge.
- Vikat, A. (2004). Women's labor force attachment and childbearing in Finland. *Demographic Research*, Special Collection 3, 175–212.
-

**Table A.5** Effect of women's employment on fertility: meta-regression estimates after random exclusion of 10% of the sample, sensitivity analysis

Variable name	Variable categories	M2
Country	Norway	0.43 (0.31)
	Sweden	0.30* (0.17)
	Finland	1.12*** (0.28)
	Netherlands	0.38 (0.37)
	France	0.13 (0.18)
	Belgium	0.93** (0.40)
	United Kingdom	0.45 (0.65)
	Germany	0.61** (0.27)
	Spain	-0.37** (0.16)
	Italy	ref.
	post-socialist Hungary	2.70*** (0.73)
	post-socialist Czech Republic	0.64* (0.38)
Birth cohort	>=1960	-0.58*** (0.17)
	<1960	ref.
Method	Continuous time	0.66* (0.37)
	Discrete	ref.
Parity progression	Parity one	-0.01 (0.12)
	Parity two	<i>dropped</i>
	Parity three	-0.06 (0.16)
	All parities	ref.
Constant		0.27 (0.46)
adj- $R^2$		0.718
Number of studies		61

*Note:* \*\*\* <0.01, \*\* <0.05, \* <0.1. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. The results are standardized for the construction of the variable describing the effect of employment on childbearing and the sample selected

*Source:* Author's calculations

**Table A.6** Effect of young children on women's employment entry: meta-regression estimates after random exclusion of 10% of the sample, sensitivity analysis

Variable name	Variable categories	M2
Country	Denmark	2.49*** (0.74)
	Finland	1.51* (0.73)
	France	0.77* (0.40)
	The Netherlands	1.70** (0.75)
	The United Kingdom	0.40 (0.40)
	Germany	ref.
	Italy	-0.06 (7.53)
	Type of transition	From unemployment
from inactivity		0.58*** (0.20)
from non-employment to full-time job		ref. -0.19 (0.25)
to part-time job		0.48** (0.22)
to any job		ref.
Birth cohort	>=1960	-1.27** (0.51)
	<1960	ref.
Method	Continuous	1.36** (0.64)
	discrete	ref.
Constant		-1.19** (0.51)
adj- $R^2$		0.954
Number of studies		33

Note: \*\*\* <0.01, \*\* <0.05, \* <0.1. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. The results are standardized for the construction of the variable describing the effect of children on mothers' employment entry

Source: Author's calculations

**Table A.7** Parameter estimates for first conception hazard, Poland, cohorts 1971–1981

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
Intercept	-5.56 (0.20)	***	-5.65 (0.21)	***	-5.69 (0.21)	***
<i>Time since age 15</i>						
15–20 years (slope)	0.54 (0.05)	***	0.55 (0.05)	***	0.57 (0.05)	***
20–24 years (slope)	0.14 (0.03)	***	0.16 (0.03)	***	0.18 (0.03)	***
24–28 years (slope)	0.03 (0.04)		0.06 (0.04)		0.07 (0.04)	
28–32 years (slope)	-0.06 (0.06)		-0.04 (0.07)		-0.04 (0.07)	
32–35 years (slope)	-0.31 (0.21)		-0.30 (0.21)		-0.30 (0.21)	
<i>Time since 1986</i>						
Slope	-0.03 (0.01)	***	-0.04 (0.01)	***	-0.04 (0.01)	***
<i>Time since leaving education</i>						
<i>Tertiary-level education</i>						
Shift for leaving education	0.26 (0.17)		0.23 (0.17)		0.29 (0.17)	*
0–4 years (slope)	0.13 (0.07)	**	0.13 (0.07)	**	0.14 (0.07)	**
>4 years (slope)	0.01 (0.09)		0.01 (0.09)		0.02 (0.09)	
<i>Secondary-level education</i>						
Shift for leaving education	1.09 (0.12)	***	1.09 (0.12)	***	1.12 (0.12)	***
0–3 years (slope)	-0.10 (0.05)	*	-0.10 (0.06)	*	-0.08 (0.06)	
>3 years (slope)	-0.05 (0.03)		-0.05 (0.03)		-0.05 (0.03)	
<i>Vocational education</i>						
Shift for leaving education	1.57 (0.17)	***	1.56 (0.17)	***	1.59 (0.17)	***
0–2 years (slope)	-0.13 (0.10)		-0.11 (0.10)		-0.10 (0.10)	
>2 years (slope)	-0.12 (0.03)	***	-0.11 (0.03)	***	-0.11 (0.03)	***

**Table A.7** (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
<i>Primary education</i>						
Shift for leaving education	1.62 (0.49)	***	1.59 (0.50)	***	1.56 (0.50)	***
0–2 years (slope)	0.07 (0.27)		0.11 (0.27)		0.14 (0.28)	
>2 years (slope)	-0.17 (0.04)	***	-0.17 (0.04)	***	-0.17 (0.04)	***
<i>Employed (ref=no)</i>						
Yes	0.10 (0.06)	*	0.09 (0.06)		-0.08 (0.07)	
<i>Place of residence (ref=rural)</i>						
Urban	-0.02 (0.05)		-0.02 (0.06)		-0.02 (0.06)	
<i>Mother’s education (ref=high)</i>						
Low	0.12 (0.07)	*	0.14 (0.08)	*	0.15 (0.08)	*
<i>Father’s education (ref=high)</i>						
Low	0.19 (0.08)	**	0.21 (0.08)	**	0.21 (0.08)	***

Note: Significance: \*=0.1; \*\*=0.05; \*\*\*=0.01

Source: Author’s calculations on Employment, Family and Education Survey (2006)

**Table A.8** Parameter estimates for second or higher-order conception hazard, Poland, cohorts 1971–1981

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
Intercept	-2.31 (0.23)	***	-2.44 (0.25)	***	-2.40 (0.25)	***
<i>Age of youngest child</i>						
0–1 years (slope)	1.67 (0.19)	***	1.72 (0.20)	***	1.70 (0.20)	***
1–3 years (slope)	-0.03 (0.05)		0.001 (0.05)		0.02 (0.05)	
>3 years (slope)	-0.12 (0.02)	***	-0.10 (0.02)	***	-0.09 (0.02)	***
<i>Time since 1986</i>						
slope	-0.05 (0.01)	***	-0.05 (0.01)	***	-0.06 (0.01)	***
<i>Age at previous birth (ref=20–22)</i>						
15–19	-0.001 (0.08)		-0.04 (0.09)		-0.07 (0.10)	
23–25	-0.20 (0.09)	**	-0.14 (0.10)		-0.12 (0.10)	
25–28	-0.29 (0.10)	***	-0.19 (0.13)		-0.14 (0.13)	
28+	-0.74 (0.16)	***	-0.57 (0.20)	***	-0.49 (0.21)	**
<i>Number of children (ref=one)</i>						
Two	-0.82 (0.08)	***	-0.97 (0.13)	***	-1.02 (0.13)	***
Three or more	-0.42 (0.13)	***	-0.76 (0.25)	***	-0.83 (0.25)	***
<i>Employed (ref=no)</i>						
Yes	0.01 (0.06)		0.01 (0.06)		-0.12 (0.07)	*
<i>Education level (ref=vocational)</i>						
Tertiary	-0.24 (0.14)	*	-0.32 (0.15)	**	-0.28 (0.15)	*
Secondary	-0.12 (0.07)	*	-0.16 (0.08)	*	-0.15 (0.08)	*
Primary	0.12 (0.10)		0.15 (0.11)		0.14 (0.11)	
Still in education	-0.67 (0.17)	***	-0.71 (0.17)	***	-0.74 (0.17)	***

**Table A.8** (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
<i>Place of residence</i> (ref=rural)						
Urban	-0.38 (0.06)	***	-0.41 (0.07)	***	-0.41 (0.07)	***
<i>Mother's education</i> (ref=high)						
Low	0.05 (0.09)		0.08 (0.10)		0.07 (0.10)	
<i>Father's education</i> (ref=high)						
Low	0.08 (0.10)		0.10 (0.10)		0.13 (0.11)	

Note: Significance: \*=0.1; \*\*=0.05; \*\*\*=0.01

Source: Author's calculations on Employment, Family and Education Survey (2006)

**Table A.9** Parameter estimates for hazard of employment entry, Poland, cohorts 1971–1981

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
Intercept	-1.5995 (0.23)	***	-2.50 (0.24)	***	-2.44 (0.24)	***
<i>Time since age 15</i>						
15–20 (slope)	0.3187 (0.03)	***	0.47 (0.03)	***	0.49 (0.03)	***
20–25 (slope)	-0.156 (0.02)	***	0.05 (0.02)	*	0.07 (0.02)	***
25–30 (slope)	-0.0598 (0.02)	***	0.10 (0.03)	***	0.12 (0.03)	***
30–35 (slope)	-0.006 (0.03)		0.07 (0.04)	*	0.07 (0.04)	**
<i>Time since 1986</i>						
<1994 (slope)	-0.1643 (0.03)	***	-0.17 (0.03)	***	-0.17 (0.03)	***
1995–98 (slope)	0.033 (0.02)	*	0.04 (0.02)	**	0.04 (0.02)	**

Table A.9 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endoogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
1999–2003 (slope)	–0.0458 (0.02)	**	–0.07 (0.02)	***	–0.08 (0.02)	***
2004–06 (slope)	0.0367 (0.02)	**	0.05 (0.02)	**	0.04 (0.02)	*
<i>Time since entering non-employment * Order of the non-employment spell</i>						
<i>Second spell</i>						
Shift for entering non-employment	–1.0455 (0.21)	***	–2.18 (0.23)	***	–2.00 (0.23)	***
0–0.5 year (slope)	2.655 (0.4511)	***	3.24 (0.47)	***	3.23 (0.47)	***
>0.5 year (slope)	–0.0233 (0.02)		–0.04 (0.02)	**	–0.04 (0.02)	**
<i>Third or higher-order spell</i>						
Shift for entering non-employment	–0.1413 (0.24)		–1.78 (0.26)	***	–1.45 (0.27)	***
0–0.5 year (slope)	2.3418 (0.52)	***	2.86 (0.53)	***	2.89 (0.53)	***
>0.5 year (slope)	–0.1077 (0.03)	***	–0.12 (0.04)	***	–0.11 (0.04)	***
<i>Number of children (ref =no children)</i>						
One	–0.83 (0.05)	***	–1.19 (0.07)	***	–1.35 (0.07)	***
Two	–0.98 (0.07)	***	–1.61 (0.10)	***	–1.90 (0.11)	***
Three or more	–1.14 (0.13)	***	–1.98 (0.17)	***	–2.41 (0.18)	***
<i>Education level (ref=primary)</i>						
Tertiary	1.65 (0.10)	***	1.82 (0.15)	***	1.70 (0.16)	***
Secondary	0.71 (0.08)	***	0.92 (0.13)	***	0.81 (0.14)	***
Vocational	0.45 (0.08)	***	0.83 (0.13)	***	0.71 (0.14)	***
Still in education	–1.30 (0.09)	***	–1.56 (0.13)	***	–1.68 (0.14)	***

**Table A.9** (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
<i>Work experience</i> (ref=0–3 years)						
3–6 years	0.08 (0.07)		–0.48 (0.10)	***	–0.62 (0.10)	***
>6 years	0.23 (0.10)	**	–0.90 (0.15)	***	–1.09 (0.15)	***
<i>Place of residence</i> (ref=rural)						
Urban	0.19 (0.04)	***	0.23 (0.06)	***	0.21 (0.07)	***
<i>Mother's education</i> (ref=high)						
Low	–0.06 (0.05)		0.03 (0.09)		0.03 (0.09)	
<i>Father's education</i> (ref=high)						
Low	0.11 (0.05)	**	0.23 (0.09)	**	0.25 (0.09)	**

Note: significance: \*=0.1; \*\*=0.05; \*\*\*=0.01

Source: Author's calculations on Employment, Family and Education Survey (2006)

**Table A.10** Parameter estimates for hazard of employment exit, Poland, cohorts 1971–1981

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
Intercept	–4.68 (0.54)	***	–6.05 (0.64)	***	–5.43 (0.65)	***
<i>Work-experience</i>						
0–0.5 years (slope)	1.85 (0.41)	***	2.72 (0.45)	***	2.61 (0.45)	***
0.5–3 years (slope)	–0.20 (0.04)	***	0.06 (0.05)		0.14 (0.05)	***
>3 years (slope)	–0.03 (0.02)	**	0.07 (0.02)	***	0.14 (0.03)	***

Table A.10 (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
<i>Time since entering employment * Order of the employment spell</i>						
<i>Second spell</i>						
Shift for entering employment	-0.65 (0.26)	**	-1.70 (0.28)	***	-1.38 (0.28)	***
0-0.5 year (slope)	2.26 (0.56)	***	2.75 (0.58)	***	2.68 (0.58)	***
>0.5 year (slope)	-0.06 (0.03)	**	-0.04 (0.03)		-0.04 (0.03)	
<i>Third or higher-order spell</i>						
Shift for entering employment	1.11 (0.19)	***	-0.77 (0.26)	***	-0.24 (0.27)	
0-0.5 year (slope)	-0.84 (0.49)	*	-0.003 (0.51)		-0.08 (0.52)	
>0.5 year (slope)	-0.08 (0.06)		-0.07 (0.06)		-0.078 (0.06)	
<i>Time since age 15</i>						
15-20 (slope)	0.22 (0.07)	***	0.14 (0.08)		0.067 (0.09)	
20-25 (slope)	-0.12 (0.02)	***	-0.16 (0.03)	***	-0.27 (0.03)	***
25-30 (slope)	-0.08 (0.02)	***	-0.15 (0.03)	***	-0.24 (0.03)	***
30-35 (slope)	-0.08 (0.04)	**	-0.16 (0.04)	***	-0.23 (0.04)	***
<i>Time since 1986</i>						
<1994 (slope)	0.16 (0.07)	**	0.20 (0.08)	**	0.22 (0.08)	***
1995-98 (slope)	-0.04 (0.02)	*	-0.02 (0.03)		-0.01 (0.03)	
1999-2003 (slope)	0.04 (0.02)		0.06 (0.03)	**	0.07 (0.03)	**
2004-06 (slope)	0.03 (0.02)		0.05 (0.03)	*	0.06 (0.03)	**

**Table A.10** (continued)

Explanatory variables	Single-process, not controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Single-process, controlling for unobserved heterogeneity		Multi-process (accounting for endogeneity)	
	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.	Coeff. (st.error)	Sig.
<i>Number of children</i> (ref=no children)						
One	1.09 (0.06)	***	1.52 (0.08)	***	1.60 (0.09)	***
Two	0.85 (0.09)	***	1.54 (0.13)	***	1.75 (0.15)	***
Three or more	1.25 (0.14)	***	1.99 (0.21)	***	2.33 (0.24)	***
<i>Education level</i> (ref=primary)						
Tertiary	-0.75 (0.13)	***	-0.90 (0.20)	***	-0.97 (0.21)	***
Secondary	-0.48 (0.10)	***	-0.45 (0.17)	***	-0.56 (0.18)	***
Vocational	-0.26 (0.10)	***	-0.14 (0.17)		-0.31 (0.17)	*
Still in education	-0.45 (0.12)	***	-0.46 (0.18)	**	-0.50 (0.19)	***
<i>Place of residence</i> (ref=rural)						
Urban	-0.08 (0.05)		-0.04 (0.08)		-0.06 (0.08)	
<i>Mother's education</i> (ref=high)						
Low	-0.01 (0.07)		0.05 (0.12)		-0.01 (0.12)	
<i>Father's education</i> (ref=high)						
Low	0.09 (0.07)		0.12 (0.12)		0.04 (0.12)	
<i>Type of employee</i> (ref=employee)						
Helping family member	-1.62 (0.29)	***	-1.92 (0.35)	***	-1.93 (0.35)	***
Self-employed	-0.68 (0.10)	***	-0.76 (0.14)	***	-0.76 (0.13)	***
<i>Type of employment contract</i> (ref=permanent)						
Temporary	0.81 (0.05)	***	1.14 (0.08)	***	1.15 (0.08)	***
<i>Sector</i> (ref=private)						
Public sector	-0.14 (0.06)	**	-0.15 (0.08)	*	-0.15 (0.08)	*

Note: Significance: \*=0.1; \*\*=0.05; \*\*\*=0.01

Source: Author's calculations on Employment, Family and Education Survey (2006)



# References

- Aaberge, R., Colombino, U., Del Boca, D., Ermisch, J., Francesconi, M., Pasqua, S., et al. (2005). Labor supply and fertility in Europe and the U.S. In T. Boeri, D. Del Boca, & C. Pissarides (Eds.), *Women at work: An economic perspective* (pp. 125–153). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aassve, A., Burgess, S., Propper, C., & Dickson, M. (2006). Employment, family union and childbearing decisions in Great Britain. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 169(4), 781–804.
- Abramowitz, M., & Stegun, I. A. (1972). *Handbook of mathematical functions*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Abramowska, A., Balcerzak-Paradowska, B., Kotowska, I. E., Kowalska, I., Muszyńska, M., & Wróblewska, W. (2003). *Polityka ludnościowa – cele, rozwiązania, opinie* (Population Policy – objectives, measures, opinions). Research report prepared based on the Population Policy Acceptance Study. Warsaw: Institute of Statistics and Demography – Warsaw School of Economics.
- Adserà, A. (2004). Changing fertility rates in developed countries: The impact of labor market institutions. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17, 17–43.
- Adserà, A. (2005). Vanishing children: From high unemployment to low fertility in developed countries. *American Economic Review*, 95(2), 189–193.
- Ahn, N., & Mira, P. (2002). A note on the changing relationship between fertility and female employment rates in developed countries. *Journal of Population Economics*, 15, 667–682.
- Algan, Y., & Cahuc, P. (2006). *The roots of low European employment: Family culture?* Paper presented at the European Commission seminar ‘Employment in Europe,’ Occasional Seminars, Brussels, 13 December 2006. [http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/employment\\_analysis/docs/061213\\_algan\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/employment_analysis/docs/061213_algan_en.pdf)
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53(1), 43–58.
- Andersson, G. (1999). Childbearing trends in Sweden. *European Journal of Population*, 15, 1–24.
- Andersson, G. (2000). The impact of labour-force participation on childbearing behaviour: Pro-cyclical fertility in Sweden during the 1980s and the 1990s. *European Journal of Population*, 16, 293–333.
- Andersson, G. (2002). Fertility developments in Norway and Sweden since the early 1960s. *Demographic Research*, 6(4), 67–86.
- Andersson, G., Duvander, A.-Z., & Hank, K. (2004). Do child-care characteristics influence continued childbearing in Sweden? An investigation of the quantity, quality, and price dimension. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 14, 407–418.
- Andersson, G., Hoem, J. M., & Duvander, A.-Z. (2006). Social differentials in speed-premium effects in childbearing in Sweden. *Demographic Research*, 14, 51–70.
- Angrist, J. D., & Evans, W. N. (1998). Children and their parents’ labor supply: Evidence from exogenous variation in family size. *American Economic Review*, 88(3), 450–477.

- Anttonen, A., & Sipilä, J. (1996). European social care services: Is it possible to identify models? *Journal of European Social Policy*, 6(2), 87–100.
- Ariza, A., de la Rica, S., & Ugidos, A. (2005). The effect of flexibility in working hours on fertility: A comparative analysis of selected European countries. *Public Finance and Management*, 5(1), 110–151.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & van Loo, M. F. (1980). Decision-making and fertility: A theory of exchange in the family. In T. K. Burch (Ed.), *Demographic behavior: Interdisciplinary perspectives on decision-making* (pp. 91–124). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & van Loo, M. F. (1991). A purposeful behaviour theory of work and family size decisions. In J. J. Siegers, J. de Jong-Gierveld, & E. van Imhoff (Eds.), *Female labour market behaviour and fertility: A rational-choice approach* (pp. 101–129). Berlin: Springer.
- Baizán, P. (2005). *Couples' careers and fertility: An event history analysis of the ECHP samples of Denmark, Italy, Spain, and United Kingdom*. Paper presented at the 25th IUSSP International Population Conference, Tours, France, 18–23 July 2005.
- Baker M., & Milligan K. (2005). *How does job-protected maternity leave affect mothers' employment and infant health?* (National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, Massachusetts, Working Paper No. 11135).
- Balcerzak-Paradowska, B. (1999). *Polityka rodzinna: Między dwoma modelami* [Family policy: In-between the two models]. Warsaw: Institute of Labour and Social Studies.
- Balcerzak-Paradowska, B., Chłoń-Domińczak, A., Kotowska, I. E., Olejniczuk-Merta, A., Topińska, I., & Wóycicka, I. (2003). The gender dimensions of social security reform in Poland. In E. Fultz, M. Ruck, & S. Steinhilber (Eds.), *The gender dimensions of social security reform in Central and Eastern Europe: Case studies of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland* (pp. 187–313). Budapest: ILO Subregional Office for Central and Eastern Europe.
- Beblo, M., & Wolf, E. (2000). *How much does a year off cost? Estimating the wage effects of employment breaks and part-time periods*. ZEW Discussion Paper No 00-69. Mannheim: Zentrum für Ökonomische Wirtschaftsforschung.
- Beblo, M., & Wolf, E. (2002). *Wage penalties for career interruptions: An empirical analysis for West Germany*. ZEW Discussion Paper No 02-45. Mannheim: Zentrum für Ökonomische Wirtschaftsforschung.
- Becker, G. S. (1965). A theory of the allocation of time. *Economic Journal*, 75, 493–517.
- Becker, G. S. (1993). *A treatise on the family*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Becker, G. S., & Lewis, H. G. (1973). On the interaction between the quantity and quality of children. *The Journal of Political Economy* (Part 2: New Economic Approaches to Fertility) 81, 279–288.
- Berger, L. M., & Waldfogel, J. (2004). Maternity leave and the employment of new mothers in the United States. *Journal of Population Economics*, 17, 331–349.
- Berkowitz King, R. (2005). The case of the American women: Globalization and the transition to adulthood in an individualistic regime. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 305–326). London: Routledge.
- Bernhardt, E. M. (1993). Fertility and employment. *European Sociological Review*, 9(1), 25–42.
- Bettio, F., & Plantega, J. (2004). Comparing care regimes in Europe. *Feminist Economics*, 10, 85–113.
- Biggerstaff, B. J., & Tweedie, R. L. (1997). Incorporating variability in estimates of heterogeneity in the random effects model in meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine*, 16, 753–768.
- Bijak, J., Kupiszewska, D., Kupiszewski, M., Saczuk, K., & Kicinger, A. (2007). Population and labour force projections for 27 European countries, 2002–2052: Impact of international migration on population ageing. *European Journal of Population*, 23, 1–31.
- Billingsley, S. (2010). Downward social mobility and fertility in Russia. *Stockholm Research Reports in Demography*, 2010, 1.
- Blau, D. M., & Robins, P. K. (1989). Fertility, employment, and child-care costs. *Demography*, 26, 287–299.

- Blossfeld, H.-P. (1995). Changes in the process of family formation and women's growing economic independence: A comparison of nine countries. In H.-P. Blossfeld (Ed.), *The new role of women: Family formation in modern societies* (pp. 3–23). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Brandth, B., & Kvande, E. (2009). Gender or gender-neutral care politics for fathers? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 624(1), 177–189.
- Brewster, K. L., & Rindfuss, R. R. (2000). Fertility and women's employment in industrialised nations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 271–296.
- Budig, M. J. (2003). Are women's fertility and employment histories interdependent? An examination of causal order using event history analysis. *Social Science Research*, 32, 376–401.
- Burch, T. K. (1980). Decision-making theories in demography: An introduction. In T. K. Burch (Ed.), *Demographic behaviour: Interdisciplinary perspectives on decision-making* (pp. 1–22). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Carrasco, R. (2001). Binary choice with binary endogenous regressors in panel data: Fertility and female labour force participation. *Journal of Business and Economics Statistics*, 19(4), 385–394.
- Castles, F. G. (2003). The world turned upside down: Below replacement fertility, changing preferences and family-friendly public policy in 21 OECD countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 13(3), 209–229.
- Cochran, W. G. (1954). The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics*, 10, 101–129.
- Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Colombino, U., & Di Tommaso, M. L. (1996). Is the preference for children so low, or is the price of time so high? A simultaneous model of fertility and participation in Italy with cohort effects. *Labour*, 10(3), 475–493.
- Connelly, R. (1992). The effect of child care costs on married women's labor force participation. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 74(1), 89–90.
- Corijn, M. (2001). Transition to adulthood in Flanders (Belgium). In M. Corijn & E. Klijzing (Eds.), *Transition to adulthood in Europe* (pp. 103–130). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Cramer, J. C. (1980). Fertility and female employment: Problems of causal direction. *American Sociological Review*, 45(2), 167–190.
- Crompton, R., & Harris, F. (1998). Explaining women's employment patterns: 'orientations to work' revisited. *British Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 118–136.
- D'Addio, A. C., & M. M.d'Ercole. (2005). *Trends and determinants of fertility rates in OECD countries: The role of policies* (OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Paper No. 27). Paris: OECD.
- Duvander, A.-Z., Lappegard, T., & Andersson, G. (2006). Family policy and fertility: Fathers' and mothers' use of parental leave and continued childbearing in Norway and Sweden. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 20(1), 45–57.
- De Bruijn, B. J. (1999). *Foundations of demographic theory: Choice, process, theory*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- De Laat, J., & A. Sevilla Sanz. (2006). *Working women, men's home time and lowest-low fertility*. ISER Working Paper 2006–23. Essex: Institute for Social and Economic Research.
- Del Boca, D. (2002). The effect of child care and part-time opportunities on participation and fertility decisions in Italy. *Journal of Population Economics*, 15, 549–573.
- Del Boca, D., & Locatelli, M. (2006). *The determinants of motherhood and work status: A survey* (IZA Discussion Paper No. 2414). Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labour.
- Del Boca, D., Pasqua, S., & Pronzato, C. (2005). Fertility and employment in Italy, France and the UK. *Labour*, 19, 51–77.
- Del Boca, D., Pasqua, S., & Pronzato, C. (2009). Motherhood and market work decisions in institutional contexts. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 61, 147–171.
- DerSimonian, R., & Laird, N. (1986). Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*, 7, 177–188.
- Di Tommaso, M. L. (1999). A trivariate model of participation, fertility and wages: The Italian case. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 23, 623–640.

- Drobníč, S. (1997). Part-time work in Central and Eastern European countries. In H.-P. Blossfeld & C. Hakim (Eds.), *Between equalization and marginalization* (pp. 71–89). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duclos, E., Lefebvre, P., & Merrigan, P. (2001). *A natural experiment on the economics of storks: Evidence on the impact of differential family policy on fertility rates in Canada*. Center for Research on Economic Fluctuations and Employment (Working paper No. 136). Université du Québec à Montréal.
- Easterlin, R. (1976). The conflict between aspirations and resources. *Population and Development Review*, 2, 417–425.
- Easterlin, R. A. (1980). Marriage and childbearing. In R. A. Easterlin (Ed.), *Birth and fortune: The impact of numbers on personal welfare* (pp. 37–59). New York: Basic Books.
- Engelhardt, H. (2009). Zum Wandel der Korrelation von Fertilität und Frauenerwerbstätigkeit in Raum und Zeit: Eine empirische Analyse unter Berücksichtigung der Effekte ausgewählter sozialer Indikatoren. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung*, 21(3), 246–263.
- Engelhardt, H., Kögel, T., & Prskawetz, A. (2004). Fertility and women's employment reconsidered: A macro-level time-series analysis for developed countries, 1960–2000. *Population Studies*, 58(1), 109–120.
- Engelhardt, H., & Prskawetz, A. (2004). On the changing correlation between fertility and female employment over space and time. *European Journal of Population*, 20, 35–62.
- Ermisch, J. F. (1979). The relevance of the 'Easterlin hypothesis' and the 'New Home Economics' to fertility movements in Great Britain. *Population Studies*, 33, 39–58.
- Ermisch, J. F. (1988). The econometric analysis of birth rate dynamics in Britain. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 23, 563–576.
- Ermisch, J. F. (1991). Economic models of women's employment and fertility. In J. J. Siegers, J. de Jong-Gierveld, & E. van Imhoff (Eds.), *Female labour market behaviour and fertility: A rational-choice approach* (pp. 175–190). Berlin: Springer.
- Ermisch, J. F. (2003). *An economic analysis of the family*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1999). *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission. (2005). *Confronting demographic change: A new solidarity between the generations*. Brussels: Communication from the Commission COM(2005) 94.
- European Commission. (2006). *The demographic future of Europe – From challenge to opportunity*. Brussels: Green Paper, Commission Communication COM(2006) 571.
- European Commission. (2007). *Europe's demographic future: Facts and figures*. Brussels: Commission Staff Working Document SEC(2007) 638.
- Felmlee, D. (1993). The dynamic interdependence of women's employment and fertility. *Social Science Research*, 22, 333–360.
- Fokkema, T., & Esveldt, I. (2008). *Child-Friendly Policies* (Comparative report on children and child-friendly policies). Wiesbaden: Bundesinstitut für Bevölkerungsforschung.
- Fortin, B., Lacroix, G., & Rolet, S. (2004). Welfare benefits and the duration of welfare spells: evidence from a natural experiment in Canada. *Journal of Public Economics*, 88, 1495–1520.
- Francesconi, M. (2002). A joint dynamic model of fertility and work of married women. *Journal of Labour Economics*, 20(2), 336–380.
- Francesconi, M., & Golsch, K. (2005). The process of globalization and transition to adulthood. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 249–276). London and New York: Routledge.
- Freedman, D., Thornton, A., Camburn, D., Alwin, D., & Young-DeMarco, L. (1988). The life history calendar: A technique for collecting retrospective data. *Sociological Methodology*, 18, 37–68.
- Friedman, M. (1962). *Price theory. A provisional text*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Gauthier, A. H. (1996). *The state and the family: A comparative analysis of family policies in industrialized countries*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Gauthier, A. H. (2007). The impact of family policies on fertility in industrialized countries: a review of the literature. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 26, 323–346.
- Gauthier, A. H., & Hatzius, J. (1997). Family benefits and fertility: An econometric analysis. *Population Studies*, 51, 295–306.
- Goldstein, J., Wolfgang, L., & Testa, M. R. (2003). The emergence of sub-replacement family size ideals in Europe. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22, 479–496.
- Góra, M. (1996). *The labour market in Poland: 1990–1995. Empirical and methodological studies*. Monografie i Opracowania, 421. Warsaw: Warsaw School of Economics Publishing.
- Gornick, J. C., Meyers, M. K., & Ross, K. E. (1997). Supporting the employment of mothers: Policy variations across fourteen welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 7, 45–70.
- Gornick, J. C., & Meyers, M. K. (2003). *Families that work: Policies for reconciling parenthood and employment*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gurgand, M., & Margolis, D. N. (2005). *Does work pay in France? Monetary incentives and the guaranteed minimum income* (IZA (Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn) Discussion Paper No. 1467).
- Gustafsson, S., & Stafford, F. (1992). Child care subsidies and labor supply in Sweden. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 27(Special Issue on Child Care), 204–230.
- Haas, L., & Hwang, P. C. (1999). Parental leave in Sweden. In P. Moss & F. Deven (Eds.), *Parental leave: Progress or pitfall? Research and Policy Issues in Europe* (35). The Hague, The Netherlands, and Brussels: NIDI/CGBS Publications pp. 45–68.
- Hakim, C. (2000). *Work-lifestyle choices in the 21st century: Preference theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hank, K., & Kreyenfeld, M. (2003). A multilevel analysis of child care and women's fertility decisions in Western Germany. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65, 584–596.
- Higgins, J. P. T., & Thompson, S. G. (2004). Controlling the risk of spurious findings from meta-regression. *Statistics in Medicine*, 23, 1663–1682.
- Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., Deeks, J. J., & Altman, D. G. (2002). Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*, 327, 557–560.
- Hoem, B. (2000). Entry into motherhood in Sweden: The influence of economic factors on the rise and fall in fertility, 1986–1997. *Demographic Research*, 2, Article 4.
- Hoem, J. M. (1993). Public policy as the fuel of fertility: Effects of a policy reform on the pace of childbearing in Sweden in the 1980s. *Acta Sociologica*, 36(1), 19–31.
- Hotz, V. J., & Miller, R. A. (1988). An empirical analysis of life cycle fertility and female labor supply. *Econometrica*, 56, 91–118.
- Hoynes, H., & MaCurdy, T. (1994). Has the decline in benefits shortened welfare spells? *The American Economic Review*, 84(Papers and Proceedings of the Hundred and Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association), 43–48.
- Huber, J. (1980). Will U.S. fertility decline towards zero? *Sociological Quarterly*, 21(4), 481–492.
- Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1990). *Culture shift in advanced industrial societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jaumotte, F. (2003). Labour force participation of women: Empirical evidence on the role of policy and other determinants in OECD Countries. *OECD Economic Studies*, 37, 52–108.
- Joesch, J. M. (1994). Children and the timing of women's paid work after childbirth: A further specification of the relationship. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56(2), 429–440.
- Keck, W., Hessel, P., & Saraceno, C. (2009). *Database on intergenerational policy indicators*. Methodological Report. Multilinks Research Report.
- Keiding, N. (1998). Selection effects and non-proportional hazards in survival models and models for repeated events. *Proceedings of the XIX International Biometric Conference, Cape Town, Invited Papers*.
- Kimmel, J. (1995). The effectiveness of child-care subsidies in encouraging the welfare-to-work transition of low-income single mothers. *The American Economic Review*, 85, 271–275.

- Klerman J. A., & Leibowitz, A. (1999). Job continuity among new mothers. *Demography*, 36, 145–155.
- Klijzing, E., Siegers, J., Keilman, N., & Groot, L. (1988). Static versus dynamic analysis of the interaction between female labour force participation and fertility. *European Journal of Population*, 4, 97–116.
- Knapp, G., & Hartung, J. (2003). Improved tests for a random effects meta-regression with a single covariate. *Statistics in Medicine*, 22, 2693–2710.
- Kögel, T. (2004). Did the association between fertility and female employment within OECD countries really change its sign? *Journal of Population Economics*, 17(1), 45–65.
- Konstantopoulos, S. (2006). *Fixed and mixed effects models in meta-analysis* (IZA Discussion Paper No. 2198). Bonn: The Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Korpi, W. (2000). Faces of inequality: Gender, class, and patterns of inequalities in different types of Welfare States. *Social Politics*, 7, 127–191.
- Kotowska, I. E. (1995). Discrimination against women in the labour market in Poland during the transition to a market economy. *Social Politics*, 2(1), 76–90.
- Kotowska, I. E. (1999). Drugie przejście demograficzne i jego uwarunkowania (Second demographic transition and its circumstances). In I. E. Kotowska (Ed.), *Przemiany demograficzne w Polsce w latach 90. w świetle koncepcji drugiego przejścia demograficznego* [Demographic changes in Poland in the framework of the second demographic transition] (pp. 115–138). Warsaw: Warsaw School of Economics Publishing.
- Kotowska, I. E. (2004). Zmiany demograficzne a przyszły rynek pracy [Demographic changes and the future labour market]. In S. Borkowska (Ed.), *Przyszłość rynku pracy w XXI wieku* [Future of the labour market in the 21st century] (pp. 115–138). Warsaw: Institute of Labour and Social Affairs and Central Statistical Office.
- Kotowska, I. E. (2005). Europa wobec przeobrażeń rodziny. Czy potrzebna jest europejska strategia prorodzinna? [Europe towards family changes: Do we need a European family strategy?]. In J. M. Radlo (Ed.), *Polska wobec redefinicji Strategii Lizbońskiej* [Poland towards a redefinition of the Lisbon Strategy] (pp. 223–241). Warsaw and Gdańsk: Green Paper of the Polish Forum for Lisbon Strategy.
- Kotowska, I. E., & Sztanderska, U. (2007). Zmiany demograficzne a zmiany na rynku pracy w Polsce (Population changes and labour market developments in Poland). In I. E. Kotowska, U. Sztanderska, & I. Wóycicka (Eds.), *Aktywność zawodowa i edukacyjna a obowiązki rodzinne w świetle badań empirycznych* (Economic and educational activity versus family obligations) (pp. 13–46). Warsaw: Scholar Publishing.
- Kotowska, I. E., Józwiak, J., Matysiak, A., & Baranowska, A. (2008). Poland: Fertility decline – a response to profound societal change and transformations in the labour market? *Demographic Research*, 19(Article 22), 795–854.
- Kowalska, I., & Wróblewska, W. (2008). Intergenerational changes in the value system in Europe. In C. Höhn, D. Avramov, & I. E. Kotowska (Eds.), *People, population change and policies: Lessons from the population policy acceptance study, Vol. 1: Family change* (pp. 181–202). Berlin: Springer.
- Kravdal, Ø. (2002). The impact of individual and aggregate unemployment on fertility in Norway. *Demographic Research*, 6, 263–294.
- Kreyenfeld, M. (2001). Work/family processes and socioeconomic outcomes. *Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung*, 70, 74–79.
- Kreyenfeld, M. (2005). *Economic uncertainty and fertility postponement: Evidence from German panel data* (MPIDR Working Paper No 2005-034). Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research.
- Kurz, K., Steinhage, N., & Golsch, K. (2005). Case study Germany: Global competition, uncertainty and the transition to adulthood. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 51–82). London and New York: Routledge.
- Lalive, R., & Zweimuller, J. (2005). *Does parental leave affect fertility and return-to-work? Evidence from a 'true natural experiment'* (IZA Discussion paper No. 1613). Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.

- Lappegard, T. (2008). Changing the gender balance in caring: Fatherhood and the division of parental leave in Norway. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 27, 139–159.
- Lehrer, E., & Nerlove, M. (1986). Female labour force behavior and fertility in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12, 181–204.
- Leibowitz, A., Klerman, J. A., & Waite, L. J. (1992). Employment of new mothers and childcare choice: Differences by children's age. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 27(Special Issue on Child Care), 112–133.
- Leस्थाeghe, R. (1992). Der zweite demographische Übergang in den westlichen Ländern: Eine Deutung [The second demographic transition in Western countries: An interpretation]. *Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungsforschung*, 18(3), 313–354.
- Letablier, M.-T. (1998). Comparing family policies in Europe (Periodic Progress Report No. 1 of the thematic network 'Working and mothering: Social practices and social policies' TSER Programme of the European Commission, Area III: Research into Social Integration and Social Exclusion in Europe).
- Lewis, J., & Ostner, I. (1995). Gender and the evolution of European social policies. In S. Leibfried & P. Pierson (Eds.), *European social policy: Between fragmentation and integration* (pp. 159–193). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Liefbroer, A. C. (2005). Transition from youth to adulthood in the Netherlands. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 83–104). London and New York: Routledge.
- Liefbroer, A. C., & Corijn, M. (1999). Who, what, where, and when? Specifying the impact of educational attainment and labour force participation on family formation. *European Journal of Population*, 15, 45–75.
- Light, A., & Ureta, M. (1992). Panel estimates of male and female job turnover behavior: Can female nonquitters be identified? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 10, 156–181.
- Lillard, L. A. (1993). Simultaneous equations for hazards: Marriage duration and fertility timing. *Journal of Econometrics*, 56, 189–217.
- Lillard, L. A., & Panis, C. W. A. (1996). Marital status and mortality: The role of health. *Demography*, 33(3), 313–327.
- Lillard, L. A., Brien, M. J., & Waite, L. J. (1995). Premarital cohabitation and subsequent marital dissolution: A matter of self-selection? *Demography*, 32(3), 437–457.
- Lillard, L. A., & Waite, L. J. (1993). A joint model of marital childbearing and marital disruption. *Demography*, 30(4), 653–681.
- Lück, D., & Hofäcker, D. (2003). *Rejection and acceptance of the male breadwinner model: Which preferences do women have under which circumstances?* (Globalife Working Paper No. 60). Germany: University of Bamberg.
- Macunovich, D. (1996). Relative income and price of time: Exploring their effects on U.S. fertility and female labour force participation. *Population and Development Review*, 22(Supplement), 223–257.
- Macura, M. (2000). *Fertility decline in the transition economies, 1989–1999: Economic and social factors revisited. Economic Survey of Europe 2000/1* (pp. 189–207). Geneva: Economic Commission for Europe, United Nations.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370–396.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Mason, K. O., & Kuhlthau, K. (1992). The perceived impact of child care costs on women's labor supply and fertility. *Demography*, 29, 523–543.
- Matysiak, A. (2006). Sharing professional and household duties within Polish couples: Preferences and actual choices. *Studia Demograficzne*, 1/147, 122–153.
- Matysiak, A. (2007a). Organizacja czasu pracy i opieki [Combining work with care]. In I. E. Kotowska, U. Sztanderska, & I. Wóycicka (Eds.), *Aktywność zawodowa i edukacyjna a obowiązki rodzinne w świetle badań empirycznych* [Economic and educational activity versus family obligations] (pp. 345–380). Warsaw: Scholar Publishing.

- Matysiak, A. (2007b). Indywidualne przesłanki zwiększenia aktywności ekonomicznej ludności [Individual prerequisites for increasing economic activity]. In I. E. Kotowska, U. Sztanderska, & I. Wóycicka (Eds.), *Aktywność zawodowa i edukacyjna a obowiązki rodzinne w świetle badań empirycznych* [Economic and educational activity versus family obligations] (pp. 383–403). Warsaw: Scholar Publishing.
- Matysiak, A. (2009). Employment first, then childbearing: Women's strategy in post-socialist Poland. *Population Studies*, 63(3), 253–276.
- Matysiak, A., & Steinmetz, S. (2008). Finding their way? Female employment patterns in West Germany, East Germany, and Poland. *European Sociological Review*, 24(3), 331–345.
- Matysiak, A., & Vignoli, D. (2008). Fertility and women's employment: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Population*, 24(4), 363–384.
- McRae, S. (2003). Constraints and choices in mothers' employment careers: A consideration of Hakim's preference theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 54(3), 317–338.
- Meeker, B. F. (1980). Rational decision-making models in interpersonal behavior. In T. K. Burch (Ed.), *Demographic behaviour: Interdisciplinary perspectives on decision-making* (pp. 23–42). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Meulders, D., & S. O'Dorchai. (2008). The position of mothers in the comparative welfare state perspective. In D. Del Boca & C. Wetzels (Eds.), *Social policies, labour markets and motherhood: A comparative analysis of European countries* (pp. 1–27). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Michalopoulos, C., Robins, P. K., & Garfinkel, I. (1992). A structural model of labor supply and child care demand. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 27(Special Issue on Child Care), 166–203.
- Milligan, K. (2005). Subsidizing the stork: New evidence on tax incentives and fertility. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83, 539–555.
- Mills, M., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (2005). Globalization, uncertainty and the early life course: A theoretical framework. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in the society* (pp. 1–24). London and New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Mincer, J. (1963). Market prices, opportunity costs and income effects. In C. F. Christ (Ed.), *Measurement in economics* (pp. 63–97). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Moffit, R. A. (1984). Profiles of fertility, labour supply and wages of married women: A complete life cycle model. *Review of Economic Studies*, 51, 263–278.
- Muszyńska, M. (2004). *Family models in Europe in the context of women's status* (Working Papers on Population, Family and Welfare No 6). Budapest: Hungarian Central Statistical Office.
- Muszyńska, M. (2007). *Structural and cultural determinants of fertility in Europe*. Warsaw: Warsaw School of Economics Publishing.
- Neyer, G. (2003). *Family policies and low fertility in Western Europe* (MPIDR Working Paper WP 2003-021). Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research.
- Neyer, G. (2006). *Family policies and fertility in Europe: Fertility policies at the intersection of gender policies, employment policies and care policies* (MPIDR Working Paper 2006-010). Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research.
- Neyer, G., & Andersson, G. (2008). Consequences of family policies on childbearing behavior: Effects or artifacts? *Population and Development Review*, 34(4), 699–724.
- Ni Bhrolchain, M. (1986a). Women's paid work and the timing of births: Longitudinal evidence. *European Journal of Population*, 2, 43–70.
- Ni Bhrolchain, M. (1986b). The interpretation and role of work-associated accelerated childbearing in post-war Britain. *European Journal of Population*, 2, 135–154.
- Ni Bhrolchain, M. (1993). How to answer the fertility employment question (and how not to). In M. Ni Bhrolchain (Ed.), *New perspectives on fertility in Britain. Studies on Medical and Population Subjects* (pp. 151–157). London: HMSO.
- O'Brien, M. (2009). Fathers, parental leave policies, and infant quality of life: International perspectives and policy impact. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 624(1), 190–213.

- OECD (2001). *Balancing work and family life: Helping parents into paid employment*. OECD Employment Outlook (pp. 129–166). Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2003). *Making work pay – making work possible*. Employment Outlook. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2004a). *Benefits and wages*. OECD Indicators. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2004b). *Employment protection regulation and labour market performance*. OECD Employment Outlook. (pp. 61–125). Paris: OECD.
- Olah, L. S. (2003). Gendering fertility: Second births in Sweden and Hungary. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22, 171–200.
- Orloff, A. S. (1993). Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 303–328.
- Pampel, F. C., & Peters, H. E. (1995). The Easterlin effect. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 163–194.
- Pascall, G., & Lewis, J. (2004). Emerging gender regimes and policies for gender equality in a wider Europe. *Journal of Social Policy*, 33, 373–394.
- Pascall, G., & Manning, N. (2000). Gender and social policy: Comparing welfare states in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 10, 240–266.
- Pfau-Effinger, B. (1998). Gender culture and the gender arrangement: A theoretical framework for cross-national gender research. *Innovation*, 11, 147–166.
- Philipov, D. (2008). Family-related gender attitudes. In C. Höhn, D. Avramov, & I. E. Kotowska (Eds.), *People, population change and policies: Lessons from the Population Policy Acceptance Study, Vol 2: Demographic knowledge – gender – ageing* (pp. 153–174). Berlin: Springer.
- Pissarides, C., Garibaldi, P., Olivetti, C., Petrongolo, B., & Wasmer, E. (2005). Women's employment patterns: Some facts. In T. Boeri, D. Del Boca, & C. Pissarides (Eds.), *Women at work: An economic perspective* (pp. 12–24). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollak, R. A., & Watkins, S. (1993). Cultural and economic approaches to fertility: Proper marriage or misalliance? *Population and Development Review*, 19, 467–496.
- Pongracz, M., & Z. Spèder. (2008). Attitudes towards forms of partnership. In C. Höhn, D. Avramov, & I. E. Kotowska (Eds.), *People, population change and policies: Lessons from the population policy acceptance study* (pp. 105–205). Berlin: Springer.
- Powell, L. M. (1998). Part-time versus full-time work and child care costs: Evidence for married mothers. *Applied Economics*, 30, 503–511.
- Ribar, D. C. (1992). Child care and the labour supply of married women: Reduced form evidence. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 27(Special Issue on Child Care), 134–165.
- Rindfuss, R. R., Guilkey, D. K., Morgan, S. P., & Kravdal, Ø. (2010). Child-care availability and fertility in Norway. *Population and Development Review*, 36(4), 725–748.
- Rindfuss, R. R., Guzzo, K., & Morgan, S. P. (2003). The changing institutional context of low fertility. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 22, 411–438.
- Róbert, P., & E. Bukodi E. (2005). The effects of the globalization process on the transition to adulthood in Hungary. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 176–214). London and New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, W. C., & Harbison, S. F. (1980). Towards a unified theory of fertility. In T. K. Burch (Ed.), *Demographic behaviour: Interdisciplinary perspectives on decision-making*. (pp. 201–235). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Rønsen, M. (2004). Fertility and public policies: Evidence from Norway and Finland. *Demographic Research*, 10, 143–170.
- Rønsen, M., & Sundström, M. (2002). Family policy and after-birth employment among new mothers: A comparison of Finland, Norway and Sweden. *European Journal of Population*, 18, 121–152.
- Rosenzweig, M. R., & Schultz, T. P. (1985). The demand for and supply of births: Fertility and its life-cycle consequences. *American Economic Review*, 75(5), 992–1015.
- Rosenzweig M. R., & Wolpin, K. I. (1980). Life-cycle labour supply and fertility: Causal inferences from household models. *Journal of Political Economy*, 88(2), 328–348.

- Rostgaard, T. (2004). *Family support policies in Central and Eastern Europe – A Decade and a half transition*. Budapest: UNESCO.
- Rychtarikova, J. (1999). Is Eastern Europe experiencing a second demographic transition? *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Geographica*, 1, 19–44.
- Rychtarikova, J. (2000). Demographic transition or demographic shock in recent population development in the Czech Republic? *Acta Universitatis Carolinae Geographica*, 1, 89–102.
- Saraceno, C., & Keck, W. (2008). *The institutional framework of intergenerational family obligations in Europe: A conceptual and methodological overview*. Multilinks Research Report.
- Schmitt, C. (2005). *Gender-specific effects of unemployment on family formation: Evidence from a cross-national view*. Paper presented at the 25th IUSSP International Population Conference, Tours, France, 18–23 July 2005.
- Schneider, H., & Uhlenendorf, A. (2004). *The transition from welfare to work and the role of potential labor income* (IZA Discussion Paper No. 1420). Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Schröder, J. (2005). *Der Zusammenhang zwischen Erwerbstätigkeit und Fertilität: Ein Überblick über den Forschungsstand* (MZES Working Paper No. 89). Mannheim: Mannheim Centre for Social Research.
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Shaw, K. (1994). The persistence of female labour supply: Empirical evidence and implications. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 29(2), 348–378.
- Siegers, J. J. (1991). Towards a better understanding of the relationship between female labour market behaviour and fertility. In J. J. Siegers, J. de Jong-Gierveld, & E. van Imhoff (Eds.), *Female labour market behaviour and fertility: A rational-choice approach* (pp. 265–274). Berlin: Springer.
- Siegers J. J., de Jong-Gierveld, J., & van Imhoff, E. (1991). Editors' introduction. In J. J. Siegers, J. de Jong-Gierveld, & E. van Imhoff (Eds.), *Female labour market behaviour and fertility: A rational-choice approach* (pp. 1–7). Berlin: Springer.
- Siemieńska, R. (1997). Wartości i postawy warunkujące obecność kobiet na rynku pracy [Values and attitudes determining women's labour supply]. In R. Siemieńska (Ed.), *Wokół problemów zawodowego równouprawnienia kobiet i mężczyzn* [On gender equality in the labour market]. Warsaw: Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, pp. 61–84.
- Sigle-Rushton, W. (2008). England and Wales: Stable fertility and pronounced social status differences. *Demographic Research*, 19(Special Collection Volume on Childbearing Trends and Policies in Europe), Article 15, 455–502.
- Simó Noguera, C., Castro Martin, T., & Soro Bonmatí, A. (2005). The Spanish case: The effects of the globalization process on the transition to adulthood. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society* (pp. 375–402). London and New York: Routledge.
- Sjöberg, O. (2004). The role of family policy institutions in explaining gender role attitudes: a comparative multilevel analysis of thirteen industrialised countries. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 14, 107–123.
- Smith, N., Dex, S., Vlasblom, J. D., & Callan, T. (2003). The effects of taxation on married women's labour supply across four countries. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 55, 417–439.
- Smith-Lovin, L., & Tickamyer, A. R. (1978). Nonrecursive models of labor force participation, fertility behavior, and sex role attitudes. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 541–557.
- Sobotka, T. (2004). *Postponement of childbearing and low fertility in Europe*. Amsterdam: Dutch University Press.
- Sobotka, T., Wolfgang, L., & D. Philipov. (2005). 'Missing births': *Decomposing the declining number of births in Europe into tempo, quantum and age structure effects* (European Demographic Research Papers No. 2). Vienna: Vienna Institute of Demography.
- Soja, E. (2005). *Hipoteza Easterlina w świetle zachowań prokreacyjnych generacji urodzonych w latach 1942–1966 w Polsce* [The Easterlin Hypothesis and the fertility behaviours of

- cohorts born 1942–1966 in Poland]. Warsaw: Fundacja Promocji i Akredytacji Kierunków Ekonomicznych i Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne.
- Spitze, G. (1988). Women's employment and family relations: A review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(3), 595–618.
- Stankunienė, V., & Mauskaitė, A. (2008). Family transformations in the post-communist countries: attitudes towards changes. In C. Höhn, D. Avramov, & I. E. Kotowska (Eds.), *People, population change and policies: Lessons from the population policy acceptance study* (pp. 127–157). Berlin: Springer.
- Stanley, T. D. (2001). Wheat from chaff: Meta-analysis as quantitative literature review. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(3), 131–150.
- Stolzenberg, R. M., & Waite, L. J. (1984). Local labor markets, children and labor force participation of wives. *Demography*, 21, 157–170.
- Stuck, A. E., Walthert, J. M., Nikolaus, T., Büla, C. J., Hohmann, C., & Beck, J. C. (1999). Risk factors for functional status decline in community-living elderly people: A systematic literature review. *Social Science & Medicine*, 48, 445–469.
- Sundström, M., & Duvander, A.-Z. (2002). Gender division of childcare and the sharing of parental leave among new parents in Sweden. *European Sociological Review*, 18(4), 433–447.
- Sztanderska, U. (2005). Aktywność zawodowa kobiet w Polsce. Jakie szanse? Jakie rezultaty? [Labour force participation of women in Poland? What opportunities? What outcomes?] In *Szansa na wzrost dzietności – jaka polityka rodzinna?* [Possibilities of increasing fertility: Which family policies?] (pp. 43–63). Blue paper of the Polish Forum for Lisbon Strategy. Warsaw-Gdansk: Gdansk Institute on Market Economics.
- Sztanderska, U., & Grotkowska, G. (2007). Zatrudnienie i bezrobocie kobiet i mężczyzn [Employment and unemployment of women and men]. In I. E. Kotowska, U. Sztanderska, & I. Wóycicka (Eds.), *Aktywność zawodowa i edukacyjna a obowiązki rodzinne w świetle badań empirycznych* [Economic and educational activity versus family obligations] (pp. 170–218). Warsaw: Scholar Publishing.
- Taniguchi, H., & Rosenfeld, R. A. (2002). Women's employment exit and re-entry: Differences among whites, blacks and Hispanics. *Social Science Research*, 31, 432–471.
- Testa, M. R. (2006a). *Childbearing preferences and family issues in Europe*. Research Report from the Special Eurobarometer 253/Wave 65.1, European Commission, October 2006.
- Testa, M. R. (2006b). Childbearing preferences and family issues in Europe: Evidence from the Eurobarometer 2006 Survey. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 2007, 357–379.
- Thevenon, O. (2010). *Macro-level database on fertility and policies supporting families with children in European and OECD countries*. Deliverable within the REPRO project.
- Treas, J., & Widmer, E. D. (2000). Married women's employment over the life course: Attitudes in cross-national perspective. *Social Forces*, 78, 1409–1436.
- Trifiletti, R. (1999). Southern European welfare regimes and the worsening position of women. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 9, 49–64.
- Turchi, B. A. (1991). How economics, psychology and sociology might produce a unified theory of fertility and labour market participation. In J. J. Siegers, J. de Jong-Gierveld, & E. van Imhoff (Eds.), *Female labour market behaviour and fertility. A rational-choice approach* (pp. 237–262). Berlin: Springer.
- Tymicki, K. (2008). *Przemiany wzorca dzietności w Polsce w latach 1989–2007. Analiza i opracowanie danych z rejestracji urodzeń* [Changes in fertility patterns in Poland in the years 1989–2007: Analyses based on register data]. Research report prepared at the Institute of Statistics and Demography. Warsaw: Warsaw School of Economics.
- Udehn, L. (2002). The changing face of methodological individualism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 479–507.
- UN (1983). *Report of the meeting on population. Sofia, 6–12 October 1983* (Document No. ECE/AC.9/2). Geneva: United Nations.
- Van de Kaa, D. J. (1987). Europe's second demographic transition. *Population Bulletin*, 42(1). Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau.

- Van de Kaa, D. J. (1988). *The second demographic transition revisited: Theories and expectations*. Paper presented at the Conference on Population and European Society by the Commission of the European Economic Community and the European University Institute, Florence, Italy, 7–9 December 1988.
- Van Peer, C., & Rabušić, R. (2008). Will we witness an upturn in European fertility in the near future? In C. Höhn, D. Avramov, & I. E. Kotowska (Eds.), *People, population change and policies: Lessons from the population policy acceptance study* (pp. 215–241). European Studies of Population 16/1. The Hague: Springer.
- Vemer, E. C., Marilyn, G., Lawrence, H., & Cooper, H. (1989). Marital satisfaction in remarriage: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 51(3), 713–725.
- Vikat, A. (2004). Women's labor force attachment and childbearing in Finland. *Demographic Research*, 3(Article 8), 175–212.
- Vikat, A., Spéder, Z., Beets, G., Billari, F. C., Bühler, C., Désesquelles, A., et al. (2007). Generations and gender survey (GGS): Towards a better understanding of relationships and processes in the life course. *Demographic Research*, 17(Article 14), 389–440.
- Vitali, A., Billari F. C., Prskawetz, A., & Testa, M. R. (2009). Preference Theory and low fertility: A comparative perspective. *European Journal of Population*, 25, 413–438.
- Wagner, M., & Weiss, B. (2006). On the variation of divorce risks in Europe: Findings from a meta-analysis of European longitudinal studies. *European Sociological Review*, 22(5), 483–500.
- Waite, L. J., & Stolzenberg, R. M. (1976). Intended childbearing and labor force participation of young women: Insights from nonrecursive models. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 235–252.
- Waldfogel, J., Higuchi, Y., & Abe, M. (1999). Family leave policies and women's retention after childbirth: Evidence from the United States, Britain, and Japan. *Journal of Population Economics*, 12, 523–545.
- Waldorf, B., & Byrun, P. (2005). Meta-analysis of the impact of age structure on fertility. *Journal of Population Economics*, 18, 15–40.
- Weichselbaumer, D., & Winter-Ebmer, R. (2005). A meta-analysis of the international gender gap. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3), 479–511.
- Weller, R. H. (1977). Wife's employment and cumulative family size in the United States, 1970 and 1960. *Demography*, 14(1), 43–65.
- Westoff, C. F. (1978). Marriage and fertility in the developed countries. *Scientific American*, 239(6), 51–57.
- Willekens, F. J. (1991). Understanding the interdependence between parallel careers. In J. J. Siegers, J. de Jong-Gierveld, & E. van Imhoff (Eds.), *Female labour market behaviour and fertility: A rational-choice approach* (pp. 11–31). Berlin: Springer.
- Willekens, F. J. (1999). The life-course approach: Models and analysis. In L. J. G. Van Wissen, & P. A. Dykstra (Eds.), *Population issues. An interdisciplinary focus* (pp. 23–51). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Willis, R. J. (1973). A new approach to the economic theory of fertility behavior. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(Part 2: New Economic Approaches to Fertility), 14–64.
- Zhang, J., Quan, J., & Van Meerbergen, P. (1994). The effect of tax-transfer policies on fertility in Canada, 1921–1988. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 29, 181–201.
- Zhang, J., & Yu, K. F. (1998). What's the relative risk? *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 280(19), 1690–1691.

# Index

## B

Barriers to labour market entry, 50–51, 74–76, 118

## C

Childcare, 46–47, 65–70, 72–73, 116, 151  
Context/macro-context, 6–7, 9, 45–54, 59–60, 63–88, 112–121, 145–147  
Costs of children, 44  
Cross-country correlation between fertility and women's labour supply, 4–5  
    Central and Eastern Europe, 15, 28, 40–41, 148–149  
    Western Europe, 15, 25, 39–40, 148

## D

Data requirements, 90, 145  
Dual earner/female double burden, 119–121

## E

Economic transformation, 112–113  
Effect size, 92, 97–101  
Endogeneity, 8, 112, 127–129, 133, 139

## F

Family policies, 4, 46–50, 64–73, 150–151  
    Central and Eastern Europe, 67–68  
    Poland, 113–117, 121–124  
    Western Europe, 64–66  
Family policy model, 64–68  
    Central and Eastern Europe, 67–68  
    Western Europe, 64–66  
Flexibility index, 74–76  
Flexibility of work arrangements, 51–52, 74–76, 118–119

## G

Gender norms, 10–11, 77–82, 119–121, 150

## I

Income effect, 44, 46, 53, 59, 82–84, 96–97, 108, 144, 146  
Income transfers, 49–50, 113  
Incompatibilities between work and family  
    cultural, 45–46, 52–53, 77–82, 120, 151  
    general, 7, 13, 30, 39–41, 45–46, 104–108, 121, 141, 145–151  
    institutional, 45–50, 64, 68–73, 117, 151  
    structural, 45–46, 50–52, 73–77, 117–119, 151  
Incompatibility hypothesis, 39  
Index  
    of cultural incompatibilities between work and family, 80–82  
    general index of incompatibilities between work and family, 85–88, 146  
    of institutional incompatibilities between work and family, 68–71  
    of structural incompatibilities between work and family, 76–77  
Instrumental variable estimation, 128

## L

Labour force participation  
    country groups, 18–20  
    definition, 12  
    developments in Central and Eastern Europe, 23  
    developments in Western Europe, 21–22  
    of mothers, 30–35  
    in Poland, 124–126  
    relationship with incompatibilities, 73, 77, 82, 86–87  
Labour market entry index, 74–76  
Labour market structures, 50–52, 73–77, 117–119, 151  
Living standards/economic conditions, 53, 82–84, 90, 97, 108, 112–113, 146, 149

**M**

- Marginal effective tax rates, 50, 69, 72, 151
- Material aspirations, 55–56, 59–60, 90, 96–97, 108, 149–150
- Maternity leave, 47–48, 69, 72, 116
- Meta-analysis/qualitative literature review, 10, 91–92, 97–100
- Meta-regression, 100–105
- Meta-sample, 92–95
- Methodological individualism, 6–7
- Motives, 55–56, 126, 140–141, 145, 150
  - orientations toward work and family, 55–61, 123, 126–127, 145
- Multi-process hazard model, 8, 112, 129–137, 139–140, 145

**O**

- Orientations toward work and family, 55–61, 123, 126–127, 145

**P**

- Parental leave, 47–48, 65–69, 72–73, 116–117, 151
- Part-time employment
  - definition, 12
  - developments in Central and Eastern Europe, 23–24
  - developments in Western Europe, 22–23
  - of mothers, 35–38, 51–52
  - Poland, 118–119
- Paternity leave, 48–49, 66, 68–69, 72–73, 151
- Piecewise linear spline model, 131
- Population ageing, 2
- Preferences, 7, 55–61
- Preference theory, 57
- Price effect, 44–46, 59, 96–97, 144

- Price of time model/micro-economic theory of fertility and women's labour supply, 44–45, 59, 144

**R**

- Random-effect model, 98
- Rational choice, 7
- Relative income model, 55, 59, 144

**S**

- Selection, 58–61, 96–97, 112, 127–129, 133, 135–137, 140, 144–145
  - negative, 58, 61, 96, 127, 133
  - positive, 58, 61, 96, 127–128, 133, 135–137, 140, 145

**T**

- Temporary employment, 51, 118
- Theory of human motivation, 56
- Total fertility/period total fertility
  - definition, 12
  - developments, 1–2, 10–11
  - developments in Central and Eastern Europe, 15, 27–28
  - developments in Western Europe, 15, 24–25
  - Poland, 122
  - relationship with incompatibilities, 73, 77, 82, 86–87

**U**

- Unemployment
  - definition, 12
  - developments, 22–23, 50–51, 112–113, 118

**W**

- Welfare state typology, 64–66