



COMPARATIVE STUDIES

ECE ANALYSES OF WFS SURVEYS IN EUROPE AND USA

NUMBER 21

DECEMBER 1982

ELISE F. JONES

UNFPA LIBRARY

Socio-Economic Differentials in Achieved Fertility

INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL INSTITUTE
Permanent Office. Director: E. Lunenberg
428 Prinses Beatrixlaan, PO Box 950
2270 AZ Voorburg
Netherlands

WORLD FERTILITY SURVEY
Project Director:
Halvor Gille
35-37 Grosvenor Gardens
London SW1W 0BS, UK

The World Fertility Survey (WFS) is an international research programme whose purpose is to assess the current state of human fertility throughout the world. This is being done principally through promoting and supporting nationally representative, internationally comparable, and scientifically designed and conducted sample surveys of fertility behaviour in as many countries as possible.

The WFS is being undertaken, with the collaboration of the United Nations, by the International Statistical Institute in co-operation with the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. Financial support is provided principally by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the United States Agency for International Development. Substantial support is also provided by the UK Overseas Development Administration.

For information on Country Reports, WFS publications, and WFS depository libraries, write to the Publications Office, International Statistical Institute, 428 Prinses Beatrixlaan, PO Box 950, 2270 AZ Voorburg, Netherlands. For information on the WFS generally, write to the Information Office, World Fertility Survey, International Statistical Institute, 35-37 Grosvenor Gardens, London SW1W 0BS, UK.

L'Enquête Mondiale sur la Fécondité (EMF) est un programme international de recherche dont le but est d'évaluer l'état actuel de la fécondité humaine dans le monde. Afin d'atteindre cet objectif, des enquêtes par sondage sur la fécondité sont mises en oeuvre et financées dans le plus grand nombre de pays possible. Ces études, élaborées et réalisées de façon scientifique, fournissent des données représentatives au niveau national et comparables au niveau international.

L'EMF est entreprise, en collaboration avec les Nations Unies, par l'Institut International de Statistique, qui coopère avec l'Union internationale pour l'étude scientifique de la population. Le financement de ce programme est essentiellement assuré par le Fonds des Nations Unies pour les activités en matière de population et par l'Agence des Etats-Unis pour le développement international. Une contribution importante est aussi faite par le Département pour le développement des pays d'outre-mer du Royaume-Uni.

Pour toute information concernant les rapports d'enquêtes nationaux, les publications de l'EMF ou les bibliothèques dépositaires, écrire au Bureau des publications, Institut International de Statistique, 428 Prinses Beatrixlaan, BP 950, 2270 AZ Voorburg, Pays-Bas. Pour tous renseignements complémentaires sur l'EMF en général, écrire au Bureau d'information, Enquête Mondiale sur la Fécondité, Institut International de Statistique, 35-37 Grosvenor Gardens, Londres SW1W 0BS, Royaume-Uni.

La Encuesta Mundial de Fecundidad (EMF) es un programa internacional de investigación cuyo propósito es determinar el estado actual de la fecundidad humana en el mundo. Para lograr este objetivo, se están promoviendo y financiando encuestas de fecundidad por muestreo en el mayor número posible de países. Estas encuestas son diseñadas y realizadas científicamente, nacionalmente representativas y comparables a nivel internacional.

El proyecto está a cargo del Instituto Internacional de Estadística, contando con la colaboración de las Naciones Unidas y en cooperación con la Unión Internacional para el Estudio Científico de la Población. Es financiado principalmente por el Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para Actividades de Población y por la Agencia para el Desarrollo Internacional de los Estados Unidos. La Oficina Británica para el Desarrollo de Países Extranjeros proporciona también un gran apoyo financiero.

Puede obtenerse información sobre Informes de Países como otras publicaciones de la EMF y las bibliotecas depositarias, escribiendo a la Oficina de Publicaciones, Instituto Internacional de Estadística, Prinses Beatrixlaan 428, Casilla Postal 950, 2270 AZ Voorburg, Países Bajos. Si desea información de carácter general sobre la EMF, escriba a la Oficina de Información, Encuesta Mundial de Fecundidad, Instituto Internacional de Estadística, 35-37 Grosvenor Gardens, Londres SW1W 0BS, Reino Unido.

COMPARATIVE STUDIES

**ECE ANALYSES OF
WFS SURVEYS IN EUROPE AND USA**

Socio-Economic Differentials in Achieved Fertility

ELISE F. JONES

**Population Activities Unit
UN Economic Commission for Europe
Palais des Nations, Geneva**

Contents

PREFACE	5
1 INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 The Survey Material	7
1.2 The Approach Used	9
2 BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS	10
3 CURRENT CIRCUMSTANCES	13
4 THE RESPONDENT'S EMPLOYMENT	25
5 CONCLUSIONS	34

TABLES

1	Average number of live births, standard deviation, number of missing cases and total number of women; average standardized by duration of marriage	8
2	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by type of childhood residence, religious affiliation, intensity of religious feeling and wife's level of education	11
3	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by religious affiliation and by intensity of religious feeling	12
4	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by type of current residence, size of place of current residence, husband's level of education, husband's socio-occupational status, family income, husband's income and number of rooms in the dwelling	15
5	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by type of current residence and by type of childhood residence and wife's level of education	17
6	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by husband's level of education and by wife's level of education and type of current residence	18
7	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by husband's socio-occupational status and by type of current residence and husband's level of education	20
8	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by husband's income and by husband's level of education	22
9	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by number of rooms in the dwelling and by type of current residence	23

10	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by work history, proportion of time worked since marriage, employment status, occupation, full-time or part-time work, place of work, and wife's income	26
11	Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by work history and by wife's level of education, type of current residence, husband's socio-occupational status and husband's income	28

Preface

The World Fertility Survey itself is mainly concerned with the developing countries of the world. Nevertheless, around 1975 a number of developed countries undertook fertility surveys, broadly on the lines recommended by the World Fertility Survey. The main responsibility for the promotion of WFS-type surveys in Europe (and some developed countries outside Europe), and for comparative analyses of their findings, was entrusted to the Secretariat of the UN Economic Commission for Europe. This was partly due to the interest shown by the ECE Conference of European Statisticians in WFS and partly to the experience in comparative fertility studies gained by ECE's population experts in the course of preparing an earlier report which compared 12 national fertility surveys taken around 1970.¹

The final report of the new comparative project, undertaken in the context of the World Fertility Survey, will focus on the causes of recent fertility decline in the ECE region, and will also use data derived from sources other than the WFS-type surveys in Europe and North America.² Since this report is not likely to appear in print before 1983, several short papers summarizing the main findings of the study will be published earlier, appearing in the *WFS Comparative Studies* series as a separate subseries under the title 'ECE Analyses of WFS Surveys in Europe and USA'.

The preface to the WFS series of comparative cross national summaries draws readers' attention to the difficulty of maintaining inter-country comparability of data collected for the developing countries. This difficulty is

even greater with regard to the developed countries, many of which had had fertility surveys before and were more inclined to ensure internal than external comparability. The final report devotes a whole chapter to exploration and explanation of inter-country comparability problems, but the preliminary papers can only draw attention to the more serious deviations from proposed standards. The papers are necessarily limited in scope and their nature is somewhat less analytical than foreseen for the final report.

This preface would not be complete without acknowledgement of the contribution of various UN agencies to the ECE/WFS project. The Conference of European Statisticians devoted two meetings to WFS, and approved a model questionnaire and basic tabulation plan for the countries in the ECE region. The UN Working Group on Social Demography held several meetings of experts involved in the national fertility inquiries to assist the ECE Secretariat in the preparation of the comparative study, and its members played a crucial role in securing the supply of national data for the project. Altogether 16 national individual data tapes were received by ECE and two countries prepared sets of tables listed in the preliminary tabulation plan for the comparative study.

Last but not least, UNFPA provided financial assistance to the project.

JANEZ STANOVNIK
Executive Secretary
UN Economic Commission for Europe

¹ *Fertility and Family Planning in Europe around 1970: a Comparative Study of Twelve National Surveys*, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, 1976 (Sales No. E.76.XIII.2).

² For a more detailed outline of this report, see J. Berent, 'Directions and Methods of Analysis of World Fertility Survey Data in Low Fertility Countries'. IUSSP International Population Conference, Mexico City, 1977 (1.2.2.).

1 Introduction

One of the unique features of a fertility survey is the possibility it offers for relating socio-economic characteristics to reproductive behaviour at the individual level. The existence of a substantial number of surveys for European countries and the USA, all taken around the same time and covering similar types of background material, provides a promising opportunity to re-examine fertility differentials in developed societies from a cross-national perspective.

Patterns of variation in achieved fertility for 14 countries are reviewed in this paper. The emphasis is largely descriptive, taking maximum advantage of the breadth of information that is available. Analysis in depth of the ways in which various factors may be interrelated in their impact on fertility will inevitably be more limited in scope with respect both to geographic coverage and to the substantive issues that can be addressed; this is deferred to the final report of the project.

The data provided by the surveys are described very briefly in the section that immediately follows. The next section outlines the plan of the present analysis and the statistical procedures used. The substantive results are presented in sections 2–4, and these findings are reviewed and discussed in the concluding section of the paper.

1.1 THE SURVEY MATERIAL³

The list of individual countries covered in this analysis is indicated in table 1. Together with the USA, most of the larger national populations of Europe are included, and at the same time the various regions of Europe are well represented. It should be noted, however, that the Belgian survey refers only to the Flemish-speaking part of the population. The surveys took place within a relatively short period from 1975 to 1979.

Although the original definitions of the samples differed to some extent, it was possible to select a common base for comparative purposes, consisting of currently married women in their first marriage, below the age of 45. The exceptions are Denmark and Poland, where currently married women who had been married more than once could not be identified, and France, where women less than 20 years of age were excluded from the original sample. Divorce and remarriage are relatively common in Denmark, and the presence of Danish women married

more than once is the only one of these departures that can be considered of any practical consequence. The number of respondents in the final samples varied from 2290 for France to 9799 for Poland (see table 1).

The surveys for developed countries were designed and conducted essentially independently of one another, and there were substantial differences between countries in the form and content of the material collected. A large part of the lengthy data-processing stage for the project of which this analysis is a part was devoted to reclassifying the information in such a way as to be meaningful for comparisons across countries. In 12 cases the survey results had been made available to the ECE Secretariat in the form of data tapes containing the individual-level information, but for Bulgaria and Romania only tabulations were provided, and little manipulation was possible.

The dependent variable used for purposes of this analysis presented few problems. Achieved fertility is defined as the number of live births the respondent had had up to the date of the survey. This measure lacks any definite reference in time but has the advantage of representing information that is concrete in nature and easy to obtain. A direct question on the total number of live births had been included in all of the national surveys except those of Finland, Italy and Yugoslavia, where the data were extracted from the birth histories. The Italian and Yugoslav birth histories allowed for a maximum of nine births, but with this minor exception, no problems of intercountry comparability were encountered. As shown in table 1, there is very little missing information on this variable.

The situation was quite different regarding the social and economic characteristics that form the independent variables. Even for such key topics as residence and education, which were covered by almost all countries, there were dissimilarities in the type and degree of detail of the original information. Other topics of interest, including, for instance, religion and certain aspects of women's employment, were apt to be approached in quite disparate ways, if they were covered at all. In the context of a brief report, it is not possible to do justice either to the complicated process of converting this material to a standard format or to the specific problems of comparability that remain in the data.⁴ However, the most salient features of the different variables are mentioned in the main body of the paper as each is introduced into the discussion. Because the degree of comparability that could be achieved was inevitably limited, the discussion focusses on patterns of association rather than on the actual levels shown for particular subgroups.

³ For a general description of the surveys covered in the ECE/WFS Comparative Fertility Study, see J. Berent, E.F. Jones and M.K. Siddiqui, 'Basic Characteristics, Sample Designs and Questionnaires' (1982). *WFS Comparative Studies* no. 18. Hungary and the Netherlands are included in the project but are omitted from this paper because their samples are not comparable to the other countries and standardization by marriage duration was therefore not appropriate.

⁴ These topics will be covered in detail in the final report of the project, which will also present the distributions of the samples on all principal characteristics.

Table 1 Average number of live births, standard deviation, number of missing cases and total number of women; average standardized by duration of marriage^a

	Belgium (Flemish)	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	Denmark ^b	Finland	France ^c	Great Britain	Italy	Norway	Poland ^b	Romania	Spain	USA	Yugoslavia
Average	1.78	1.85	2.00	1.98	1.84	2.02	1.89	1.96	2.00	2.00	2.03	2.36	1.99	2.19
Standard deviation	1.44	1.22	1.05	1.17	1.25	1.46	1.37	1.24	1.22	1.33	1.47	1.47	1.65	1.60
Number of missing cases	4	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	—	—
Total number of women	4010	6352	2932	3129	5349	2290	3682	5359	2824	9799	8771	4618	5545	6806
Standardized average ^d	1.79	1.78	1.96	2.00	1.86	2.01	1.85	1.95	2.05	2.07	2.00	2.41	2.08	2.17

^aSample weights were used for the computation of all statistics for France, Italy, Spain, USA and Yugoslavia. The number of missing cases and the total number of women shown in this table are unweighted.

^bWomen married more than once included.

^cWomen less than 20 years of age excluded.

^dFor Denmark, marriage duration refers to the current marriage.

NOTE: The notation — indicates data nil or negligible; in subsequent tables, the notation . . indicates data not available or not pertinent.

1.2 THE APPROACH USED

The average number of births, standardized by duration of marriage, is presented for categories of the socio-economic variables. These characteristics are taken up in three groups that form a rough sequence in order of their proximity to the fertility decision-making process. As far as possible, the same principle was followed in determining the order in which the variables are considered within each group, but very often this had to be purely arbitrary.

The first group relates to the respondent's own background: her childhood residence, religion and education. Although religion and education are not necessarily static, on the whole these are characteristics that a woman brings with her into marriage and which remain relatively stable throughout adult life. These attributes are usually considered of importance in relation to fertility because of the part they play in the formation of values, role orientations and life plans.

The second group of characteristics represent selected circumstances of the respondent's life around the time of the survey: current residence, her husband's education and economic activity and the standard of living of the family. Such factors can be thought of as being added at marriage or afterwards to the set of considerations that may ultimately influence a woman's reproductive behaviour.

The third group concerns the respondent's own employment: whether she ever worked, how much she may have worked, the type of work and the conditions of her work. Although this last category represents in a sense simply another facet of the respondent's adult life, employment warrants special treatment because it competes to a greater or lesser extent with childbearing for a woman's time and personal resources and is thus bound up with fertility decisions in a particularly immediate way.

It is hardly necessary to point out that this ordering of the variables is far from precise. There is much overlapping even with respect to their conceptual sequence in time. The time dimension is further blurred by the fact that the information was collected at one point in each respondent's reproductive life, which varies from woman to woman, and most of the questions referred specifically to the moment of interview. But since the effects of factors that are more removed from fertility decisions are likely to be worked out partly through their role as determinants of factors that are closer, it is nevertheless useful to structure the material in this way.

Each variable is considered first in terms of its overall relationship with achieved fertility and then in combination with other variables selected from those that have been introduced up to that point. The choice of two-way tabulations to be included was determined mainly on grounds of substantive interest, although it was often limited by practical considerations. Both associations and interactions between the variables are examined. Not many items of information are known for all the countries, and some are available for only a few; in any given table, countries for which there is no relevant information are omitted.

Standardization by duration of marriage was necessary to take into account variation of exposure to the risk of childbearing. Since many of the variables are themselves related to duration of marriage, substantial differences in distribution by marriage duration often exist between

the categories of a given variable, and this could distort comparisons among them. An arbitrary standard was selected that resembles the collective distribution of the national samples by duration of marriage reasonably closely.⁵

Marriage duration	Weight
0-4	.25
5-9	.25
10-14	.20
15-19	.15
20 +	.15
Total	1.00

Use of a uniform standard also adjusts, of course, for inter-country differences in length of exposure for any given subgroup. Direct standardization is a straightforward and familiar procedure, but it should be kept in mind that the results obtained are likely to be partly dependent on the particular standard used. Specifically, standardization by marriage duration assumes that there is no interaction between marriage duration and the variable(s) under discussion, an assumption that is inevitably violated to some degree in many instances in this paper.

The statistical reliability of the standardized values is determined not only by the total number of women in the given subgroup but partly also by the number of women in each category of the underlying distribution by marriage duration. In this report the standardized average is placed in brackets if either the total number of women involved was less than 50 or the number of women in any one category of the underlying distribution by marriage duration was less than 5. Where the total number of women was less than 10, the figure between the brackets is deleted. The standardized value could not be computed when one or more cells of the underlying distribution by marriage duration were actually empty, and in this case a double asterisk appears in the table.

As a point of departure for the discussion of differentials, selected statistics summarizing the overall distribution by number of live births for each country are also shown in table 1. The unstandardized average varies only from 1.78 in Belgium to 2.36 in Spain. Mainly because standardization raises the average for Spain still further, the range of the standardized means is slightly larger. Nevertheless for 6 of the 14 countries the standardized averages fall within .05 birth around the value of 2.00. Yugoslavia, USA and Poland are outliers on the high side, along with Spain. Finland, Great Britain, Belgium and Bulgaria deviate toward the low side, although the spread in that direction is narrower. Considering the low overall level of fertility in these developed societies, there is likely to be more variation within countries than between them, but the general scale of the socio-economic differentials to be examined can nevertheless be expected to be rather small.

⁵ For Denmark, marriage duration had to be calculated as that of the most recent marriage; the duration distribution is thus biased downwards to some extent, while the achieved fertility of relatively recently married women may be inflated by children born to previous marriages. For Poland, marriage duration was calculated using the date of first marriage for all respondents.

2 Background Characteristics

Type of Childhood Residence

This refers to the rural or urban character of the place where the respondent grew up. The information was usually based simply on the respondent's memory of her surroundings during late childhood. In several of the surveys the question was not asked of women who had spent their childhood in another country.

Respondents who had grown up in rural areas had consistently had more children by the time of the survey than those with an urban background, although the difference is small in most cases (table 2). However, in Poland women with rural backgrounds had one-third more children on the average than their urban counterparts and in Romania one-quarter more. The differential is also appreciable in France and Norway.

Religious Affiliation

Relatively few of the surveys included questions on religion and all of these are outside eastern Europe. The information obtained is of two types, one concerning the respondent's religious affiliation and the other concerning the extent of her involvement in religion. Among the six countries where the respondent was asked whether she belonged to any religion, the range of responses allowed for was usually limited. In France the question referred specifically to 'regular practice' of a religion, and a substantial majority of respondents fell into the category of 'no religion'. Since one religion predominates in most countries, the possibilities for inter-country comparisons of patterns are very limited. However, Catholics appear to have slightly higher fertility than other principal groups in Belgium, Great Britain and USA (table 2). France is the only country where there are sufficient Muslims to provide an estimate, and it exceeds that for Catholics by a considerable margin. Women who reported that they had no religion had clearly had the fewest births in Belgium and USA, although this is not the case in Spain.

Intensity of Religious Feeling

A similar group of countries asked, regardless of religious affiliation, about the extent of a respondent's religious participation or about the importance of religion to her. The responses to these somewhat dissimilar questions have been brought together as three categories of intensity of religious feeling. Overall there appears to be a positive association with the number of births (table 2). This is more true in the countries that are predominantly Catholic, where the differences between the most religious and

the least religious women are at least 0.5 child. Cross-classification of religious affiliation by intensity of religious feeling shows that also in Great Britain and USA the association of achieved fertility with intensity of religious feeling exists mainly among Catholics (table 3). This is not inconsistent with the emphasis in Catholic doctrine on traditional family values.

Altogether, the material on religion offered by these surveys suggests that religious beliefs and practice can have an appreciable impact on childbearing under certain circumstances. But because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence, and particularly in view of the restricted scope for examination of differentials within countries, religion is not considered in combination with other variables in the remainder of this paper.

Wife's Level of Education

The standard classification was designed to represent the level of education completed by the respondent. Five categories were provided for, ranging from women with less than elementary education to those with some post-secondary education. A high level of comparability was achieved on the whole, although strict equivalence was not always feasible due to disparities in the input information, which are themselves partly a reflection of basic differences in the education systems and institutions of the various countries. For several countries the two lowest categories are combined. The number of women with any post-secondary education is frequently small at the longer durations of marriage, and the standardized values for this category are thus apt to be less reliable than those for other groups. Because there is a certain interest in this category as such, however, it has been kept distinct from women who completed their education with higher secondary school.

A negative association between level of education and achieved fertility is evident in every country except Belgium, where there is no clear pattern (table 2). The overall differences for the range of education categories shown in some cases exceeds one child. The relationship is generally stronger at the lower than at the upper end of the education scale, implying that education is of greater potential significance in relation to fertility in countries such as Bulgaria, Spain and Yugoslavia where substantial proportions of women still have not attained the lower secondary school level. The drop from those who completed higher secondary school to those who went on to obtain at least some post-secondary education is nevertheless substantial in Czechoslovakia, Poland, USA, Yugoslavia and possibly Italy.

Table 2 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by type of childhood residence, religious affiliation, intensity of religious feeling and wife's level of education

	Belgium (Flemish)	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	Finland	France	Great Britain	Italy	Norway	Poland	Romania	Spain	USA	Yugoslavia
<i>Type of childhood residence</i>														
Rural	1.81	1.82	2.05	..	1.90	2.13	2.13	2.29	2.10	2.46	2.15	..
Urban	1.79	1.71	1.88	..	1.79	1.83	1.91	1.74	1.68	2.34	2.06	..
<i>Religious affiliation</i>														
Catholic	1.82	2.02	2.14	1.96	2.42	2.27	..
Protestant	[]	**	1.81	2.03	..
Jewish	[]	[1.70]	1.80	..
Muslim	3.00	**
Other	[2.29]	[]	[2.31]	[2.16]	2.14	[2.34]	..
None	1.45	1.95	1.70	[1.54]	2.46	1.49	..
<i>Intensity of religious feeling</i>														
Strong	1.92	2.34	2.01	2.15	2.10	2.17	..
Moderate	1.78	2.00	1.83	1.91	2.08	2.17	..
Weak	1.85	1.86	1.83	1.69	1.96	1.99	..
<i>Wife's level of education</i>														
Elementary not completed	} 1.77	2.41	} 2.35	} 2.20	} 2.01	2.51	} 2.15	2.45	} 2.40	2.70	} 2.25	2.63	} 2.76	2.43
Elementary completed		1.74				2.03		1.96		2.32		2.28		1.81
Lower secondary	1.83	1.55	2.08	1.87	1.80	1.86	1.90	1.74	2.11	1.95	1.68	2.42	2.34	} 1.57
Higher secondary	1.72	1.50	1.80	1.86	1.74	1.79	1.73	1.65	1.95	1.71	1.52	2.27	2.07	
Post-secondary	[1.90]	1.37	1.62	[1.85]	1.64	[1.66]	1.72	[1.48]	1.86	1.55	1.39	[2.41]	1.82	1.40

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1. The use of square brackets and double asterisks is explained on p 9.

Table 3 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by religious affiliation and by intensity of religious feeling

Religious affiliation	Intensity of religious feeling		
	Strong	Moderate	Weak
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>			
Catholic	1.92	1.77	1.64
<i>France</i>			
Catholic	2.22	2.05	1.47
None	2.29	1.93	1.92
<i>Great Britain</i>			
Catholic	2.20	2.18	1.89
Protestant	1.91	1.78	1.82
<i>Italy</i>			
Catholic	2.14	1.91	1.72
<i>USA</i>			
Catholic	2.50	2.25	2.13
Protestant	2.07	2.14	1.94

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

3 Current Circumstances

Type of Current Residence

This information was necessarily taken directly from the rural/urban classification provided by the countries. The definition of urban residence varied from country to country, both with respect to the nature of the criteria considered and with respect to the cut-off points adopted. The Italian definition was exceptionally restrictive, and the Spanish classification does not seem to be representative of the actual population distribution.

As was true of type of childhood residence, the average number of births is universally higher for women living in rural than for those living in urban areas at the time of the survey, and on the whole the contrast for current residence is somewhat greater than that for childhood residence (table 4). However, type of current residence appears to be of minimal importance in Italy and Spain, where the problems of definition mentioned above may be responsible, and Belgium. In so far as the definitions can be taken at face value, the rural/urban differential tends to be largest in eastern Europe and neighbouring countries (Finland, Yugoslavia); here the excess of the rural over the urban average is well over 30 per cent everywhere except Czechoslovakia. Interestingly, the disparity is typically greatest in the countries where the proportions of women living in urban areas are lowest.

Cross-classification of the mean number of live births by type of current residence and type of childhood residence gives an indication of the way in which life-time residence patterns are related to fertility (table 5). It is apparent that the main reason for the stronger effect of current as opposed to childhood residence is the low fertility of the relatively large group of women who were brought up in rural areas but were living in urban places by the time of the survey. In Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Finland, they had had only as many births as urban residents who had originated in urban places; in France, Norway, Poland and Romania they had had fewer births than women who stayed in rural areas, albeit somewhat more than those both brought up and living in urban areas. The group of women who had migrated from urban to rural areas is small in most cases, but they also appear to resemble more closely women in their current than in their former type of residence. In view of the overlap between childhood and current place of residence, together with the greater overall impact of the latter, type of place of current residence is used henceforth for the examination of residence in combination with other variables.

Type of residence and level of education are usually not independent of one another, and they may thus be inter-related in their impact on fertility. The standardized means cross-classified by the two variables suggest that the rural/urban differential can often be accounted for at least partly in terms of differences in the educational structure of

the two residence categories (table 5). In Bulgaria, the difference by type of residence nearly disappears, and in Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia it is generally smaller within educational categories than for the whole country. On the other hand, the relationship by education typically remains strong for both types of residence. In Finland it is largely confined to rural residents, however, while in Czechoslovakia and France the principal differences by education are among women living in urban areas.

Size of Place of Current Residence

This variable represents essentially a further breakdown of urban residence. For most countries, the village category is identical with rural type of place of current residence. Once again the classification is based on varying quantitative and qualitative criteria, although in each case there is a clear progression from one category to the next. A strong negative relationship with achieved fertility emerges along this continuum in Czechoslovakia, Finland, Norway and Poland (table 4). In other countries such as Denmark and France, the negative association is present but relatively weak, while in Yugoslavia the only real difference appears to be between those who live in villages and those who live in any larger place.

Husband's Level of Education

The construction of this variable was in most respects identical to wife's level of education. The volume of missing data is somewhat larger than for other characteristics considered so far, amounting to 5 per cent for Finland. As expected, the average number of live births declines as husband's level of education rises (table 4). Similarly to wife's level of education, the largest differences appear at the lower end of the educational distribution, and, where this comparison can be made, especially between women whose husbands had less than a primary education and those whose husbands had completed primary school only. The number of respondents with husbands who had gone on to acquire some post-secondary education is generally large enough to warrant observing with interest that in several countries outside eastern Europe, the mean number of births appears to be higher for this group than for women whose husbands completed their education with higher secondary school (Belgium, Finland, Great Britain, Spain).

An obvious reason for the similarity in the ways in which wife's and husband's level of education are related to achieved fertility is their association with each other. Spouses are typically more or less alike in their educational background, to the extent that the range of one variable

that can be examined within any given category of the other is limited. Nevertheless the results suggest that each of the two has some importance independent of the other in most countries (table 6). The relationship with level of education of one spouse tends to be replicated within levels of education of the other spouse. As would be expected, the differences between groups that fall towards the low end of both education scales are relatively large, while they are of much less importance at the upper end. The tendency for the two sets of effects to be mutually reinforcing is fairly general, but in Poland, at least, wife's education does appear to explain largely the influence of husband's education, since the independent effects of the latter are relatively small. Moreover, there is fairly widespread evidence that the negative effects of husband's education weaken or become positive as wife's education increases (Finland, France, Great Britain, Spain, USA); this progression generates the J-shaped relationship by husband's education in some countries.

Not surprisingly, the picture presented by the cross-classification of the standardized means of husband's level of education and type of current residence resembles that for wife's level of education on the whole, but it appears also to be more complex (table 6). The overall residential differentials are again somewhat reduced within categories of husband's education (Bulgaria, Denmark, Romania). In certain countries the expected residence differential holds only or mainly for the higher categories of husband's education (Bulgaria, France, Norway, Yugoslavia), while on the other hand in Denmark rural residence is associated with higher achieved fertility only among women whose husbands had at most an elementary education. Differences by husband's education do often persist within each type of residence, but they are much more marked among urban women in France and Yugoslavia while they are more evident among rural women in Finland. The upturn in achieved fertility for women whose husbands had some post-secondary education emerges as an exclusively urban phenomenon (Belgium, Finland, Spain).

Husband's Socio-Occupational Status

It was not difficult to establish broad categories of husband's occupation on the basis of the information supplied by the countries (agricultural, manual outside agriculture, non-manual outside agriculture, other). The exception was Bulgaria, where the agricultural category had to be defined simply as the equivalent of rural residence. However, one of the principal reasons for interest in occupation in relation to fertility is as an indicator of social status. Many countries provided data on occupation in some degree of detail, and despite serious discrepancies in the national classification systems, it was possible to devise a common format that attempts to capture status variations within each of the three basic categories. Women whose husbands were unemployed were usually left out altogether, and the information on husband's occupation is missing for as many as five per cent of eligible women (Yugoslavia). The group of 'other' occupations given for some countries is too small and too heterogeneous for meaningful comparisons.

Among the three basic occupational groups, the wives of agricultural workers have the highest level of achieved

fertility in most countries (table 4). Failure to observe this relationship in Bulgaria could be due to the problem of definition referred to above. The other clearly divergent case is France. The contrast between women whose husbands were agricultural workers and those married to workers in non-agricultural occupations is particularly sharp in Belgium, Italy, Poland, Romania, USA and Yugoslavia. Outside agriculture, the wives of manual workers have higher average numbers of births than those of non-manual workers (except in Italy), but the difference is striking only in France, Poland and Romania. Thus overall differences by occupation appear to be most important for Poland and Romania.

Turning to the detailed classification, comparisons within the agricultural sector are possible for five countries; higher status is associated with lower fertility in Great Britain, Italy and Spain but with somewhat higher fertility in Finland and Poland. In so far as can be determined, among women whose husbands were manual workers a higher level of skill is fairly consistently associated with fewer births (Belgium, France, Great Britain, Italy, USA). There is very little difference between the two non-manual categories except in Yugoslavia, where the higher status group had fewer births. In sum, relative social status does appear to have some impact on fertility independent of broad occupational grouping, and the expected negative association emerges particularly clearly among manual workers.

Since occupation and residence are to some extent identified with one another, the cross-classification of these two variables yields a limited number of comparisons (table 7). For purposes of this tabulation, status is reduced effectively to two categories for the agricultural and manual as well as the non-manual occupations. But since agricultural workers are highly concentrated among rural residents, differences by status within the agricultural sector for the total samples essentially reflect those for rural residents. The only apparent exception is Poland, where the positive association of status and fertility in the total agricultural sector results from the lower achieved fertility of women whose husbands were urban agricultural employees, and there is no difference by status among the wives of rural agricultural workers. Non-manual and manual workers outside agriculture are predominantly urban but less homogenous with respect to residence than agricultural workers. Where the data are available, the negative differential by status among the wives of manual workers appears to hold for both residence groups. In Italy a weak negative relationship between fertility and status does emerge for the wives of urban non-manual workers, whereas in Yugoslavia, the negative relationship noted for the total sample appears to be confined mainly to women married to rural non-manual workers.

It is plausible that the impact of husband's occupation on fertility could be to some extent a function of his education. Unfortunately, the sample numbers are sufficient to provide meaningful comparisons only for the basic occupational categories, and even here full comparisons are not always possible. In general, the contrast by occupation appears to be greatest at the lower levels of education where both agricultural workers and manual workers outside agriculture are usually concentrated (table 7). One reason for this is the failure of the means to decline

Table 4 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by type of current residence, size of place of current residence, husband's level of education, husband's socio-occupational status, family income, husband's income and number of rooms in the dwelling

	Belgium (Flemish)	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	Finland	France	Great Britain	Italy	Norway	Poland	Romania	Spain	USA	Yugoslavia
Type of current residence														
Rural	1.85	1.97	2.16	2.16	2.09	2.19	..	1.98	2.18	2.47	2.25	2.45	..	2.45
Urban	1.78	1.64	1.89	1.94	1.71	1.93	..	1.89	1.91	1.82	1.74	2.40	..	1.96
Size of current residence														
Village	1.85	..	2.16	2.16	2.16	2.19	2.18	2.47	..	2.38	..	2.34
Small town	1.78	..	2.14	2.15	1.98	1.96	..	1.98	2.07	2.12	..	2.48	..	1.98
Medium-sized town	1.89	..	1.87	1.88	1.77	2.00	..	1.93	1.90	1.85	..	2.55	..	} 1.90
Large town	1.78	..	1.69	1.93	1.61	1.93	..	1.85	} 1.69	} 1.66	..	2.40	..	
City	1.69	..	1.53	1.84	1.55	1.77	2.20	..	
Husband's level of education														
Elem. not completed	} 1.85	2.39	..	} 2.14	} 1.97	2.31	} 2.00	2.53	} 2.22	2.67	} 1.75	2.62	} 2.66	2.52
Elem. completed		1.73	..			2.06		2.02		2.37		2.30		2.02
Lower secondary	1.72	1.58	..	1.88	1.84	1.96	1.91	1.83	2.19	2.00	1.95	2.33	2.27	} 1.77
Higher secondary	1.73	1.57	..	1.83	1.72	1.75	1.71	1.71	2.00	1.71	1.66	2.33	2.05	
Post-secondary	1.91	1.41	..	1.85	1.78	1.80	1.79	[1.66]	1.93	1.54	1.46	2.58	1.93	1.70
Husband's socio-occupational status														
<i>Agricultural workers</i>	2.23	1.68	2.07	2.04	2.02	2.33	2.26	2.51	2.44	2.58	2.62	2.44
Independent farmers	2.23	2.01	[1.90]	2.17	..	2.60	..	2.38	2.28	..
Employees	1.93	[2.28]	[2.16]	2.49	..	2.39	..	} 2.73	[3.43]	..
Unpaid family workers	[2.06]	**	..	**	..	[2.52]
Manual workers														
<i>outside agriculture</i>	1.80	1.74	1.86	2.20	1.92	1.91	2.14	2.10	2.12	2.41	2.19	2.11
Skilled workers	1.72	2.07	1.86	1.84	2.12	..
Semi-skilled workers	1.85	2.47	2.02	2.25	..
Unskilled workers	1.81	2.32	2.09	2.29	..
Non-manual workers														
<i>outside agriculture</i>	1.75	1.48	1.76	1.83	1.74	1.94	1.93	1.64	1.46	2.35	1.96	1.90
Managerial, tech. and prof. workers	1.82	1.73	1.92	1.72	1.85	1.93	2.36	1.95	1.82
Other non-manual workers	1.68	1.78	1.79	1.75	1.94	1.92	2.34	1.98	2.04
<i>Other workers</i>	**	[2.04]	..	1.83	1.95	1.91	[2.59]

[Table continues]

Table 4 (cont.)

	Belgium (Flemish)	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	Finland	France	Great Britain	Italy	Norway	Poland	Romania	Spain	USA	Yugoslavia
Family income^a														
Very low	2.01	1.86	2.10	2.05	1.86	2.59	[2.29]	2.19	1.92	..	2.53	..
Low	1.95	1.72	1.82	2.12	1.71	2.10	2.07	1.94	} 2.06	..	2.21	..
Medium	1.80	1.62	1.84	1.96	1.63	1.85	1.98	1.81		..	2.08	..
High	1.55	1.51	1.95	1.68	1.66	1.51	1.65	1.80		..	1.91	..
Very high	1.79	1.49	1.87	1.76	1.66	1.57	1.68	1.60	1.57	..	1.84	..
Husband's income^a														
Very low	1.66	2.15	1.62	2.23	1.93	1.93	2.26	..
Low	1.62	1.86	1.64	2.03	1.89	1.97	2.22	..
Medium	1.75	1.94	1.74	1.93	1.91	1.61	2.00	..
High	1.88	1.79	1.70	1.94	1.86	1.86	2.04	..
Very high	1.95	1.89	1.82	1.79	1.98	1.73	2.01	..
Number of rooms in dwelling														
No room	[1.63]	2.45
1 room	..	1.96	**	**	**	**	..	[2.74]	**	2.07
2 rooms	..	1.93	1.54	1.31	1.58	1.48	..	2.03	[1.45]	2.14
3 rooms	..	1.74	1.87	1.83	1.70	1.71	..	2.01	1.74	2.02
4 rooms	..	1.69	2.04	1.95	1.90	2.01	..	1.86	1.99	2.14
5 or more rooms	..	1.80	2.29	2.17	2.10	2.31	..	1.97	2.24	2.37

^aRestricted to *urban residents* except for the USA where all respondents are included.

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

	Type of current residence	
	Rural	Urban
Type of childhood residence		
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>		
Rural	1.85	1.76
Urban	1.83	1.78
<i>Bulgaria</i>		
Rural	1.98	1.64
Urban	2.40	1.67
<i>Czechoslovakia</i>		
Rural	2.17	1.93
Urban	2.06	1.86
<i>Finland</i>		
Rural	2.10	1.71
Urban	2.03	1.74
<i>France</i>		
Rural	2.26	1.98
Urban	2.01	1.80
<i>Norway</i>		
Rural	2.21	1.98
Urban	2.09	1.84
<i>Poland</i>		
Rural	2.49	1.99
Urban	2.16	1.72
<i>Romania</i>		
Rural	2.25	1.80
Urban	2.07	1.66
<i>Spain</i>		
Rural	2.47	2.45
Urban	[2.31]	2.35
Wife's level of education		
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>		
Elementary or less	1.84	1.76
Lower secondary	1.88	1.82
Higher secondary	[1.82]	1.71
Post-secondary	**	[1.91]
<i>Bulgaria</i>		
Elementary not completed	2.38	2.35
Elementary completed	1.80	1.68
Lower secondary	1.59	1.53
Higher secondary	1.60	1.47
Post-secondary	[1.44]	1.36
<i>Czechoslovakia</i>		
Elementary or less	2.46	2.28
Lower secondary	2.22	2.00
Higher secondary	1.86	1.78
Post-secondary	1.84	1.58
<i>Denmark</i>		
Elementary or less	2.30	2.15
Lower secondary	2.15	1.81
Higher secondary	1.96	1.84
Post-secondary	**	[1.81]

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

Table 6 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by husband's level of education and by wife's level of education and type of current residence

	Husband's level of education				
	Elementary not completed	Elementary completed	Lower secondary	Higher secondary	Post-secondary
Wife's level of education					
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>					
Elementary or less	1.81		1.66	1.77	[1.64]
Lower secondary	1.96		1.80	1.74	1.91
Higher secondary	1.90		1.73	1.63	1.80
Post secondary	**		**	[2.07]	[1.96]
<i>Denmark</i>					
Elementary or less	2.27		1.99	1.90	[2.47]
Lower secondary	1.92		1.84	[1.81]	**
Higher secondary	1.90		1.85	1.85	[1.82]
Post-secondary	**		**	[1.81]	[1.82]
<i>Finland</i>					
Elementary or less	2.07		1.92	1.84	[1.80]
Lower secondary	1.86		1.86	1.73	1.62
Higher secondary	1.73		1.82	1.70	1.89
Post-secondary	[1.95]		[1.11]	**	1.69
<i>France</i>					
Elementary not completed	2.58	2.53	2.52	[1.73]	**
Elem. completed	2.08	2.06	1.98	1.82	[1.25]
Lower secondary	[2.42]	1.93	1.92	[1.64]	[1.67]
Higher secondary	[1.75]	1.82	[1.69]	1.77	1.95
Post-secondary	**	**	[1.56]	[1.74]	[1.63]
<i>Great Britain</i>					
Elementary or less	[2.27]		[2.18]	[2.04]	**
Lower secondary	1.88		1.97	1.72	[1.45]
Higher secondary	1.96		1.76	1.72	1.87
Post-secondary	[1.60]		[1.36]	1.60	1.88
<i>Italy</i>					
Elementary not completed	2.62	2.50	2.07	[2.28]	**
Elem. completed	2.46	1.95	1.94	1.73	[1.84]
Lower secondary	**	1.83	1.68	1.71	[1.84]
Higher secondary	**	[1.86]	[1.62]	1.67	[1.71]
Post-secondary	..	**	[1.94]	**	**
<i>Norway</i>					
Elementary or less	[2.65]		2.50	[2.11]	**
Lower secondary	2.16		2.20	2.06	[2.13]
Higher secondary	1.99		2.01	1.94	1.85
Post-secondary	**		**	[1.69]	[1.91]
<i>Poland</i>					
Elementary not completed	2.69	2.82	[2.52]	[]	**
Elem. completed	[2.58]	2.41	2.18	1.91	[1.77]
Lower secondary	[2.60]	2.11	1.93	1.76	[1.90]
Higher secondary	**	2.04	1.75	1.66	1.56
Post-secondary	..	[1.93]	1.94	1.53	1.45
<i>Spain</i>					
Elementary not completed	2.69	2.51	2.35	2.34	**
Elem. completed	2.30	2.25	2.40	2.27	[2.57]
Lower secondary	[2.32]	[2.20]	2.33	2.48	[2.60]
Higher secondary	**	[2.02]	[1.98]	2.33	2.70
Post-secondary	**	**	**	[2.11]	[2.63]

Table 6 (cont.)

	Husband's level of education				
	Elementary not completed	Elementary completed	Lower secondary	Higher secondary	Post-secondary
<i>USA</i>					
Elementary or less	2.96		2.80	2.24	**
Lower secondary	2.49		2.46	2.22	2.23
Higher secondary	2.49		2.03	2.05	2.03
Post-secondary	[2.12]		2.14	1.80	1.79
<i>Yugoslavia</i>					
Elementary not completed	2.56	2.22		2.41	[2.65]
Elem. completed	2.11	1.80		1.71	1.79
Lower or higher secondary	[]	1.60		1.47	1.66
Post-secondary	..	**		[1.09]	1.45
Type of current residence					
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>					
Rural	1.86		1.83	[1.80]	[2.41]
Urban	1.85		1.70	1.73	1.87
<i>Bulgaria</i>					
Rural	2.39	1.82	1.79	1.85	1.50
Urban	2.37	1.65	1.50	1.48	1.40
<i>Denmark</i>					
Rural	2.28		1.95	[1.91]	[1.99]
Urban	2.07		1.87	1.81	[1.86]
<i>Finland</i>					
Rural	2.15		2.04	1.94	1.95
Urban	1.79		1.72	1.63	1.74
<i>France</i>					
Rural	2.13	2.27	2.19	2.05	**
Urban	2.41	1.94	1.86	1.65	1.79
<i>Italy</i>					
Rural	2.54	2.03	1.83	[1.71]	**
Urban	2.51	1.99	1.82	1.70	[1.59]
<i>Norway</i>					
Rural	2.21		2.32	2.08	[2.20]
Urban	2.15		1.98	1.94	1.84
<i>Poland</i>					
Rural	2.73	2.58	2.30	2.08	1.89
Urban	2.45	2.08	1.87	1.64	1.49
<i>Romania</i>					
Rural	2.37		2.01	1.85	1.63
Urban	2.06		1.91	1.57	1.44
<i>Spain</i>					
Rural	2.60	2.29	[2.38]	[2.47]	**
Urban	2.62	2.31	2.26	2.27	2.57
<i>Yugoslavia</i>					
Rural	2.52	2.37		2.20	[1.95]
Urban	2.54	1.88		1.69	1.67

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

Table 7 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by husband's socio-occupational status and by type of current residence and husband's level of education

Type of current residence	Husband's socio-occupational status						
	Agricultural workers			Manual workers outside agriculture		Non-manual workers outside agriculture	
	Independent farmers	Co-operative members	Employees unpaid family workers	Skilled workers	Semi-skilled and unskilled workers	Managerial, tech. and prof. workers	Other non-manual workers
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>							
Rural	2.20	1.78	1.77	1.86	1.79
Urban	2.10	1.71	1.87	1.82	1.67
<i>Finland</i>							
Rural	2.25	..	2.10	2.12	..	1.91	1.93
Urban	2.12	..	1.78	1.71	..	1.68	1.71
<i>France</i>							
Rural	2.02	..	2.25	2.24	2.63	2.51	2.00
Urban	2.03	..	2.18	1.99	2.41	1.85	1.72
<i>Italy</i>							
Rural	2.25	..	2.42	1.82	2.05	2.14	1.99
Urban	1.84	..	2.50	1.86	2.17	1.62	1.88
<i>Norway</i>							
Rural	2.29	..	2.23	2.03	2.07
Urban	**	..	2.00	1.87	1.80
<i>Poland</i>							
Rural	2.60	..	2.55	2.46	..	1.98	..
Urban	2.62	..	2.07	1.92	..	1.58	..
<i>Spain</i>							
Rural	2.38	..	2.71	..	2.28	2.74	2.41
Urban	2.41	..	2.73	..	2.44	2.30	2.36
<i>Yugoslavia</i>							
Rural	..	2.44	..	2.43	..	2.10	2.45
Urban	..	2.40	..	1.96	..	1.76	1.88
Husband's level of education	Husband's socio-occupational status						
	Agricultural workers			Manual workers outside agriculture		Non-manual workers outside agriculture	
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>							
Elementary or less		1.92		1.87		1.73	
Lower secondary		2.61		1.69		1.64	
Higher secondary		**		1.64		1.76	
Post-secondary		**		**		1.90	
<i>Finland</i>							
Elementary or less		2.10		1.94		1.86	
Lower secondary		1.98		1.82		1.76	
Higher secondary		1.96		1.68		1.71	
Post-secondary		[1.98]		**		1.79	

Table 7 (cont.)

Husband's level of education (cont.)	Husband's socio-occupational status		
	Agricultural workers	Manual workers outside agriculture	Non-manual workers outside agriculture
<i>France</i>			
Elementary not completed	[2.01]	2.32	2.19
Elementary completed	[1.82]	2.30	1.79
Lower secondary	[2.03]	2.04	1.90
Higher secondary	**	[2.19]	1.74
Post-secondary	**	**	1.80
<i>Great Britain</i>			
Elementary or less	[2.01]	2.08	1.87
Lower secondary	[2.11]	1.93	1.82
Higher secondary	[1.76]	1.91	1.62
Post-secondary	**	[1.55]	1.79
<i>Italy</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.81	2.38	[2.48]
Elementary completed	2.18	1.95	2.12
Lower secondary	[2.11]	1.70	1.94
Higher secondary	**	[1.66]	1.72
Post-secondary	**	**	[1.66]
<i>Norway</i>			
Elementary or less	[2.55]	2.22	[1.86]
Lower secondary	2.17	2.24	1.99
Higher secondary	[2.28]	2.07	1.89
Post-secondary	**	**	1.96
<i>Poland</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.80	2.55	..
Elementary completed	2.57	2.26	[2.21]
Lower secondary	2.35	1.95	2.29
Higher secondary	2.04	1.80	1.66
Post-secondary	1.63	[1.64]	1.53
<i>Spain</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.83	2.58	2.42
Elementary completed	2.26	2.34	2.26
Lower secondary	[1.81]	2.26	2.37
Higher secondary	[3.25]	2.20	2.38
Post-secondary	**	**	2.58
<i>USA</i>			
Elementary or less	[3.49]	2.65	2.38
Lower secondary	[2.34]	2.31	2.08
Higher secondary	[2.25]	2.08	1.99
Post-secondary	[1.90]	1.96	1.92
<i>Yugoslavia</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.45	2.44	2.53
Elementary completed	2.44	1.95	1.97
Lower or higher secondary	[2.03]	1.79	1.78
Post-secondary	**	**	1.70

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

among women married to non-manual workers as the level of husband's education rises in most countries outside eastern Europe (Belgium, Finland, France, Great Britain, Norway, Spain). In sum, there is little evidence to suggest that differences in achieved fertility by broad classes of husband's occupation can be explained by the husband's level of education.

Family Income

Income is primarily an indicator of standard of living. The three income variables used in this report were prepared in parallel fashion (family income, husband's income and wife's income, the last being taken up below in connection with the respondent's employment). Each refers to income around the time of the survey. The data have been converted to approximate quintile classes that indicate relative standing within the pertinent distribution for each national sample. Only three classes were given for Romania. Since problems of income measurement are more severe in rural than in urban areas, these variables are restricted to urban residents, except for the USA where type of current resi-

dence is not available and the entire sample is included. The information was usually not collected for unemployed persons. In addition to practical considerations of this sort, there are various conceptual problems associated with the use of survey information on income in studies of fertility, and it should be recognized that only a superficial examination of the topic is possible in the present context.

Family income is intended to represent income from all sources. Most countries asked a specific question on this, but in some cases the variable was obtained by summing the spouses' earnings. The volume of non-response is over ten per cent of eligible cases for Belgium, Denmark, Norway and USA and is relatively high elsewhere outside eastern Europe.

Achieved fertility clearly declines as family income rises in Bulgaria, France, Norway, Poland and USA, and there is some evidence also of negative effects, usually at the lower end of the income scale, in Czechoslovakia, Denmark and Finland (table 4). In Belgium the association is negative at the lower end of the income scale but turns upwards for families in the very high income category. On the other hand, Romanian families with very high

Table 8 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by husband's income and by husband's level of education^a

Husband's level of education	Husband's income				
	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>					
Elementary or less	1.75	1.72	1.87	1.87	2.10
Lower secondary	1.51	1.55	1.63	1.81	1.99
Higher secondary	[1.54]	[1.57]	1.73	1.91	1.83
Post-secondary	**	**	[1.52]	**	1.94
<i>Denmark</i>					
Elementary or less	2.28	1.94	1.99	1.94	1.98
Lower secondary	[1.87]	[1.64]	[2.03]	1.74	[2.12]
Higher secondary	**	[1.91]	[1.68]	1.76	1.75
Post-secondary	**	**	**	**	[2.01]
<i>Finland</i>					
Elementary or less	1.62	1.72	1.89	1.84	1.61
Lower secondary	1.81	1.65	1.77	1.65	1.89
Higher secondary	[1.45]	[1.63]	1.57	1.63	1.86
Post-secondary	[1.72]	**	[1.49]	1.70	1.85
<i>Poland</i>					
Elementary not completed	[1.70]	[2.71]	**	[]	**
Elementary completed	2.15	2.03	1.76	2.33	2.00
Lower secondary	1.90	2.05	1.61	1.93	1.83
Higher secondary	1.49	1.75	1.54	1.67	1.65
Post-secondary	[1.69]	[1.95]	1.41	1.48	1.52
<i>USA</i>					
Elementary or less	2.68	2.86	2.12	[2.55]	[2.06]
Lower secondary	2.66	2.21	2.21	2.18	2.23
Higher secondary	2.24	2.00	2.00	2.02	2.06
Post-secondary	[1.47]	2.30	1.88	2.02	1.98

^aRestricted to *urban residents* except for the USA where all respondents are included.

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

Table 9 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by number of rooms in the dwelling and by type of current residence

Type of current residence	Number of rooms in dwelling					
	No room	1 room	2 rooms	3 rooms	4 rooms	5 or more rooms
<i>Bulgaria</i>						
Rural	..	[2.27]	2.31	2.09	1.88	1.88
Urban	..	1.85	1.79	1.59	1.55	1.67
<i>Czechoslovakia</i>						
Rural	**	**	2.24	2.10	2.16	2.41
Urban	[1.60]	**	1.64	1.81	1.99	2.19
<i>Denmark</i>						
Rural	..	**	**	2.06	2.04	2.30
Urban	..	**	1.32	1.77	1.92	2.12
<i>Finland</i>						
Rural	..	**	2.03	2.01	2.11	2.20
Urban	..	**	1.35	1.52	1.75	2.02
<i>France</i>						
Rural	..	**	[1.92]	2.02	2.12	2.39
Urban	..	**	1.28	1.59	1.96	2.28
<i>Italy</i>						
Rural	..	**	2.10	2.07	1.86	2.01
Urban	..	[2.79]	1.97	1.92	1.87	1.85
<i>Norway</i>						
Rural	**	1.91	2.09	2.30
Urban	..	**	[1.37]	1.63	1.88	2.14
<i>Poland</i>						
Rural	2.70	2.50	2.55	2.44	2.48	2.57
Urban	[1.72]	1.70	1.82	1.81	1.94	2.18

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

incomes were particularly small. Since family income is made up principally of husband's and wife's earnings, which may themselves be differently related to fertility, it is useful to examine the two components separately (see p 33 for wife's income).

Husband's Income

This is usually the dominant element in family income. The variable refers as far as possible specifically to the husband's earnings from employment. Again with the exception of the eastern European countries, missing data frequently pose a serious problem; more than a quarter of eligible respondents failed to answer the question on husband's earnings in Denmark.

On the whole, it appears that the average number of births declines somewhat less as husband's income rises than was true of family income (table 4). Some negative effect is evident in Denmark, France, Poland and USA; this is concentrated at the lower end of the income scale in Denmark and USA. No relationship emerges in the Norwegian data, but there may be a slightly U-shaped relationship in Belgium and Finland.

The question immediately arises as to whether the impact of husband's income on achieved fertility is due

mainly to the obvious association between husband's income and husband's education. This seems all the more likely since the countries where the negative relationship with husband's income is least evident are those where an upturn in the average number of births was found at the higher levels of husband's education. The comparison is possible for five countries; France and Norway are omitted because the samples are too small to provide stable standardized statistics for most cells in the cross-classification (table 8). In Denmark and USA the negative effect of husband's income at the lower end of the scale is perceptible within levels of education. Unexpectedly, the positive relationship with husband's income is strongest at the lower levels of husband's education in Belgium, but in Finland it becomes more accentuated as husband's education increases. Whatever differences there are by husband's income in Poland almost disappear within categories of husband's education. Thus, except possibly for Poland, there is no basis for concluding that the various relationships of achieved fertility with husband's income can be accounted for by husband's education.

Number of Rooms in the Dwelling

The size of the family living quarters represents a different

dimension of standard of living. This question is of special interest in relation to fertility in some eastern European countries where limited accommodation has been suggested as a reason for the curtailment of family size. Inter-country comparability is lacking to some extent due to variation in the definition of both the quarters available to the individual family and the rooms that were to be counted.

Among the eight countries for which information is available, the number of births is typically positively related to the number of rooms in the dwelling (table 4). The exceptions are Bulgaria, Italy and Poland. However, one would expect housing to be a more critical issue in urban than in rural areas. When attention is confined to urban residents, the positive association appears even stronger everywhere outside eastern Europe except Italy (table 9).

There is also a positive relationship for urban residents in Czechoslovakia and Poland, but it is relatively weak, while in Bulgaria the direction of association appears to be negative if anything. This does not necessarily imply that living space is less relevant to fertility decisions in the East than in other parts of Europe. Where there is a free housing market, the size of the family living quarters is more likely to be a consequence than a determinant of family size, and this probably accounts for the positive association in northern and western countries. If the average housing unit in eastern countries is quite small, as would appear to be the case from the distributions of the samples by number of rooms in the dwelling that underlie the means, and housing is allocated on a basis other than family size, lack of living space could be an important consideration without being evident in this type of comparison.

4 The Respondent's Employment

Work History

This summary variable indicates whether the respondent was working at the time of the interview, whether she was not working then but had worked at some time since marriage, or whether she had not worked at all since marriage. The attempt to break each of these categories down according to whether or not the respondent had worked before marriage was unsuccessful because the respective numbers of women who had not worked before marriage were too small for analysis in virtually all cases. The precise criteria used to determine whether a respondent was currently working and whether she had worked previously differed from country to country, and for any given country the two did not necessarily match each other.

The familiar negative association between childbearing and employment stands out clearly in the overall results (table 10). The difference between currently employed women and others appears to be especially large in Belgium, France and Great Britain, where it amounts to at least 0.5 child. One may speculate that in countries where work is more an option for women than a necessity, there is a more direct trade-off between employment and childbearing. In most countries women who had not worked at all since marriage also had somewhat more births than those who were not currently working but had worked since marriage. This contrast is especially sharp in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

There are many aspects of a respondent's early background and current circumstances that might be thought to explain the strong link between a respondent's work history and her achieved fertility. The propensity to work may be a function of her education or where the family lives. Similarly, work decisions may reflect her husband's socio-occupational status or his income. These cross-tabulations are shown in table 11. In many cases it was necessary to collapse the work history variable into a simple 'currently working'/'not currently working' dichotomy in order to provide groups which are large enough for comparisons.

In seven of the twelve countries for which work history can be examined by level of education, there is evidence that the association of employment with smaller average numbers of births pertains mainly to women at the lower levels of education and diminishes as level of education rises at least up through secondary school (Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, Italy, Poland, USA, Yugoslavia). As already noted, less well educated women generally had more births than better educated women, and in these countries such large families were concentrated among women who were not working, or where this group can be distinguished, specifically among women who had not worked at all since marriage. Only in Great Britain does it appear that the fact of having a job may be less

important among women with little education than among those with more. As a whole, it seems that the respondent's educational background accounts for the effects of work history only to a limited extent.

The differences by work history also remain important within categories of type of current residence. However, in several countries the patterns differ somewhat between rural and urban areas. In Belgium, Denmark, Poland and Romania it appears that the employment of married women is more closely linked with achieved fertility in urban than in rural areas, while the reverse may be true of Bulgaria and Finland. Such mixed results do not offer much support for the hypothesis that there is less conflict between employment and childbearing in the rural than in the urban setting. It should be kept in mind, however, that this comparison could be particularly sensitive to differences among the countries in the way agricultural labour and unpaid family workers were treated during the data collection and processing stages (see the discussion of employment status below).

Finally, the results do not suggest that the effect of work history can be accounted for by the occupation or income of the husband. According to this hypothesis, the low fertility of working women would reflect a greater likelihood of such women having husbands in non-manual occupations outside agriculture and in high income groups. Work history remains important within broad categories of husband's occupation. As was found in the case of work history and education, there is also evidence of interaction between these two variables: in Belgium, Finland and France work history seems to have greater impact among the wives of manual than among the wives of non-manual workers outside agriculture, but the opposite may be true of Yugoslavia. The picture with regard to husband's income is analogous. Differences by work history persist within categories of husband's income in all of the countries for which this cross-tabulation can be presented, but at the same time the work history differential diminishes as husband's income rises in Belgium, France and USA.

Proportion of Time Worked since Marriage

Several of the surveys included a question on how much the respondent had worked since marriage. Where the results were provided in sufficient detail, an estimate could be made of the fraction of total years of marriage duration that this represented. Among women who had been employed since marriage at all, the average number of births declines rather sharply as the proportion of time spent in employment increases (table 10). This relationship is especially marked in Norway and Czechoslovakia, where the difference between those who had worked less than one-third of the time and those who had worked more than two-thirds of the time since they married is over 0.6

Table 10 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by work history, proportion of time worked since marriage, employment status, occupation, full-time or part-time work, place of work, and wife's income

	Belgium (Flemish)	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	Finland	France	Great Britain	Italy	Norway	Poland	Romania	Spain	USA	Yugoslavia
<i>Work history</i>														
Currently working	1.54	1.75	1.88	1.86	1.78	1.64	1.60	1.74	1.90	2.01	1.96	2.11	1.81	1.78
Not working, worked since marriage ^a	2.03	2.11	2.35	2.25	2.07	2.24	2.11	1.96	2.23	2.18	} 2.25	2.32	2.22	1.93
Worked only before marriage or never ^b	2.11	2.19	3.01	2.10	2.30	2.56	2.27	2.15	2.40	2.36		2.56	2.58	2.50
<i>Proportion of time worked since marriage^c</i>														
Less than one-third	2.39	..	2.21	2.31	2.29	..	2.41
One to two-thirds	2.16	..	1.80	2.00	2.02	..	2.17
More than two-thirds	1.75	..	1.69	1.63	2.04	..	2.07
<i>Employment status^d</i>														
Self-employed	[1.68]	[1.60]	1.82	1.79	2.01	2.63	..	2.02	..	2.41
Family worker ^e	2.17	2.23	2.13	2.35	2.62	2.07
Employee	1.85	1.82	1.70	1.68	1.84	1.84	..	2.14	..	1.60
Co-operative member	2.05
Other	[1.52]
<i>Occupation^d</i>														
Prof., tech. and related	1.86	[2.06]	1.71	1.53
Admin., exec., managerial	[1.27]	[1.69]	1.61	1.47
Clerical workers	1.54	[1.77]	1.69	1.70
Sales workers	1.86	2.05	1.88	1.56
Farmers, fishermen, hunters, etc	2.62	2.41	**	2.09
Transport and communications	1.97	**	[2.29]	} 1.73
Crafts, production, other labourers	1.76	1.90	2.00	
Service, sport and recreation	2.18	2.28	2.08	..
Unclassifiable	1.81
Armed forces	**
<i>Full-time or part- time work^d</i>														
Part-time	1.83	1.98	2.02	..	1.89	1.87	2.23	2.24	2.08	..
Full-time	1.42	1.82	1.75	..	1.33	1.69	1.74	2.10	1.77	..

	Belgium (Flemish)	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	Finland	France	Great Britain	Italy	Norway	Poland	Romania	Spain	USA	Yugoslavia
<i>Place of work^d</i>														
At home	1.87	2.21	2.20	1.82	1.90	2.03
Away from home	1.42	1.83	1.69	1.74	1.96	2.14
<i>Wife's income^f</i>														
Very low	1.68	1.72	..	2.00	1.82	1.85	1.98	2.03	2.02	..
Low	1.23	1.61	..	1.82	1.55	1.62	2.02	1.80	2.04	..
Medium	1.23	1.56	..	1.99	1.58	1.51	1.76	1.78	1.81	..
High	1.24	1.50	..	1.64	1.53	1.59	1.58	1.57	1.66	..
Very high	1.57	1.39	..	[1.50]	1.66	1.44	1.36	1.53	1.56	..

^aFor Denmark, includes all women who were not working but had worked previously.

^bFor Denmark, restricted to women who had never worked.

^cRestricted to women who had worked since marriage.

^dRestricted to women who were currently working.

^eIn Czechoslovakia and Spain, unpaid family workers were considered as not working.

^fRestricted to currently working urban residents except for the USA where all currently working women are included.

NOTE: See footnotes to table 1.

Table 11 Average number of live births, standardized by duration of marriage, by work history and by wife's level of education, type of current residence, husband's socio-occupational status and husband's income

	Work history		
	Currently working	Not currently working	
		Worked since marriage	Worked only before marriage or never
Wife's level of education			
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>			
Elementary or less	1.46	2.02	2.10
Lower secondary	1.53	2.07	2.20
Higher secondary	1.58	1.94	1.92
Post-secondary	[1.88]	[2.12]	[2.11]
<i>Czechoslovakia</i>			
Elementary or less	2.15	2.96	
Lower secondary	2.00	2.44	
Higher secondary	1.75	[2.20]	
Post-secondary	1.60	[1.84]	
<i>Denmark</i>			
Elementary or less	2.06	2.39	
Lower secondary	1.71	2.13	
Higher secondary	1.78	2.05	
Post-secondary	[1.63]	[2.31]	
<i>Finland</i>			
Elementary or less	1.88	2.29	
Lower secondary	1.72	2.06	
Higher secondary	1.67	2.04	
Post-secondary	1.61	[1.73]	
<i>France</i>			
Elementary not completed	1.73	2.90	
Elementary completed	1.67	2.35	
Lower secondary	1.57	2.22	
Higher secondary	1.58	2.17	
Post-secondary	[1.58]	**	
<i>Great Britain</i>			
Elementary or less	2.01	2.21	
Lower secondary	1.64	2.22	
Higher secondary	1.48	2.04	
Post-secondary	1.48	2.03	
<i>Italy</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.07	2.61	
Elementary completed	1.73	2.08	
Lower secondary	1.61	1.83	
Higher secondary	1.63	1.73	
Post-secondary	[1.45]	**	
<i>Norway</i>			
Elementary or less	[1.96]	2.71	
Lower secondary	1.96	2.27	
Higher secondary	1.80	2.26	
Post-secondary	[1.68]	[2.08]	
<i>Poland</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.58	2.95	
Elementary completed	2.28	2.40	
Lower secondary	1.92	2.01	
Higher secondary	1.68	1.87	
Post-secondary	1.54	[1.58]	

Table 11 (cont.)

	Work history		
	Currently working	Not currently working	
		Worked since marriage	Worked only before marriage or never
Wife's level of education (cont.)			
<i>Spain</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.29	2.72	
Elementary completed	1.97	2.37	
Lower secondary	1.99	2.56	
Higher secondary	2.10	2.37	
Post-secondary	[1.80]	[2.77]	
<i>USA</i>			
Elementary or less	2.31	2.75	3.09
Lower secondary	2.09	2.45	2.73
Higher secondary	1.84	2.23	2.41
Post-secondary	1.64	2.02	2.20
<i>Yugoslavia</i>			
Elementary not completed	2.01	2.14	2.64
Elementary completed	1.67	1.84	1.98
Lower or higher secondary	1.54	[2.07]	1.61
Post-secondary	1.41	**	**
Type of current residence			
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>			
Rural	1.65	1.96	2.26
Urban	1.51	2.04	2.07
<i>Bulgaria</i>			
Rural	1.93	2.42	2.53
Urban	1.62	1.97	1.78
<i>Czechoslovakia</i>			
Rural	2.06	[2.48]	3.24
Urban	1.81	2.31	[2.82]
<i>Denmark</i>			
Rural	1.98	2.43 ^a	[2.71] ^b
Urban	1.82	2.19 ^a	1.91 ^b
<i>Finland</i>			
Rural	1.99	2.29	2.60
Urban	1.64	1.93	1.99
<i>France</i>			
Rural	1.80	2.33	2.70
Urban	1.58	2.21	2.49
<i>Italy</i>			
Rural	1.79	1.95	2.20
Urban	1.64	1.96	2.08
<i>Norway</i>			
Rural	2.03	2.32	2.48
Urban	1.77	2.16	2.26
<i>Poland</i>			
Rural	2.42	2.51	2.73
Urban	1.74	2.06	2.13
<i>Romania</i>			
Rural	2.22	2.34	
Urban	1.70	2.07	

Table 11 (cont.)

	Work history		
	Currently working	Not currently working	
		Working since marriage	Worked only before marriage or never
Type of current residence (cont.)			
<i>Spain</i>			
Rural	2.11	2.37	2.61
Urban	2.12	2.31	2.54
<i>Yugoslavia</i>			
Rural	2.03	2.00	2.75
Urban	1.59	1.91	2.26
Husband's socio-occupational status			
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>			
Agricultural workers	2.04	**	2.46
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.46	2.07	2.17
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.55	1.95	1.99
<i>Finland</i>			
Agricultural workers	2.03	2.17	2.32
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.74	2.14	2.46
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.69	1.96	2.06
<i>France</i>			
Agricultural workers	1.97	**	[2.22]
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.66	2.45	2.92
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.60	2.01	2.24
<i>Great Britain</i>			
Agricultural workers	1.83	[2.12]	[2.36]
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.68	2.18	2.35
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.50	2.01	2.26
<i>Italy</i>			
Agricultural workers	2.23	[2.65]	2.37
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.64	1.84	2.17
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.80	1.97	2.10
<i>Norway</i>			
Agricultural workers	2.30	**	[2.22]
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.96	2.39	2.43
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.80	2.11	2.31
<i>Poland</i>			
Agricultural workers	2.49	2.31	2.80
Manual workers outside agriculture	2.02	2.28	2.37
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.60	1.80	1.85

Table 11 (cont.)

	Work history		
	Currently working	Not currently working	
		Worked since marriage	Worked only before marriage or never
Husband's socio-occupational status (cont.)			
<i>Spain</i>			
Agricultural workers	2.24	[2.57]	2.75
Manual workers outside agriculture	2.12	2.33	2.53
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	2.04	2.23	2.53
<i>USA</i>			
Agricultural workers	[1.99]	[2.83]	[3.25]
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.90	2.37	2.50
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.74	2.07	2.59
<i>Yugoslavia</i>			
Agricultural workers	1.95	[2.59]	2.79
Manual workers outside agriculture	1.82	2.00	2.30
Non-manual workers outside agriculture	1.61	1.79	2.31
Husband's income			
<i>Belgium (Flemish)</i>			
Very low	1.31	2.09	1.94
Low	1.34	1.88	[1.97]
Medium	1.49	2.03	2.14
High	1.66	2.04	2.19
Very high	1.71	2.12	2.23
<i>Denmark</i>			
Very low	2.01	_____	2.46 _____
Low	1.77	_____	2.07 _____
Medium	1.82	_____	2.11 _____
High	1.61	_____	2.18 _____
Very high	1.79	_____	[2.09] _____
<i>Finland</i>			
Very low	1.58	_____	[1.92] _____
Low	1.59	_____	[1.77] _____
Medium	1.61	_____	2.16 _____
High	1.65	_____	1.78 _____
Very high	1.72	_____	2.00 _____
<i>France</i>			
Very low	1.71	_____	2.84 _____
Low	1.42	_____	2.61 _____
Medium	1.62	_____	2.31 _____
High	[1.59]	_____	[2.27] _____
Very high	1.60	_____	2.02 _____
<i>Norway</i>			
Very low	1.87	_____	[1.97] _____
Low	1.75	_____	[2.31] _____
Medium	1.69	_____	[2.34] _____
High	1.63	_____	[2.25] _____
Very high	1.98	_____	[1.96] _____

5 Conclusions

The findings brought out in the three preceding sections fit in well, on the whole, with those of other studies, including the previous ECE comparative study which was based on surveys carried out around 1970. Despite the low level of childbearing that prevails in all of these countries, many socio-economic differentials persist, and characteristic patterns of national and regional variation can be identified. The principal contribution of this analysis is the extension of the coverage both to more countries and to more topics, while at the same time maintaining a satisfactory standard of comparability.

A woman's own background appears to have a pervasive influence on her eventual reproductive behaviour. Respondents brought up in rural areas subsequently had more children of their own than those brought up in urban areas. However, childhood residence is somewhat less important than the type of place where the family was living at the time of the survey, and since the two overlap, childhood residence has not been studied in depth. Few comparisons by religion were possible, but Catholics stand out as having higher achieved fertility than other groups; this is particularly true of the most religious Catholic women. The differential by wife's level of education is among the most clear and consistent to emerge in this study. Especially at the lower levels of education, the average number of births declines as education increases. This relationship holds fairly well within categories of most other principal variables, and indeed wife's education frequently explains some of the difference observed by type of current residence.

Achieved fertility also tends to vary systematically according to various current circumstances of the respondent's life. Urban residents had had fewer births than their rural counterparts, and, in most cases, the larger the place, the smaller the family. Husband's level of education has an overall negative effect on the number of births independent of that of the wife, and the two tend to reinforce each other. Although the differences are not necessarily large, in most countries the averages also follow a common pattern by broad classes of husband's occupation: agricultural workers had had more births than others, while non-manual workers had somewhat fewer. Within these broad classes the relative social status of the husband's occupation has some negative association with the number of births. Achieved fertility usually declines as family income rises, but this is less true of its major component, the income of the husband. Not surprisingly, where there is any relationship at all, the number of births increases with the number of rooms in the family living quarters.

Childbearing is especially closely tied to a woman's own economic activity. The average number of births declines sharply according to whether the respondent had not worked since marriage, had worked since marriage but was not currently working, or was working at the time

of the interview. On the whole, this is true regardless of the respondent's level of education, the type of place where the family was living, the occupation of the husband, or his income. A similar negative association is observed with the proportion of time that a respondent had worked since marriage, the status of employee, full time as opposed to part time work, and the amount of a respondent's own earnings. Only for the respondent's occupation and for work at home or away from home was little pattern found. Such strong and consistent differentials suggest a potential for policy development in this area. However, it should be recognized that, beyond clear evidence of incompatibility between childbearing and employment, the implications of these findings for fertility remain uncertain. Other types of approach are needed to identify the specific mechanisms linking the two activities and the conditions under which employment is likely to play the determining role.

These generalizations apply in somewhat differing degrees to the regions and individual countries. Many differentials, including those by education, residence and husband's socio-occupational status, are particularly pronounced in Bulgaria, Poland and Romania. It is interesting to note that there is such a high degree of contrast within a country such as Bulgaria where the overall level of achieved fertility is extremely low. Since fertility decline in the post-World War II period has been especially sharp in many of the eastern countries, the presence of strong socio-economic differentials might be thought to be associated with this experience. By this token one would expect to find substantial variation in southern Europe, where the decline has been relatively recent also, but except in Yugoslavia, this is not the case. For Italy and Spain most of the relationships examined proved to be rather weak. However, the absence of differentials is most obvious in Belgium, where the only factors that appear to have any marked association with fertility are religion and women's employment. Variation in the apparent importance of socio-economic differentials among regions and countries could well be partly a reflection of differences in the stability of the situation over time. The dependent variable used here represents an average over approximately 25 years; where there has been change during that period, the picture may be unclear.

Two additional patterns deserve comment. These are specific to certain groups of countries, primarily in the north and west. The first is the tendency for achieved fertility to be positively related to husband's level of education at the upper end of the education scale. This phenomenon occurs among urban residents and when the husband works in a non-manual occupation outside agriculture; it is increasingly pronounced as the wife's level of education also rises. One might speculate that it is a function of standard of living, but its connection with husband's income is inconsistent in these results. The

countries where it emerges most clearly are Belgium, Finland and Spain, although there is some evidence of it also in France, Great Britain and Norway.

The second is the interaction of work history with such other variables as wife's level of education, husband's occupation and husband's income. The wife's employment experience often has a greater effect within the low status categories of these variables than within the high status categories. There are many reasons why this might be so: women who are less well off may need to work longer hours at jobs that are less flexible and may not have as easy access to alternate forms of child care. This pattern is

quite widespread, but it is particularly striking in Belgium, France and USA.

An analysis of this sort is essentially exploratory and deals only superficially with the interconnections between various characteristics. Multivariate analysis is required to assess their significance relative to one another. This paper has nevertheless provided a more complete and detailed picture of socio-economic differentials in achieved fertility than has previously been available. The results point to a number of areas where further research is likely to be fruitful.