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The basics

The essential link, the ‘classical’ association:

• Incompatibility of educational enrolment and parenthood (Hoem 1986, Blossfeld Huinink 1991)
  – Widely shared

• Enrolment: as full time, and exclusive status
Motivations – prevalence and expansion
Number of full-time and part-time enrolled in Hungary, 1991–2012

Vertical axis (left):
number of people participating in education
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Dark blue: full-time
Source:
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Expansion of part-time education goes hand-in-hand with the expansion of double status positions (Róbert, Saar 2012)

Double status = enrolled and employed at the same time
Motivations and The research question

• There are also signs of prevalence and diffusion of double-status position in *Western* countries, strongly depending on educational system (Wolbers 2003)
  – Due to increasing cost of the study
  – Growing dependence

• Research question:
  What is the association between double status and parenthood/transition to parenthood?
Constructing new hypotheses: Identifying factors shaping the classical enrolment and tarnation to parenthood link

  - Societal nature:
    - sequencing norms, role incompatibility
  - Economic nature:
    - opportunity cost
    - net direct expenditures
    - forgone human capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Not employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>Double status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enrolled</td>
<td>Employed Inactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constructing new hypotheses: How the Identified factors shape double status and tarnation to parenthood link

  – Societal nature:
    • sequencing norms, role incompatibility,
  – Economic nature:
    • opportunity cost
    • net direct expenditures
    • forgone human capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>social aspects</th>
<th>economic aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequencing norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled and employed</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses

- **H1** The *multiple role conflict* hypothesis: The transition rate to motherhood among women in double status positions is lower than the transition rate among students and that among employees.
- **H2** The *mitigated role conflict* hypothesis: The transition rate to motherhood among women in double status positions is higher than the transition rate among students, but is lower than the transition rate among employees.
- **H3** The *job status dominance* hypothesis: The transition rate to motherhood among women in double status positions is higher than the transition rate among students, but is the same as the transition rate among employees.
Data and sample selection

- Second wave of the GGS, retrospective birth, employment and educational histories
- Selected countries: France, Austria, Hungary and Georgia
- Selected individuals: women born 1961-1980
- Person-month dataset: risk period starts when turning 16
- Selected time window: 1977-2008 (available for all four countries)
% distribution of current status, education and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>double status</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed only</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled only</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational attainment</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lower secondary or lower</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper secondary</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-49</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted estimates using the person-month dataset
Net status differences. The baseline model

- Method: logistic regression using the person-month dataset
  - estimated separately for the four countries
  - weights that compensate for selective nonresponse in second wave
- Variables (defining our baseline model)
  - joint employment-enrolment status categories
    - "double status" (enrolled & employed)
    - enrolled only
    - employed only
    - inactive
  - educational attainment (below upper secondary; upper secondary; tertiary)
  - age + age-squared
  - year
  - birth cohort categories (1961-65, ..., 1976-80)
- Explanatory variables are time-varying with the exception of birth cohort
Results (1): Logistic regression estimates of the model without interaction effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment-employment status</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>GE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>double status</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed only</td>
<td>0.755***</td>
<td>1.084***</td>
<td>0.458***</td>
<td>0.405*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrolled only</td>
<td>-0.700***</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>-1.158***</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inactive</td>
<td>0.902***</td>
<td>1.100***</td>
<td>0.258*</td>
<td>0.887***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional control variables: level of education, age, age-squared, year, and cohort.
Do period and cohort interactions affect the observed status differences?

- We estimate two additional models for each country:
  - Baseline model + status X year interactions
  - Baseline model + status X cohort categories interactions added

- Analytical strategy remains the same
Results (2)

- We estimate two additional models for each country:
  - Baseline model + status X year interactions
  - Baseline model + status X cohort categories interactions added
- Analytical strategy remains the same
Result (2a)
Number of predicted monthly births per 1000 women, 1977-2008, based on extended model

Legend: Double status – employment only – enrolment only – inactive
Number of predicted monthly births per 1000 women, 1977-2008

Legend: Double status – employment only – enrolment only – inactive
Summary

• Conclusion of the comparison:
  – (A) The *mitigated conflict* hypothesis (**H2**) supported in *France and Hungary*
  – (B) In *Austria and Georgia* the effect of enrolled only and double status do not differ regarding transition to parenthood, what support the validity of the *classical assumption* (Blossfeld, Huinink 1991) **without any limitation**

• Need of further studies:
  – More accurate inclusion of the enrolment status!
  – More elaboration on the educational system!

• Generally: the importance to consider double or parallel positions/roles!
Thank you for your attention!