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Background

- Family policies assumed to play significant role in enhancing fertility (Gauthier 2007, Luci-Greulich and Thévenon 2013)
- Parental response to socioeconomic inequality → delay childbearing to accumulate resources for children → effect on first/second births
- Family policies may effect timing rather than number of children (Gauthier 2007)
- Finland, Germany & United Kingdom: Divergent family policies & diverse fertility trajectories (Leitner et al., 2008; Daly 2010; Luci, & Thévenon, 2011; Esping-Andersen, & Billari, 2015)

Results: crossed random effects logit model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies as packages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Policies are often delivered as packages &amp; may reinforce each other in affecting fertility behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Principal component analysis to assess the effect of policies as packages on first &amp; second births</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data

Macrovariables
- Fertility policies, female unemployment

Microvariables
- Dependent variables: Transition to first & second births
- Control variables: Mother’s age, year of birth, relationship status, education, labour force participation, household income; grandparents’ education & ISEI

Datasets
- Finland: Register data (1995-2014)

Method
- Crossed random effects logit model

Policies as packages

Conclusion

- Overall, family policies appear to be ineffective in increasing fertility
- UK family policy affects transition to both parities in same manner, Germany and Finland somewhat flip
- In Germany, policy effect consistent across socioeconomic groups. In Finland and UK, policy effect differs across socioeconomic groups.
- Results don’t allow a conclusive interpretation.
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