

# Parenthood, number of children & expectations about old-age welfare

Article for submission

Tomass Nielsen

## A question to consider?

- <u>Aim</u>: explore association between having children and expected old-age welfare
- ESS data for 31 European countries used to model respondents worry for old-age wellbeing
- Regional groupings and numerous control variables allow for varying analyses
- <u>**Ouestion:**</u> What is the link between old-age worry and the number of children? Does the old-age social security motivation for childbirth still prevail and if so, in what manner?



#### **Research Hypothesis**

<u>1. Hypothesis:</u> Having children is associated with positive expectation towards old-age welfare?

<u>2.Hypothesis:</u> Higher number of children improves expectations towards old-age welfare?

<u>3. Hypothesis:</u> Lower-income regions (countries) see children being associated with improved expectations towards old-age welfare more than higher-income regions (countries)



#### Literature Review 1/2

## Fertility Decision-Making

Hypothesis: Fertility events reflected decision-making even in pre-transition societies.

- Knodel (1978) argues that active family limitation was largely absent contemporary research shows this might not be the case (wages, linked-lives, implicit/explicit decision)
- Fertility decisions can be explained by analysing the decision-making to have children!

#### Summary of key decision-making elements today

- <u>Foundational factors</u>: job prospects and educational level of the prospective parents, prevailing social norms and even relationship stability
- <u>Sociocultural aspects</u>: value orientations concerning desired self-realisation, religion and family norms.
- <u>Socioeconomic aspects:</u> the direct and indirect costs of rearing children
- Intrinsic benefits of children: today parents ascribe the rewards of children to be primarily
  psychological, whilst their costs in turn are financial (Fawcett, 1988).



#### Literature Review 2/2



#### Net value of children = economic (benefits - costs) + non-economic (emotional, self-realisation)

#### Fertility and instrinsic value of children

- Agrarian societies had a positive fertility-income relation as economic benefits were positive
- In non-complex economies, with low human capital investment requirements, the utility benefit of additional household members was high, especially in the vacuum of wider social-security setups
- **But today:** formalized social security setups and high human capital investments into children

#### Some research on pensions and fertility!

- Cigno and Rosati (1992) find that both pension systems and capital market development had a negative effect on fertility.
- Boldrin, De nardi and Jones (2005) estimated the effect of social security schemas on fertility decisions and found that 50% of the fertility drop in the USA and Europe from the 1960s and onwards is explained by the growth in national public pension systems.
  - The authors argue that up to 80% of the differences between the American and European fertility is explained by diverging pension schemes.

TALLINN UNIVERSITY Estonian Institute for Population Studies

Data & Approach

Using ESS data, we can setup various models to look closer into whether there today still is an association between fertility and old-age expectations!

The dependant variable in these models is the question "how worried are you that income in old age will not be adequate to cover later years" (wrinco),

We group the countries from the data into 4 regions: North, East, West and South and apply relevant filters on the data

Let us look at some descriptive results of the variable "wrinco"



#### Descriptive statistics

#### Mean value of the dependent variable



## Descriptive statistics

## Mean value of the dependent variable

6

TALLINN UNIVERSITY Estonian Institute for Population Studies



#### Descriptive statistics

wrinco

Mean value of the dependent variable

6

TALLINN UNIVERSITY Estonian Institute for Population Studies

Figure 3. Old-age worry and householde income suffiency



#### Descriptive statistics

## Mean value of the dependent variable

6

TALLINN UNIVERSITY Estonian Institute for Population Studies





## Regression Model 1/2

|                                | All       | East      | West      | South     | North     |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Children (ref = $0$ )          |           |           |           |           |           |
| 1                              | 0.170***  | 0.178     | 0.095     | 0.306     | 0.354**   |
|                                | (0.063)   | (0.138)   | (0.093    | (0.188)   | (0.153)   |
| 2                              | 0.042     | 0.016     | -0.085    | 0.365*    | 0.223     |
|                                | (0.065)   | (0.145)   | (0.095    | (0.200)   | (0.151)   |
| 3                              | -0.035    | -0.045    | -0.202    | 0.779***  | -0.017    |
|                                | (0.085)   | (0.188)   | (0.124    | (0.274)   | (0.191)   |
| 4+                             | -0.286**  | -0.678*** | -0.268    | -0.51     | -0.174    |
|                                | (0.114)   | (0.220)   | (0.168)   | (0.439)   | (0.276)   |
| Male                           | -0.287*** | -0.513*** | -0.275*** | 0.057     | -0.679*** |
|                                | (0.040)   | (0.078)   | (0.060)   | (0.112)   | (0.096)   |
| Age                            | 0.134***  | 0.056     | 0.164***  | 0.037     | 0.217***  |
|                                | (0.024)   | (0.046)   | (0.037)   | (0.069)   | (0.060)   |
| Age squared                    | -0.002*** | -0.0004   | -0.002*** | -0.0005   | -0.003*** |
|                                | (0.000)   | (0.001)   | (0.001)   | (0.001)   | (0.001)   |
| Never married                  | 0.002     | -0.295**  | -0.04     | 0.094     | 0.242*    |
|                                | (0.059)   | (0.146)   | (0.084)   | (0.191)   | (0.124)   |
| Tert. & post-sec.<br>education | -0.358*** | -0.331*** | -0.378*** | -0.326*** | -0.321*** |
|                                | (0.044)   | (0.094)   | (0.065)   | (0.123)   | (0.102)   |
| Without partner                | -0.096*   | -0.030    | -0.109    | 0.110     | -0.213*   |
|                                | (0.052)   | (0.117)   | (0.076)   | (0.162)   | (0.119)   |



## Regression Model 2/2

|   | All       | East     | West     | South     | North    |
|---|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Subjective HH income (ref =<br>Comfortable) |           |          |          |           |          |
| Coping                                      | 0.856***  | 0.919*** | 0.997*** | 0.238*    | 0.980*** |
|   | (0.049)   | (0.155)  | (0.071)  | (0.130)   | (0.106)  |
| Difficult                                   | 1.426***  | 1.625*** | 1.370*** | 1.009***  | 1.853*** |
|   | (0.067)   | (0.167)  | (0.102)  | -0.186)   | (0.184)  |
| Very difficult                              | 2.190***  | 2.364*** | 2.266*** | 1.206***  | 2.227*** |
|   | (0.109)   | (0.209)  | (0.171)  | (0.351)   | (0.362)  |
| Unemployed past 3 months                    | 0.315***  | 0.293*** | 0.333*** | 0.308***  | 0.551*** |
|   | (0.042)   | (0.079)  | (0.066)  | (0.116)   | (0.103)  |
| Subj. Health (ref = Very good)              |           |          |          |           |          |
| Good  | 0.261***  | 0.301*** | 0.223*** | 0.194     | 0.472*** |
|   | (0.049)   | (0.107)  | (0.072)  | (0.150)   | (0.105)  |
| Fair  | 0.656***  | 0.804*** | 0.572*** | 0.469***  | 1.083*** |
|   | (0.061)   | (0.127)  | (0.092)  | (0.179)   | (0.155)  |
| Bad   | 0.931***  | 0.746*** | 1.187*** | -0.037    | 0.566*   |
|   | (0.110)   | (0.201)  | (0.168)  | (0.331)   | (0.316)  |
| Very bad                                    | 1.650***  | 1.409*** | 1.801*** | 1.890*    | -0.353   |
|   | (0.267)   | (0.482)  | (0.389)  | (1.007)   | (0.822)  |
| Saving for retirement = Yes                 | -0.175*** | 0.064    | -0.057   | -0.899*** | -0.12    |
|   | (0.043)   | (0.084)  | (0.067)  | (0.115)   | (0.108)  |
| Constant                                    | 2.680***  | 3.539*** | 2.391*** | 3.951***  | -0.774   |
|   | (0.445)   | (0.814)  | (0.670)  | (1.312)   | (1.038)  |
| Observations                                | 18,460    | 5,148    | 7,809    | 2,292     | 3,211    |
| R2  | 0.149     | 0.134    | 0.142    | 0.078     | 0.132    |
| Adjusted R2                                 | 0.147     | 0.13     | 0.139    | 0.069     | 0.126    |

Note: country dummy variables not shown. \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01

#### Interaction Model







#### Interaction Model and quick answer to hypotheses



- <u>1. Hypothesis:</u> Having children is associated with positive expectation towards old-age welfare? <u>NO – not</u> <u>compared to those who have none or 1-2</u> <u>children</u>
- <u>2.Hypothesis:</u> Higher number of children improves expectations towards old-age welfare? <u>YES</u>
- <u>3. Hypothesis:</u> Lower-income regions (countries) see children being associated with improved expectations towards oldage welfare more than higher-income regions (countries) NO – see figure on right