



Childbearing across Partnerships in Europe and the United States

Elizabeth Thomson, Johan Dahlberg, Signe Svallfors

Childbearing across Partnerships in Europe and the United States

Elizabeth Thomson, Johan Dahlberg, Signe Svallfors

Stockholm University Demography Unit, Department of Sociology

Abstract

BACKGROUND

Decreasing family stability has generated increases in “multipartner fertility” or having children with more than one partner. Most studies of the phenomenon include descriptive information, but vary in the way the population at risk is defined and sometimes in the measurement method.

OBJECTIVE

This study uses comparable data and the same measurement method to generate descriptive information about the prevalence of childbearing across partnerships in 14 European countries and the United States.

METHODS

We use birth and union histories from the Harmonized Histories, most of which are based on Generation and Gender Surveys. We identify the union spells in which each child is born to determine whether all of the respondent’s children are born in the same union or some are born in different union spells, the latter defined as childbearing with more than one partner.

RESULTS

The percentage of parents with at least two children, who have had children with more than one partner, ranges from just over 6 % to over 20 %, with slightly higher percentages for mothers than fathers. As expected, percentages are higher for parents with more children. Parents are most likely to make the transition to multi-partner parenthood at the second birth, especially if the first birth occurs outside a coresidential union.

CONTRIBUTION

The estimates provide a basis for cross-national analyses of change and variability in childbearing across partnerships.

Keywords: Multipartner Fertility, Separation/Divorce, Repartnering, Stepfamily, Half-Sibling

Stockholm Research Reports in Demography 2021:6

ISSN 2002-617X

© Elizabeth Thomson, Johan Dahlberg, Signe Svallfors



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Increasing rates of parental separation throughout Europe have generated an increasing pool of parents at risk of re-partnering (Andersson & Philipov 2002; Andersson, Thomson, & Duntava 2017). Most parental separation and re-partnering occurs during the childbearing years, meaning that the newly formed step-families are at risk of producing additional births (e.g., Holland and Thomson 2011; Thomson et al. 2002; Vikat, Thomson, & Hoem 1999).

These sequences of partnership and childbearing events produce the phenomenon that is commonly referred to as “multipartner fertility”, i.e., having children with more than one partner (Carlson & Furstenberg 2006; Gray and Evans 2008; Guzzo and Furstenberg 2007; Lappegård and Rønsen 2013; Manlove et al. 2008; Meyer, Cancian, & Cook 2005; Monti 2019; Sykes & Guzzo 2019; Thomson et al. 2014). Childbearing across partnerships produces sibships of which at least two children are half- rather than full-siblings. Such complex families generate new demands for the families themselves, their extended kin, communities and the state (Meyer & Carlson 2014; Cherlin & Seltzer 2014; Thomson 2017).

Empirical studies of childbearing across partnerships have been generated in several wealthy countries where parental separation rates are quite high. They all include descriptive information about the prevalence of the phenomenon, but vary in the way the population at risk is defined (Guzzo & Dorius 2016). In this paper, we use comparable data and the same method to generate descriptive information about prevalence in childbearing across partnerships for 14 European countries and the United States. Information is provided for parents of two or more children, as well as by parity (two, three, or four) at interview, separately for mothers and fathers. Parallel to Thomson et al. (2014), we also describe the parity transitions at which childbearing with a new partner first occurs. We add

a further data point, showing the degree to which having the first child outside a coresidential union generates childbearing with different partners.

2. Prevalence estimates of childbearing across partnerships

Guzzo & Dorius (2016) summarize estimates from U.S. studies of the percentage of parents having children with more than one partner. Estimates for random samples of mothers or fathers are typically considerably lower than for studies based on disadvantaged parents, and are more comparable to estimates from other countries. Among all mothers, about 22 % have a child with more than one partner (Dorius 2012; Guzzo 2014). Among mothers with at least two children – the condition for having children with more than one partner – 28 % of those born in the 1960s but 38 % of those born around 1980 have done so. (See also Thomson et al. 2014). Among fathers (Guzzo 2014; Guzzo & Furstenberg 2007), estimates for random samples are all very close to 17 %, but again the percentages among fathers with two or more children is larger for younger cohorts (32 % vs. 22 %). Darius (2019) reports that about 21 % of all parents of two children (mothers and fathers) have at least one of their children with a new partner.

Estimates for other countries are somewhat lower. In Australia, between 11 % and 15 % of parents age 38 or older with two or more children have children with more than one parent (Gray & Evans 2008; see also Thomson et al. 2014). Estimates for fathers were in the same range for Denmark and Norway (Sobotka 2008; Lappegård, Rønsen, & Skrede 2011); Thomson et al. (2014) provide estimates for mothers of 19% in Norway, 16% in Sweden.

Thomson and colleagues (Vikat, Thomson, & Hoem 1999; Thomson et al. 2002; Holland and Thomson 2011) argue that new partnerships generate new motives for childbearing that

overcome the costs of having additional children. Thus, it is not surprising that those who have children with more than one partner are likely to have more children altogether than those having all children with one partner. The likelihood of Danish fathers having children with more than one mother increases from 7 % for men with two children to 56 % for those with five or more (Sobotka 2008). Among mothers of four children, 25 % in Australia, 36 % in Norway and Sweden, and 50 % in the U.S. have at least one of those children with a different father (Thomson et al. 2014).

Only one study investigates the parity transitions at which the first half-sibling is born. Thomson and colleagues (2014) estimate the probability to be highest for second births, between 11 % and 14 % in Australia, Norway and Sweden. In the U.S., however, 27 % of second births are estimated to be with a new partner, consistent with the much higher percentage of first births to mothers living alone. Percentages are somewhat smaller for the likelihood of a new-partner birth after having two, three, or four children with the same father.

3. Data and methods

In a recent paper, Stykes and Guzzo (2018) compare three ways to identify the other parent(s) of one's children in population surveys. Direct methods ask the respondent to name or otherwise identify the other parent of each child. Such questions are generally included in household rosters, but may not include information about children living elsewhere. When questions about children's parentage are asked directly, all children are covered, but such questions are not yet common, and responses may also suffer from social desirability bias. The indirect method relies entirely on the dates of birth and dates of unions, assuming that each relationship is with a different person. In the only direct

comparison of these methods to date, indirect methods appear to be satisfactory, and were no worse than when supplementary information on number of parental partners was provided (Stykes & Guzzo 2018). The advantage of using birth and union histories to identify the other parent(s) of one's children is that such data are ubiquitous in family demographic research.

In this paper, we take advantage of the Harmonized Histories (Perelli-Harris, Kreyenfeld, & Kubisch 2010), most but not all generated from the Generations and Gender Programme (Vikat et al. 2008; Vergauwen et al. 2015; Fokkema et al. 2016; Generations & Gender Programme 2019). We use all countries for which response rates are adequate, partnership and birth histories are known to be robust and older respondent cohorts are included: Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Georgia, Hungary, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Romania, Spain (women only), and Sweden. Supplementary material provide estimates for respondents under 46 at interview, enabling comparisons with Austria and the United States.

We conducted several checks on the quality of the union histories, identifying unions in which cohabitation or marriage is reported to have occurred before separation; marriage is reported to precede cohabitation; and in which two adjacent unions overlap by more than one month. Many of these anomalies arise from the Harmonized Histories imputation procedure where non-reported months are randomly allocated across the entire year for any two events occurring in the same year. We adjust these allocations so that cohabitation precedes marriage which precedes separation. Where months are all reported by the respondent but produce overlapping unions, we exclude the entire observation (even

though we recognize that such overlaps might in fact be real). If a marriage occurs up to five years prior to cohabitation and not during a previous union, we use the marriage date as the date of union entry; otherwise, we exclude the observation. A small number of cases are also excluded due to extreme ages at birth or union events.

Table 1 presents information on the years in which birth and union histories were collected, the age range of respondents at interview, the total number of male and female respondents, and the number of each who had at least one child and who had at least two children at the time of the interview. For all parents of at least two children, we also show how many respondents are retained for analysis, i.e., did not have any unresolvable inconsistent or missing union events or missing birth months, and the percent excluded.

Table 1. Total respondents by parental status and analytic samples

Country	Survey years	Ages	Total women	Mothers	2-child mothers	Analytic sample	% excl
Austria	2008-2009	18-46	3,001	1,804	1,222	1,190	2.6
Belgium	2008-2010	18-80	3,728	2,631	1,840	1,756	4.6
Bulgaria	2004	18-82	7,007	5,497	3,573	3,327	6.9
Czech Republic	2005	18-79	5,209	3,765	2,629	2,422	7.9
Estonia	2004-2005	21-81	5,034	4,221	2,905	2,901	0.1
France	2005	18-79	5,708	4,134	3,084	3,042	1.4
Georgia	2006	18-80	5,595	4,374	3,453	3,441	0.3
Hungary	2004-2005	21-79	7,517	5,946	4,155	3,889	6.4
Lithuania	2006	18-79	5,037	3,727	2,286	2,206	3.5
Norway	2007-2008	19-81	7,541	5,675	4,579	4,345	5.1
Poland	2010-2011	18-84	11,578	9,271	6,814	6,723	1.3
Romania	2005	18-80	6,009	4,918	3,136	3,096	1.3
Spain	2006	15-98	9,737	6,817	5,216	4,846	7.1
Sweden	2012-2013	18-80	4,991	3,676	2,981	2,923	1.9
United States	2006-2008	15-45	7,356	4,007	2,651	2,527	4.7

Country	Survey years	Ages	Total men	Fathers	2-child fathers	Analytic sample	% excl
Austria	2008-2009	18-45	1,999	922	572	553	3.3
Belgium	2008-2010	18-82	3,435	2,164	1,536	1,463	4.8
Bulgaria	2004	17-85	5,851	3,975	2,680	2,502	6.6
Czech Republic	2005	18-79	4,797	2,746	1,912	1,753	8.3
Estonia	2004-2005	21-81	2,821	2,106	1,390	1,390	0.0
France	2005	18-79	4,371	3,017	2,268	2,203	2.9
Georgia	2006	18-80	4,405	3,127	2,470	2,465	0.2
Hungary	2004-2005	21-79	6,023	4,117	2,917	2,645	9.3
Lithuania	2006	17-79	4,999	3,352	2,087	2,022	3.1
Norway	2007-2008	19-81	7,339	5,043	4,138	3,904	5.7
Poland	2010-2011	18-82	8,409	5,910	4,240	4,193	1.1
Romania	2005	18-80	5,977	4,295	2,698	2,663	1.3
Spain	2006	na	na	na	Na	na	na
Sweden	2012-2013	18-80	4,697	3,109	2,458	2,394	2.6
United States	2006-2008	15-45	6,139	2,348	1,452	1,360	6.3

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values, and the U.S. National Surveys of Family Growth

Each birth is allocated to one of the respondent's union spells, including spells between unions, based on the month of birth and the start and end month of each spell. Children born in the same month as a separation are allocated to the dissolved union. We assume that each union spell is with a different partner, and that any child born during a non-union spell has a different parent than all other children. While this choice simplifies the allocations, it may also generate a small upward bias in estimates of childbearing across partnerships. Thomson and colleagues (2014) report that a less restrictive allocation of births to unions (up to six months prior or nine months after a union) reduces estimates of childbearing across partnerships by one percent in Australia, three percent in the United States.

4. Results

We first estimate the proportion of all parents with two or more children, as well as the proportion with exactly two, three, and four children, who have had a child with two or more partners. In Table 2, we present unweighted estimates. Weights are not available for the Czech Republic and Poland, which would further reduce the variety of country contexts included. Where weights are available, major differences are not observed between the two sets of estimates. We do not include Austria and the United States in this table because the populations are substantially younger on average than those in all of the other countries. Supplementary analyses that include these countries are mentioned below and are provided in the appendix.

Table 2. Childbearing with Two or More Partners, Mothers & Fathers

	Percent Mothers, Children with 2+ Partners, unweighted			
	Total Parity			
	Two+	Two	Three	Four
Belgium	14.8	11.3	16.7	19.9
Bulgaria	10.9	9.0	17.6	25.5
Czech Republic	22.8	18.9	29.0	44.9
Estonia	21.7	16.5	28.4	35.3
France	16.4	11.1	19.2	24.6
Georgia	6.5	6.4	5.6	6.3
Hungary	12.0	8.4	16.8	27.1
Lithuania	16.1	13.2	19.6	37.9
Norway	16.9	12.6	19.6	26.8
Poland	12.5	10.0	13.9	18.1
Romania	12.0	9.2	15.3	13.6
Spain	10.1	7.9	11.4	11.6
Sweden	16.2	10.8	21.1	34.3

	Percent Fathers, Children with 2+ Partners, unweighted			
	Total Parity			
	Two+	Two	Three	Four
Belgium	11.0	8.3	11.8	20.7
Bulgaria	7.5	5.9	14.9	10.5
Czech Republic	17.4	13.8	26.9	27.8
Estonia	17.4	10.9	26.3	43.4
France	12.8	7.8	12.8	24.3
Georgia	7.2	5.4	8.6	12.8
Hungary	13.6	8.3	21.6	39.6
Lithuania	11.5	10.1	14.1	22.1
Norway	15.1	9.9	18.2	28.1
Poland	10.1	8.0	12.8	13.2
Romania	8.6	7.2	11.4	9.9
Spain	Na	na	na	na
Sweden	16.3	7.7	23.7	44.2

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values

na = not available

In the first column, we present the statistic that has been most commonly reported in studies of one or a smaller set of countries – the percentage of parents with two or more children whose children do not all have the same other parent. For both mothers (top

panel) and fathers (bottom panel), the percentage is lowest in Georgia (6.5 % and 7.2 % for mothers and fathers, respectively) and highest in the Czech Republic (22.8 %, 17.4 %).

Countries where more than 15 % of parents have children with more than one partner include Estonia, Norway, and Sweden. French and Lithuanian two-child mothers also exceed 15 %. In most countries, the percentage for mothers exceeds that of fathers by two to four percent. The columns to the right show that the percentage generally increases with increasing total parity. In some countries, large percentages of mothers and fathers with three or four children have produced those children with different partners.

In Table 3, we present parity progressions with new partners. The first column shows, among those with at least two children, the percentage who had their second child with a new partner. The second column is based on those who had two children with one partner and went on to have a third child, the third column on those who had three children with the same partner and went on to have a fourth child. Again, the experience of mothers is presented in the top panel, fathers in the bottom panel.

Table 3: Parity Transitions, New Partner Births: Mothers & Fathers

	Percent Births with New Partner, Mothers, unweighted		
	Parity Transition after Births with Same Partner		
	1 st to 2 nd	2 nd to 3 rd	3 rd to 4 th
Belgium	12.2	5.3	3.9
Bulgaria	10.1	4.3	4.3
Czech Republic	19.5	13.3	13.5
Estonia	17.3	12.6	11.1
France	13.7	4.9	3.8
Georgia	6.0	0.7	0.9
Hungary	9.9	5.7	7.4
Lithuania	14.0	6.5	11.5
Norway	14.4	5.2	4.4
Poland	10.9	2.9	2.3
Romania	10.5	2.6	1.6
Spain	9.0	1.2	1.3
Sweden	12.8	8.3	8.5

	Percent Births with New Partner, Fathers, unweighted		
	Parity Transition after Births with Same Partner		
	1 st to 2 nd	2 nd to 3 rd	3 rd to 4 th
Belgium	8.5	5.8	2.7
Bulgaria	6.5	6.4	0.0
Czech Republic	15.4	9.1	5.6
Estonia	12.5	14.3	11.7
France	9.9	4.7	6.0
Georgia	6.0	2.2	2.0
Hungary	11.2	7.3	8.8
Lithuania	10.4	3.8	2.9
Norway	12.1	6.3	4.7
Poland	9.0	2.3	1.9
Romania	7.8	2.1	0.3
Spain	na	na	na
Sweden	12.0	10.6	10.3

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values
na = not available

In almost every country, the second birth is most likely by far to be the first point at which a mother or father has a child with a new partner, ranging from a low in Georgia (6 % of mothers, fathers) to a high in the Czech Republic (19.5 % of mothers, 15.4 % of fathers). A

single exception is fathers in Estonia where a new-partner birth is more likely after having two children with one woman. Differences in progression to a new partner birth are very small and in different directions for those who had two or three children with the first common parent. Conditional on having another child, the chances are in most cases under 10 %. Czech, Estonian and Lithuanian mothers, and Estonian fathers are exceptions.

Table 4 shows that most of the new-partner births at parity two are linked to having the first child outside a coresidential partnership. The first column shows the percentage of parents with two or more children whose first birth occurred during a non-coresidential spell. The second column is the percentage of second births that are classified as with a different partner because either the first birth or the second (or both) occurred in a non-union spell. The small differences between these percentages are those who had their first birth in a union and the second when not living with a partner. The third column shows the percentage of parents with the first child in a union and the second in a different union. The final column corresponds to the first column in Table 3, i.e., the total percentage of second births estimated to be with a different partner (sum of the second and third columns).

Table 4: Contribution of Non-union Births to Childbearing with Two or More Partners: Mothers & Fathers

	Percent two-child Mothers, Unweighted			Total new-partner births
	Non-Union 1st birth	Non-union 1st or 2nd birth	Different unions	
Belgium	8.5	9.5	2.7	12.2
Bulgaria	7.7	8.2	1.9	10.1
Czech Republic	15.4	16.6	3.0	19.5
Estonia	7.3	8.8	8.5	17.3
France	10.5	11.8	1.9	13.7
Georgia	5.1	5.4	0.6	6.0
Hungary	5.0	6.0	3.8	9.9
Lithuania	10.9	11.7	2.3	14.0
Norway	10.1	11.1	3.3	14.4
Poland	8.6	9.3	1.6	10.9
Romania	7.2	8.7	1.8	10.5
Spain	7.5	8.1	0.9	9.0
Sweden	8.0	8.5	4.3	12.8

	Percent two-child fathers, unweighted			Total new-partner births
	Non-Union 1st birth	Non-union 1st or 2nd birth	Different unions	
Belgium	6.3	6.9	1.6	8.5
Bulgaria	5.0	5.1	1.4	6.5
Czech Republic	11.8	12.5	2.9	15.3
Estonia	4.0	4.7	7.8	12.5
France	6.7	7.2	2.7	9.9
Georgia	4.9	5.0	1.1	6.0
Hungary	6.7	7.2	4.0	11.2
Lithuania	8.1	8.8	1.7	10.4
Norway	8.4	9.0	3.1	12.1
Poland	7.0	7.3	1.7	9.0
Romania	5.7	5.8	2.0	7.8
Spain	Na	na	na	na
Sweden	8.3	8.7	3.3	12.0

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values
na = not available

In every country, the vast majority of second births are counted as new-partner births because they occur after non-union first births. Only in Estonia is it more or equally likely that the first and second births occur in two different unions. At later parity transitions

(after two or three children with the same partner), the contribution of non-union births to the new partner category is negligible (analyses available on request).

We also generated estimates for respondents under 46 at the time of interview, providing comparisons with Austria and the United States where the surveys did not include older respondents; results are provided in the appendix. For the U.S. we generated only weighted estimates because the samples were stratified on characteristics associated with parental separation and childbearing. With the reduction in sample size, it was not possible in many countries, especially for fathers, to estimate the childbearing across partnerships at higher parities.

We find that Austria is among the countries with relatively high percentages of those with two or more children who have at least one new-partner birth (19.4 % of mothers, 15.9 % of fathers). The United States is an outlier with 35.9 % percent for mothers, 31.0 % percent for fathers. Even more than in other countries, the excess in the United States occurs after a non-union first birth.

In other countries, results for lower parities and parity transitions are generally similar to those for the full samples. Although there have been dramatic increases in parental separation and exposure to the risk of childbearing with new partners, the younger cohorts have not yet reached the end of their childbearing years and may therefore eventually achieve higher rates than evidenced in the currently available data.

5. Concluding thoughts

The descriptive material provided herein can serve as a baseline for future cross-national research on childbearing across partnerships, especially for comparison with estimates from future surveys that include now-standard birth and union histories. The role of non-union first births deserves greater scrutiny, particularly in terms of the assignment of such births to different partners.

6. Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all of our colleagues who have worked to produce the Generations and Gender Surveys and the Harmonized Histories used in this analysis. The research was further supported by the Swedish Research Council through the Linnaeus Center for Social Policy and Family Dynamics in Europe (Grant 349-2007-8701) and Project Grant 421-2014-1668).

REFERENCES

- Andersson, G. and Philipov, D. (2002). Life-table representations of family dynamics in Sweden, Hungary, and 14 other FFS countries: A project of descriptions of demographic behavior. *Demographic Research* 7: 67–144.
- Andersson, G., Thomson, E., & Duntava, A. (2017). Life-table representations of family dynamics in the 21st century. *Demographic Research* 37: 1081-1230.
- Carlson, M. J., and Furstenberg, F. F. (2006). The prevalence and correlates of multipartnered fertility among urban U.S. parents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 68: 718-732.
- Cherlin, A. J., and Seltzer, J. A. (2014). Family complexity, the family safety net, and public policy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654: 231-239.
- Fokkema, T., Kveder, A., Heikel, N., Emery, T., and Liefbroer, A. (2016). Generations and Gender Programme Wave 1 data collection: An overview and assessment of sampling and fieldwork methods, weighting procedures, and cross-sectional representativeness. *Demographic Research* 34, 499–524.
- Furstenberg, F.F., Jr., and King, R. B. (1999). Multipartnered fertility sequences: Documenting an alternative family form. Paper presented at the 1998 annual meetings of the Population Association of America, Chicago, IL. April 2-4, 1999.

Generations and Gender Programme. (2019). <http://www.ggp-i.org>.

Gray, E., and Evans, A. (2008). The limitations of understanding multi-partner fertility in Australia. *People and Place* 16(4): 1-8.

Guzzo, K. B. (2014). New partners, more kids, multiple-partner fertility in the United States. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654: 66–86.

Guzzo, K. B., and Dorius, C. (2016). Challenges in measuring and studying multipartnered fertility in American survey data. *Population Research and Policy Review* 35: 553–579.

Guzzo, K. B., and Furstenberg, F. F. (2007). Multipartnered fertility among American men. *Demography* 44(3): 583-601.

Holland, J. A., and Thomson, E. (2011). Stepfamily childbearing in Sweden: Quantum and tempo effects, 1950-99. *Population Studies* 65: 115-128.

Kreyenfeld, M., Hornung, A., and Kubisch, K. (2013). The German Generations and Gender Survey: Some critical reflections on the validity of fertility histories. *Comparative Population Studies* 38(1): 3–28.

Lappegård, T., and Rønsen, M. (2013). Socioeconomic differentials in multipartner fertility among Norwegian men. *Demography* 50: 1135–1153.

Lappegård, T., Rønsen, M., and Skrede, K. (2011). Fatherhood and fertility. *Fathering* 9(1): 103-120.

Manlove, J., Logan, C., Ikramullah, E., and Holcombe, E. (2008). Factors associated with multiple-partner fertility among fathers. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(2): 536–548.

Meyer, D.R., Cancian, M., and Cook, S. T. (2005). Multiple-partner fertility: Incidence and implications for child support policy. *Social Service Review* 79: 577-601.

Meyer, D. R., and Carlson, M. J. (2014). Family complexity: Implications for policy and research. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 654(1): 259-276.

Monte, L. M. (2019). Multiple-partner fertility in the United States: A demographic portrait. *Demography* 56: 103–127.

Perelli-Harris, B., Kreyenfeld, M., and Kubisch, K. (2010). Harmonised histories manual for the preparation of comparative fertility and union histories. Rostock: Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research (MPIDR working paper WP 2010–011).

Sobotka, T. (2008). Does persistent low fertility threaten the future of European populations? In: Surkyn, J., Deboosere, P., and van Bavel, J. (eds.) *Demographic challenges for the 21st Century. A state of art in demography*. Brussels: VUBPRESS: 27-89.

Stykes, J. B., and Guzzo, K. B. (2019). Multiple-partner fertility: Variation across measurement approaches. In R. Schoen (ed.), *Analytical Family Demography*. Springer: 215-239.

Thomson, E., Hoem, J. M., Vikat, A., Buber, I., Fuernkranz-Prskawetz, A., Toulemon, L., Henz, U., Godecker, A. L., and Kantorova, V. (2002). Childbearing in stepfamilies: Whose parity counts? In Klijzing, E., & Corijn, M. (eds.), *Dynamics of fertility and partnership in Europe: Insights and lessons from comparative research*, Volume II. Geneva/New York: United Nations: 87-99

Thomson, E., Lappegård, T., Carlson, M., Evans, A., and Gray, E. 2014. Childbearing across partnerships in Australia, the United States, Norway and Sweden. *Demography* 51: 485-508.

Vergauwen, J., Wood, J., de Wachter, D., and Neels, K. (2015). Quality of demographic data in GGS wave 1. *Demographic Research* 32: 723–774.

Vikat, A., Thomson, E., and Hoem, J. M. (1999). Stepfamily fertility in contemporary Sweden: The impact of childbearing before the current union. *Population Studies* 53(2): 211-225.

Vikat, A., Spéder, Z., Beets, G., Billari, F.C., Bühler, C., Désesquelles, A., Fokkema, T., Hoem, J.M., MacDonald, A., Neyer, G., Pailhé, A., Pinnelli, A., and Solaz, A. (2008). Generations and Gender Survey (GGS): Towards a better understanding of relationships and processes in the life course. *Demographic Research* 17: 389–440.

Childbearing across Partnerships in Europe and the United States: Appendix

Elizabeth Thomson

Johan Dahlberg

Signe Svallfors

Short Abstract

This appendix complements the Descriptive Findings of Thomson, Dahlberg & Svallfors on childbearing across partnerships. They estimate the percentage of mothers and fathers with at least two children who have children with two or more partners for 13 European countries included in the Harmonized Histories: Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Georgia, Hungary, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Romania, Spain (mothers only), and Sweden. These surveys included respondents up to at least age 79. The Austrian and U.S. surveys were limited to respondents in the childbearing years, i.e., under age 46. The appendix includes the same estimates as in the main paper, but limited to respondents under age 46 in all 15 countries. Due to the smaller number of respondents, higher-order parity-specific estimates are not provided in some countries. As in the main tables, estimates are unweighted to allow for the inclusion of Czech Republic and Poland, but weighted estimates are reported for the United States due to oversampling of minority groups.

Table A1. Childbearing with Two or More Partners, Mothers & Fathers Under 46 at Interview

	Percent Mothers, Children with 2+ Partners, unweighted*			
	Total Parity			
	Two+	Two	Three	Four
Austria	19.4	15.2	24.4	41.1
Belgium	14.1	11.0	18.8	ns
Bulgaria	9.2	7.2	18.2	ns
Czech Republic	22.9	18.7	32.9	42.0
Estonia	26.5	19.9	38.7	36.1
France	15.7	10.3	21.0	36.2
Georgia	5.4	5.2	4.6	5.7
Hungary	13.0	9.4	19.1	20.6
Lithuania	16.8	14.6	18.9	ns
Norway	17.9	12.7	21.6	39.3
Poland	14.8	11.7	18.8	32.2
Romania	9.4	7.9	13.6	ns
Spain	12.8	10.1	20.2	ns
Sweden	12.0	7.2	18.2	ns
United States*	35.9	30.2	37.4	48.5

	Percent Fathers, Children with 2+ Partners, unweighted*			
	Total Parity			
	Two+	Two	Three	Four
Austria	15.9	12.2	22.1	ns
Belgium	11.0	8.0	13.9	ns
Bulgaria	6.3	4.8	15.8	ns
Czech Republic	18.5	13.6	34.5	ns
Estonia	16.1	12.1	23.0	ns
France	11.8	6.6	16.4	ns
Georgia	6.3	5.5	7.5	ns
Hungary	13.6	8.8	19.8	42.3
Lithuania	11.2	11.5	8.1	ns
Norway	13.1	8.6	18.9	30.0
Poland	11.0	9.2	15.7	ns
Romania	8.1	7.2	13.5	ns
Spain	na	na	na	ns
Sweden	11.3	6.2	21.1	ns
United States*	31.0	23.1	35.9	55.8

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values, and the U.S. National Survey of Family Growth

na = not available; ns = fewer than 50 (unweighted) observations

*U.S. weighted to account for over-sampling of minority respondents

Table A2: Parity Transitions, New Partner Births: Mothers & Fathers under 46 at Interview

	Percent Births with New Partner, Mothers, unweighted*		
	Parity Transition after Births with Same Partner		
	1 st to 2 nd	2 nd to 3 rd	3 rd to 4 th
Austria	17.0	7.6	9.7
Belgium	12.0	6.1	ns
Bulgaria	8.3	4.2	8.3
Czech Republic	18.8	20.1	ns
Estonia	20.8	17.3	11.6
France	12.9	7.0	7.7
Georgia	4.8	1.0	3.3
Hungary	11.1	5.3	5.1
Lithuania	15.3	6.6	ns
Norway	15.3	6.7	6.9
Poland	12.6	5.6	7.7
Romania	8.0	5.7	1.4
Spain	11.3	5.7	7.7
Sweden	9.3	8.7	ns
United States*	31.1	10.2	11.4

	Percent Births with New Partner, Fathers, unweighted		
	Parity Transition after Births with Same Partner		
	1 st to 2 nd	2 nd to 3 rd	3 rd to 4 th
Austria	14.3	5.6	ns
Belgium	8.8	7.1	ns
Bulgaria	5.4	6.2	ns
Czech Republic	16.1	11.6	ns
Estonia	13.8	8.1	ns
France	9.8	4.2	ns
Georgia	6.0	1.4	ns
Hungary	11.5	7.2	5.8
Lithuania	10.5	3.0	ns
Norway	10.9	6.6	5.2
Poland	10.5	0.8	1.7
Romania	7.3	3.4	0.0
Spain	na	na	na
Sweden	8.8	8.8	ns
United States*	27.4	11.4	4.2

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values

na = not available; ns = fewer than 50 (unweighted) observations

*U.S. weighted to account for over-sampling of minority respondents

Table A-3: Contribution of Non-union Births to Childbearing with Two or More Partners: Mothers & Fathers Under 46 at Interview

	Percent two-child Mothers, Unweighted*			
	Non-Union 1st birth	Non-union 1st or 2nd birth	Different unions	Total new- partner births
Austria	12.3	13.5	3.5	17.0
Belgium	6.7	8.1	3.9	12.0
Bulgaria	5.0	5.7	2.7	8.3
Czech Republic	13.6	15.5	3.3	18.8
Estonia	9.3	11.4	9.4	20.8
France	8.1	9.9	3.0	12.9
Georgia	3.5	4.0	0.8	4.8
Hungary	6.2	7.1	4.0	11.1
Lithuania	11.1	12.0	3.3	15.3
Norway	9.7	10.6	4.6	15.3
Poland	8.7	10.1	2.5	12.6
Romania	3.7	4.5	3.5	8.0
Spain	8.2	9.2	2.1	11.3
Sweden	3.5	4.0	5.3	9.3
United States*	23.6	26.0	5.1	31.1

	Percent two-child fathers, unweighted*			
	Non-Union 1st birth	Non-union 1st or 2nd birth	Different unions	Total new- partner births
Austria	10.7	11.6	2.2	13.7
Belgium	4.6	5.5	3.3	8.8
Bulgaria	4.0	4.2	1.3	5.4
Czech Republic	11.2	12.3	3.8	16.1
Estonia	3.4	4.1	9.6	13.8
France	5.9	6.3	3.5	9.8
Georgia	5.0	5.1	0.9	6.0
Hungary	7.5	7.8	3.7	11.5
Lithuania	7.4	7.8	2.8	10.5
Norway	6.4	6.9	4.0	10.9
Poland	7.9	8.3	2.2	10.5
Romania	4.0	4.0	3.3	7.3
Spain	na	na	na	na
Sweden	5.6	6.1	2.7	8.8
United States*	21.8	23.9	3.5	27.4

Source: Harmonized Histories from the Generations and Gender Surveys, the Spanish Survey of Fertility and Values

na = not available; ns = fewer than 50 (unweighted) observations

*U.S. weighted to account for over-sampling of minority respondents

Stockholm Research Reports in Demography
Stockholm University,
106 91 Stockholm,
Sweden
www.su.se | info@su.se | ISSN 2002-617X



Stockholm
University

Demography Unit