

The diffusion of late fertility across European regions

Ingrid Setz, MC Compans & Éva Beaujouan

Wittgenstein Centre (IIASA, OeAW, University of Vienna)

WIC Conference 2024, Vienna, Austria

Contemporary trends

Late fertility is a prevalent trend

- Increased number of births at advanced reproductive ages
 - 22% of TFR from births at 35+ in Europe in 2018 (Riederer & Beaujouan, 2024)
- Many drivers: extended time in education (Vasireddy et al. 2023), competing activities (Testa 2017), adverse economic conditions and youth unemployment (Skirbekk 2022; Matysiak et al. 2021)

Consequences that span health and socioeconomics realms

- Greater socioeconomic resources (Myrskylä et al., 2017)
- Higher health risks & decreased fecundity (Schmidt et al., 2012; Sauer, 2004)



Late fertility has been on the rise

Share of fertility rates at ages 40+ in total fertility (Beaujouan & Sobotka 2022)





Heterogeneity *between* **countries**

Share of fertility rates at ages 40+ in total fertility (Beaujouan & Sobotka 2022)





Heterogeneity within countries

Evidence so far

- Spatial variation
 - Urban areas exhibit higher prevalence of late fertility (Riederer & Beaujouan, 2024; Buelens, 2021; Campisi et al., 2022; Šprocha & Fitalov, 2022)
- Temporal variation
 - MAB increased universally, but at different paces (Buelens, 2021)
- Contextual factors explain diverse prevalence within countries
 - Studies emphasize economic (Riederer & Beaujouan, 2024; Šprocha & Fitalov, 2022) and social context (Campisi et al., 2022)
- → How has late fertility spread across space and time?



Demographic behaviour may not spread randomly

- Social influence & learning at the individual and aggregate level (Bongaarts & Watkins 1996; Costa 2015; Montgomery & Casterline 1996; Rogers 1983)
- Channels of transmission include kinship ties, social networks and mass media
 - E.g. trends in one's environment can provide insights into the costs and rewards of childbearing (Balbo and Barban 2014; Bernardi 2003)
 - E.g. positive media portrayal of ART and mothers in their forties may alleviate concerns regarding late childbearing (Lahad and Madsen 2016; Mills, Lavender, and Lavender 2015)
- Space is, inherently, one key dimension of transmission processes
 - Hägerstrand (1968) argues that the spread of new phenomena reflects the spatial structure of social networks



Patterns of spread

contagious diffusion and hierarchical diffusion



(Morrill, Gaile, & Thrall 2020; Sant-Julien 2007; Figure: twimg)



Patterns of spread

Intuition the behaviour of a region spreads along specifically organised channels of communication, bypassing intermediate locations

hierarchical diffusion





Patterns of spread

contagious diffusion



Intuition the **behaviour of a region** spreads along proximity to **neighboring regions**



Patterns of spread

contagious diffusion



Verified for family-related behaviour

e.g. historical fertility transitions (Brée & Doignon 2022; Goldstein & Klüsener 2014), contemporary low fertility rates (Vitali & Billari 2017; Wu et al. 2022), and cohabitation behavior (Vitali, Aassve, & Lappegård 2015)

Studies test whether behaviour (*today*) is associated with the behaviour of neighboring regions (*today*)



This paper

- focuses on understanding the geography of the spread in late fertility
- hypothesizes that the spread is driven by proximity (contagious diffusion)

Late childbearing behavior in a given region in the current period (t) is influenced by the behaviors observed in nearby regions earlier (t-1)



This paper

- focuses on understanding the geography of the spread in late fertility
- hypothesizes that the spread is driven by proximity (contagious diffusion)
 - it acknowledges a temporal lag of diffusion today' behaviour is explained by yesterday's behaviour
 - it allows for urban influence but is not limited to it
- exploits regional variation in the rise of the contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility
- empirically tests diffusion processes in spatial econometric model



Data & sources

Macroeconomic data from Eurostat and ESPON

- 193 regions (NUTS 2) in 18 European countries
- 2006-2018

Measure of late fertility

• our baseline threshold refers to 35-49

Contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility_{*i*,t} = $\frac{\sum_{a=35}^{49} ASFR_{a,i,t}}{TFR_{i,t}} \times 100$

Contextual socioeconomic factors

• % women in tertiary education, %NEET, GDP, population density



Econometric framework

Dynamic spatial Durbin model (SDM)

$$Y_t = \tau Y_{t-1} + \delta W Y_t + \eta W Y_{t-1} + X_t \beta + W X_t \theta + \delta + \varepsilon_t$$

- *Y* contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility
- X matrix of regressors: women with tertiary education, NEET, GDP, population density
- *W* weights matrix (default connectivity: binary contiguity)
- δ fixed effects



Econometric framework

Dynamic spatial Durbin model (SDM)

$$Y_t = \tau Y_{t-1} + \delta W Y_t + \eta W Y_{t-1} + X_t \beta + W X_t \theta + \delta + \varepsilon_t$$

η represents the spatio-temporal diffusion parameter

- *Y* contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility
- X matrix of regressors: women with tertiary education, NEET, GDP, population density
- *W* weights matrix (default connectivity: binary contiguity)
- δ fixed effects



Descriptives I



Mean 16.6 SD 4.9 Min 9.0 Max 30.3







Descriptives II



Non-capital regions * Capital regions
Country mean

Main result

Dependent variable Contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility					
	35-49		40-4	40-49	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
WY _t	0.784***	0.343***	0.747***	0.356***	
Y_{t-1}		0.454***		0.373***	
WY_{t-1}		0.138***		0.249***	
Women with tertiary education	0.052***	0.033***	0.058***	0.028	
NEET	-0.011	0.002	0.019	0.001	
GDP	0.271***	0.118***	0.373***	0.191***	
Population density	0.402***	0.202**	0.802***	0.466***	
WWomen with tertiary education	0.061***	0.010	0.082***	-0.023	
WNEET	0.044***	0.005	0.064***	0.020	
WGDP	-0.113***	-0.119**	-0.163***	-0.117**	
WPopulation density	-1.072***	-0.360	-1.297***	-0.779*	
Observations	2,509	2,316	2,509	2,316	
W	W^1	W^1	W^1	W^1	
Region FE	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Dynamic		\checkmark		\checkmark	
Log. Likelihood	1768.491	2216.42	605.5419	1004.574	
R ² adjusted	0.781	0.914	0.662	0.848	

Main result

	Dependent variable Contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility					
		35-49		40-49		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
	WYt	0.784***	0.343***	0.747***	0.356***	
	Y_{t-1}		0.454***		0.373***	
Spatio-temporal diffusion	WY_{t-1}		0.138***		0.249***	
	Women with tertiary education	0.052***	0.033***	0.058***	0.028	
	NEET	-0.011	0.002	0.019	0.001	
	GDP	0.271***	0.118***	0.373***	0.191***	
	Population density	0.402***	0.202**	0.802***	0.466***	
	WWomen with tertiary education	0.061***	0.010	0.082***	-0.023	
	WNEET	0.044***	0.005	0.064***	0.020	
	WGDP	-0.113***	-0.119**	-0.163***	-0.117**	
	WPopulation density	-1.072***	-0.360	-1.297***	-0.779*	
	Observations	2,509	2,316	2,509	2,316	
	W	W^1	W^1	W^1	W^1	
	Region FE	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	
	Dynamic		\checkmark		\checkmark	
	Log. Likelihood	1768.491	2216.42	605.5419	1004.574	
	R ² adjusted	0.781	0.914	0.662	0.848	

Sensitivity to stricter age-threshold

	Dependent variable Contribution of late fertility rates to total fertility					
		35-49		40-49		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
	WYt	0.784***	0.343***	0.747***	0.356***	
	Y_{t-1}		0.454***		0.373***	
Spatio-temporal diffusion	WY_{t-1}		0.138***		0.249***	
	Women with tertiary education	0.052***	0.033***	0.058***	0.028	
	NEET	-0.011	0.002	0.019	0.001	
	GDP	0.271***	0.118***	0.373***	0.191***	
	Population density	0.402***	0.202**	0.802***	0.466***	
	WWomen with tertiary education	0.061***	0.010	0.082***	-0.023	
	WNEET	0.044***	0.005	0.064***	0.020	
	WGDP	-0.113***	-0.119**	-0.163***	-0.117**	
	WPopulation density	-1.072***	-0.360	-1.297***	-0.779*	
	Observations	2,509	2,316	2,509	2,316	
	W	W^1	W^1	W^1	W^1	
	Region FE	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	
	Dynamic		\checkmark		\checkmark	
	Log. Likelihood	1768.491	2216.42	605.5419	1004.574	
	R ² adjusted	0.781	0.914	0.662	0.848	

Sensitivity to static or dynamic specification

	Dependent variable Contribution of	of late fertility	rates to total fertili	ty	
		35-49		40-49	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Static	WYt	0.784***	0.343***	0.747***	0.356***
	Y_{t-1}		0.454***		0.373***
Dynamic	WY _{t-1}		0.138***		0.249***
	Women with tertiary education	0.052***	0.033***	0.058***	0.028
	NEET	-0.011	0.002	0.019	0.001
	GDP	0.271***	0.118***	0.373***	0.191***
	Population density	0.402***	0.202**	0.802***	0.466***
	WWomen with tertiary education	0.061***	0.010	0.082***	-0.023
	WNEET	0.044***	0.005	0.064***	0.020
	WGDP	-0.113***	-0.119**	-0.163***	-0.117**
	WPopulation density	-1.072***	-0.360	-1.297***	-0.779*
	Observations	2,509	2,316	2,509	2,316
	W	W^1	W^1	W^1	W^1
	Region FE	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
	Dynamic		\checkmark		\checkmark
	Log. Likelihood	1768.491	2216.42	605.5419	1004.574
	R ² adjusted	0.781	0.914	0.662	0.848

Summary

Our study adds a new dimension to the understanding of late fertility development over time: **the role of geographic processes**

We find

- Robust evidence of contagious diffusion Late fertility today (t) is influenced by nearby values from yesterday (t-1)
 - Capital regions tend to act as forerunners in this spread
 - Ongoing trend: we observe no plateuing
 - Future trends are likely to be amplified by geographic processes

The diffusion of late fertility across European regions

Contact ingrid.setz@oeaw.ac.at

BIC.LATE receives funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant Agreement No 101001410).

www.oeaw.ac.at/vid www.wittgensteincentre.org