

We apologise for the late appearance of what should have been the May Newsletter.  
We will catch up in August with another Newsletter then.

## BSPS MEETINGS

Wednesday 6 July

### BSPS AGM and Day Meeting

The 2005 Annual General Meeting of the British Society for Population Studies will be held at 10.30am on Wednesday 6 July in the Graham Wallas Room at the London School of Economics (directions to the venue at the bottom of the day meeting announcement on BSPS website). The Annual Report and accounts for 2004 and the agenda for the meeting will be distributed to members in advance of the meeting. All members are encouraged to attend.

To be followed by:

### BSPS Day Meeting Recent Developments in Ethnic Demography 6 July 2005

To be held in the Graham Wallas Room at the London School of Economics, following the BSPS Annual General Meeting. Members and non-members are welcome to attend this meeting, for which there is no charge.. However, please pre-register by emailing [pic@lse.ac.uk](mailto:pic@lse.ac.uk) or by phone to 020 7955 7666 (so that numbers attending can be assessed).

Coffee/Registration for Day Meeting

**Welcome/Introduction** – *John Hollis (Greater London Authority)*

**ONS update on current work and ethnic group population projections** –  
*Michael Rendall (Office for National Statistics)*

Lunch

**Ethnic change between generations** – *Baljit Bains/John Hollis (Greater London Authority)*

**Health inequalities** – *James Nazroo (University College London)*

**Census profiles** – *Greg Ball (Birmingham City Council)*

### Discussion

16.15 Close

The Graham Wallas Room is on the fifth floor of the Main Building (Old Building) at LSE on Houghton Street. Enter by the main entrance and take the lift to the fifth floor. Walk through the Staff Dining Room and Senior Common Room to reach the Graham Wallas Room. Alternative entry by the door next to the Student Service Centre on Clare Market, where the lift directly inside the door will leave you outside the Graham Wallas Room if taken to the fifth floor.

\*\*\*

### British Society for Population Studies Annual Conference 2005

As previously announced, the 2005 BSPS Annual Conference will be held at the University of Kent at Canterbury from 12-14 September 2005. Booking forms and the provisional programme have already been sent to members as email attachments, but these can also be downloaded from the BSPS website at [www.bsps.org.uk](http://www.bsps.org.uk). The provisional programme is updated regularly on the website.

It would be much appreciated if members could distribute details of the Conference as widely as possible, and encourage interested non-members to attend.

**Plenary theme:** Intergenerational Relations.

### Plenary speakers:

Professor Ronald Lee (University of California at Berkeley)  
Professor Emily Grundy (Centre for Population Studies, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine)  
Alison O'Connell (Pensions Policy Institute)

### Parallel strand sessions on:

Care and carers; intergenerational relationships at older ages; the economics of ageing; families and households; social support & mortality at older ages; health and mortality;

migration, population mobility and ethnicity; sub-national data; census, local government & national issues; fertility; evolutionary demography; historical demography; health inequalities; reproductive health. A **poster session** will be held on the first evening and posters will be displayed throughout the Conference. (The BSPS is happy to display material of interest to participants – please contact the Secretariat to arrange). As in 2004, there will be a **poster prize** of £100 in book tokens for the poster judged to be the best on display. Judges to be announced later.

Registration will be £50 for members and £75 for non-members. Accommodation packages for the entire Conference are available at £113 (shared bathroom facilities) and £147 (ensuite). Twenty-four hour stays and day registration are also available. Booking forms available from the Secretariat, or download from the website.

\*\*\*

## OTHER MEETINGS

**20<sup>th</sup> June 2005**

### **Migration Statistics from the Census A joint LARIA/CCSR/LGA Seminar Crewe Alexandra Football Club, Crewe**

What Is It All About? Migration tells about a locality's fortunes. The Census is the richest source of migration statistics in the UK. They inform population projections, monitor the social balance of those who arrive and leave, map the fortunes of cities and their hinterlands, and explain the changing racial composition of localities. This seminar, organised by the Local Authorities Research and Intelligence Association (LARIA), the Centre for Census and Survey Research (CCSR) and the Local Government Association (LGA), aims to guide researchers through the variety of migration statistics available from the 2001 Census, to advise on their quality and on their efficient use. The speakers are experienced practitioners who will also give examples of best practice in the application of migration statistics for local and national policy.

Further information from; [lariaoffice@aol.com](mailto:lariaoffice@aol.com)

\*\*\*

**7<sup>th</sup> July 2005**

### **Sex Selection: a Global Issue**

A meeting organised by Human Genetics Alert, and The Cornerhouse

In India millions of female foetuses are being aborted, seriously disrupting the balance of the sexes in some regions. In Britain a vociferous lobby is arguing for the 'right' to choose our children's sex. What do these developments mean for gender justice and for the future of our societies? Is sex selection the opening to a new 'designer baby' eugenics?

This meeting will be a rare chance to hear about the struggle against sex selection in India first hand, from one of the leading campaigners, Sabu George, from the Centre for Women's Development Studies, New Delhi. Philosopher Paula Boddington will describe the current issues in Britain, and look at the links

between policy in India and the UK. The meeting will be of vital interest to anyone concerned with women's rights, development issues and the reproductive technology debate in the UK.

Venue: Room 12, Friends House, 173 Euston Rd., London NW1 (opposite Euston Station)

Time: 6.30 pm, July 7th 2005

If you plan to attend, or for more information, please e-mail [info@hgalert.org](mailto:info@hgalert.org) or call 020 7704 6100.

[www.hgalert.org](http://www.hgalert.org) [www.thecornerhouse.org.uk](http://www.thecornerhouse.org.uk)

\*\*\*

**15<sup>th</sup> September 2005**

### **Univerisy of Edinburgh**

On Thursday 15th september 2005, the Edinburgh University Data Library will be hosting a one day workshop on the National Child Development Study (NCDS) and the 1970 British Cohort Study (BCS70). This event, which is organized jointly by the Centre For Longitudinal Studies (CLS) and the Economic and Social Data Service (ESDS), will be of particular interest to researchers who are considering using data from the most recent sweep of the surveys. A non-refundable fee of £60 (£30 for he students) covers a buffet lunch and workshop documentation.

Further details, a copy of the provisional programme and booking form are available via the esds website:

<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/news/eventdetail.asp?id=1399>

\*\*\*

**16-17 November 2005**

### **Census: Present and Future University of Leicester**

A conference presenting the latest census-based research and exploring the future of population datasets

The ESRC/JISC Census Programme is pleased to announce Census: Present and Future, a two-day conference to showcase some of the best research based on the 2001 censuses and explore the challenges of the coming decade. It will be held at the Gilbert Murray Conference Centre, University of Leicester on 16-17 November and we have an excellent line-up of speakers from national statistical organizations, census users within and beyond academia and from the Census programme itself. An initial announcement and outline schedule are now available on the Programme website (follow the Conference link at <http://census.ac.uk> ). Delegate registration and the full programme will be available in June. Enquiries should be addressed to [census2005@geodata.soton.ac.uk](mailto:census2005@geodata.soton.ac.uk)

On Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2005 the Centre for Longitudinal Studies will be holding a 1-day introductory workshop on the Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) at the Institute of Education, University of London. This event, which is organized in association with the Economic and Social Data Service (ESDS), is designed both for researchers who are considering using data from the MCS in their work and for those in government

departments and the voluntary sector who are involved in commissioning research. Issues to be covered will include: themes and content covered by the MCS1 survey; survey design, non-response and weighting of MCS sample; future surveys of MCS; accessing the MCS via the ESDS; introduction to MCS documentation and meta-data; and a practical session using the *Idealist* data dictionary and subsets of MCS data.

A non-refundable fee of £60 (£30 for HE students) covers a buffet lunch and workshop documentation.

A copy of the provisional programme and booking form for this meeting are available via the ESDS website:

<http://www.esds.ac.uk/longitudinal/news/eventdetail.asp?ID=1349>

Places are strictly limited. Please email [booking@esds.ac.uk](mailto:booking@esds.ac.uk) as soon as possible to reserve a place.

An on-line version of the summer 2005 issue of the *cls* cohort studies newsletter (kohort) is now available via the institute of education website:

[HTTP://WWW.IOE.AC.UK/BEDFORDGROUP/CLS/KOHORT/UMMER05\\_ONLINE.PDF](http://www.ioe.ac.uk/bedfordgroup/cls/kohort/summer05_online.pdf)

Please do remember to notify us of any reports, papers, books etc that you have had published recently based on *cls* cohort study data - by faxing back or posting a copy of the form on the final page of the newsletter.

\*\*\*

## NOTICES

### Parkes Foundation Small Grants Fund 2006

The Parkes Foundation Small Grants Fund helps to promote research into the biosocial sciences. Priority is given to the support of research which involves the integrated study of biological and social features of human populations. Relevant disciplines are anthropology, demography and population studies, ecology & environmental studies, nutrition, and population genetics.

Grants are directed particularly towards helping **graduate research students** meet their field work costs, but others may apply. Undergraduate projects, however, are not supported. Grants are small, usually not exceeding £600.

The application form, on which applications **must** be submitted, can be obtained from the Executive Secretary by email – [mah44@cam.ac.uk](mailto:mah44@cam.ac.uk) or by post – Parkes Foundation, Department of Biological Anthropology, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3DZ.

The closing date for receipt of applications is **27 January 2006**; applications will be considered by the Trustees and awards will be made in March/April 2006.

In 2005, grants were awarded to:

Rebecca Drury, Department of Anthropology, University College London (Changing socioeconomic patterns and wildlife trade in rural Cambodia)

Mohua Guha, International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai, India (Health consequences of arsenic pollution in West Bengal)

Frances Hansford, Department of International Development, University of Oxford (Discrimination in intra-household food distribution in rural Brazil)

Tatyana Intigrinova, Department of Anthropology, University College London (Local resource use practices & economic change in Buryatia)

Pieta Nasanen, Department of Human Sciences, Loughborough University (Indoor air pollution & respiratory disease in Bangladesh)

Giovanni Orlando, Department of Anthropology, University College London (Biodiversity conservation policy & livelihood in rural Uganda)

Abhishek Singh, International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai, India (Male involvement in reproductive health in Maharashtra State, India)

Chiedza Zingoni, Department of Human Sciences, Loughborough University (Nutrition transition among adolescents in Soweto/Johannesburg)

\*\*\*

### THE VICTORIAN PANEL STUDY

The idea of generating a Victorian Panel Study (VPS) arose from an initiative taken by The National Archives (TNA) to enter into collaborative agreements with appropriate Higher and Further Education (HE/FE) stakeholders in order to generate new Information Technology and Communications (ITC) resources to the mutual benefit of all parties. In the discussions between TNA and the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) that followed, the idea of jointly creating a VPS was first raised and the ESRC subsequently agreed to fund a pilot project, of which this questionnaire forms a part.

In outline the proposed VPS would take as its base the individuals and households recorded in the existing ESRC-funded computerised national two per cent sample of the 1851 British census, created by Professor Michael Anderson, and trace these through subsequent registration and census information for the fifty-year period to 1901. The result would be a linked database with each census year between 1851 and 1901 in essence acting as a series of benchmarks.

This project is timely because great advances have been made in recent years in terms of the creation of computerised and searchable indices to major collections of historical sources. In relation to the proposed VPS, of particular importance are the national databases that exist for the censuses of 1881 and 1901. Following on the success of creating the 1901 internet-based resource, TNA is already committed to a programme of computerising the remaining nineteenth-century censuses for England and Wales. Likewise for Scotland, where the census has been administered separately from that of England and Wales since 1861, plans are well advanced to digitise and index all remaining un-indexed censuses. In addition to this massive

programme of census computerisation and indexing, the Office for National Statistics (ONS) has announced its intention to produce a searchable database of the 'historic' civil registers of births, marriages and deaths. Although the precise timescale for the completion of these indexing projects is not available at present, however, it is expected that they will be generated over the course of the next five years.

Although these resources are being created primarily with the huge genealogical and family history communities in mind, they potentially offer significant opportunities to the academic research community as well, particularly in facilitating the possibility and potential for tracing individuals over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century.

The primary objectives of the pilot project are:

- to test differing sampling and methodological issues;
- to examine the linking problems involved.
- to investigate the relationship between the VPS and other longitudinal data projects (both contemporary and historical);
- to explore the strategic partnerships which will support the VPS;
- to recommend a framework and strategy for creating a full VPS.

An online questionnaire forms another important part of the VPS pilot project: to gain input into both the demand for and potential uses of a VPS. Despite the technical possibilities that exist for creating a VPS, clearly the full project will not be funded unless sufficient demand for the resulting VPS can be demonstrated. In view of this, your opinion counts. We would therefore be grateful if you could take the time to complete the short questionnaire online at:

[www.data-archive.ac.uk/home/vps\\_survey.asp](http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/home/vps_survey.asp)

\*\*\*

## COURSES

### European Doctoral School of Demography (EDSD)

The EDSD is a new, eleven-month program that will be offered every year. Students will acquire a solid knowledge base on causes and consequences of demographic change, population data, statistical and mathematical demography, as well as modeling, simulation and forecasting. The program is intended for young researchers at a very early stage in their career, namely in the first year of their doctoral education. EDSD is under the auspices of the European Association for Population Studies (EAPS). For school years 2005-6 and 2006-7, the School is managed by the International Max Planck Research School of Demography (IMPRSD) and located and operated in the Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research in Rostock, Germany. The EDSD will admit a new cohort of up to 24 students every year. The EDSD does not charge fees, and makes available a number of scholarships to enable students to attend the School's course program. You will find more information on the EDSD at <http://www.eds-demography.org/>.

The EDSD invites applications for school year 2005-6. Students with an excellent MA degree or its equivalent are eligible to apply for a fellowship to the EDSD program. The application deadline for EDSD

school year 2005-6 is 1 June 2005. Please see <http://www.eds-demography.org/application/> for instructions how to apply.

\*\*\*

## REPORTS OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

### The consequences of later and lower fertility

Report of one day meeting organised by the British Society for Population Studies and the International Longevity Centre UK. The conference was held at the BT International Conference Centre in London on 26 April 2005.

The first presentation was by **Tomas Sobotka** (Vienna Institute of Demography) entitled '*Low and later fertility in Europe*'. Tomas gave a snapshot of fertility trends across Europe, identifying three prominent trends. Firstly, the decline of total fertility rates (TFR) to very low levels and the emergence of "lowest-low" fertility (a TFR of 1.3 or below). Secondly, the postponement of parenthood associated with later reproductive ages, and increasing "polarisation" of first birth timing. Lastly, the increasingly diverse family situation of childbearing, in particular the rise of extra-marital childbearing. One of Tomas's main conclusions was that in the long-run, sustained low fertility rates are likely to be a regional rather than a pan-European problem.

Tomas talked about the effect of fertility timing on summary indicators of fertility, such as the TFR. The effect of postponement can give a false sense of the level of fertility using the TFR and consequently of the underlying (or intrinsic) growth rate of the population. For example, the TFR for the EU25 countries was 1.46 children per woman in 1995-2000, giving a negative annual intrinsic growth rate of -1.13 per cent. However, using the TFR value adjusted for postponement of 1.71 gives a corresponding growth rate of -0.60 per cent. Tomas then turned to the role of postponement on the quantum of fertility. He concluded that a key result of the distortion effect of postponement is that the TFR is substantially affected but final cohort fertility less so. However, there is another effect of a general decrease in the intensity of childbearing with age (although this may be compensated for by a shift in the age intensity profile) which is more country specific.

Tomas then moved on to talk about the institutional and socio-economic context of fertility, and how the characteristics of the welfare state influence fertility decisions. There has been a reversal of the traditional associations between TFRs and marriage rates (positive), and labour participation of women, divorce rates and extra-marital childbearing (all negative). He posited that very low fertility is not a hallmark of the second demographic transition, in that the post-modern family, characterised by high partnership instability and plurality of living arrangements, is not necessarily linked to very low fertility. Tomas gave the example of Sweden, where there is a high plurality of living arrangements but also the most stable cohort fertility in the EU. Tomas then proceeded to contrast Spain and Sweden, and he concluded that the differences in fertility were not due to differences in postponement, as they

has shown similar increase in mean age at childbearing, but they were due to women in Spain having a much lower rate of “catching up”, that is having a second or third child after age 30.

Tomas’s predictions for the future were that most European countries are unlikely to experience further decline in period TFRs, and that lowest-low TFRs would be a temporary phenomenon. Tomas concluded that, in the medium-term, the shift towards later parenthood was important in explaining current European fertility levels and cross-country differences. In addition, two main fertility patterns were emerging: a higher fertility belt including Ireland, UK, France, Belgium, Netherlands and the Nordic countries (TFR of between 1.7 and 2.1, higher progression to a second child and a considerable percentage of women have a third child), and a lower fertility region including Italy, Greece, Spain, Germany, Switzerland, Eastern Europe and parts of Central Europe (underlying fertility level of around 1.5 children per woman and low progression from second to third child). Thus issues surrounding low fertility were not uniform throughout Europe, but in the low fertility areas, long-term stability may be challenged especially if there is negative net migration and social systems fail to respond.

**Cecilia Tomassini** (LSHTM and ONS) spoke about work carried out with Emily Grundy (LSHTM) in a presentation entitled ‘*Fertility histories and health in mid and later life: are there health benefits from delayed motherhood?*’ drawn from a paper which has subsequently been published (Emily Grundy and Cecilia Tomassini 2005, Fertility history and health in later life: a record linkage study in England and Wales, *Social Science & Medicine*, 61, 217-228).

Cecilia outlined various theories about possible links between reproductive history and later health, including those drawn from evolutionary biology, and explained that the impetus for this study came from earlier work undertaken by Emily Grundy which suggested that both parity and timing of childbearing were associated with later health. Much earlier work on this topic has included poor controls for related demographic characteristics (such as marital history) and socio-economic factors which is a serious weakness, as both are associated with fertility and with health and mortality.

The paper presented by Cecilia was based on results of a study using the ONS Longitudinal Study. The study population for this particular analysis were women members born 1911-1940 and present in 1971 census (which included fertility history). One limitation was the census only recorded legitimate births. It has been suggested that there were an additional 4-6% non-marital births, and 8-9% births where linkage failed. The sample size for the study was large at over 87,000 women. Outcome measures were mortality between the age of 50 and end of the observation period in 2000 (when those in the study were aged 69-89).

The study controlled for socio-economic variables (including age, sex marital status, housing tenure, access to car, economic activities, social class and educational qualifications). It found that nulliparous women had much higher mortality than other women and this effect was stronger for latest cohort where childlessness was less frequent. The probability of childless women dying in the period of observation (was 28% higher for the youngest cohort compared to women with only 2 children. Women with five or more children or, in the oldest cohort one child only, also had higher

mortality risks. Short birth intervals were independently associated with higher risks. Women who had become mothers in their teens had higher mortality in later life and also higher odds of long term illness in 1991. However, women who had a child at age 40 or older had lower mortality risks, possibly reflecting a slower pace of ageing in this selected group.

This work was part of an ongoing project funded by the Economic and Social Science Council and involving collaboration with Mike Wadsworth and John Henretta and analyses of the 1946 birth cohort study (National Child Development Study) and the US Health and Retirement Survey. Related work on mothers of twins is being carried out in collaboration with Danish colleagues.

**Mike Murphy’s** (LSE) presentation was entitled ‘*What are the Implications of twentieth century fertility for kin availability in the twenty-first century? A comparison of Britain, Finland and France*’. He explained that the care needs of elderly people, particularly the oldest old (80 and over), are mostly met by informal carers – predominantly children and spouses. As the number of elderly people increases rapidly, the availability of informal care is of increasing importance. Two factors are relevant, willingness to provide care, and the existence of kin, and there are increasing concerns that reductions in fertility, leading to fewer people having adult children in due course, will reduce the pool of potential carers.

There are no official projections on the number of people with living adult children, so at the moment it is hard to establish whether availability is getting worse and what problems are likely to arise in the future. Demographic modelling is required to analyse kin availability, based on the determinants of fertility (number of children and timing of childbearing) and mortality.

After discussing how this can be done, he presented a series of charts illustrating the findings. Actual and the most recent projected mortality data were used to illustrate the increase in survival rates and life expectancies in all three countries. For example it is projected that 42% of French women born in 1940 will still be alive at age 90; 79% of French women born in 2000 are expected to reach age 90, and there will be 40 times as many deaths beyond age 90 as among these women in their 60s. This is particularly significant as the need for care is often concentrated in a relatively short period prior to death, often at extreme old ages.

In all three countries, the proportion of women who remained childless decreased until the cohort born around 1945 and then steadily increased. Thus the proportion of women aged 80 and over (presently those born before 1925, but including those born before 1945 in 20 years time) with at least one living child will therefore increase for some decades (by about 9% in E&W and France, and 6% in Finland over the next quarter century or so). In this period, a higher proportion of elderly people are likely to have a surviving child than any generation ever born in these countries.

The role of fertility was then considered further. Although fertility is declining, the variability in the mother’s age at birth is increasing. In Great Britain in 2000 there was a 16-year gap between the lower and upper deciles in age at childbearing: 10

per cent of births were at ages below 20.9, and 10 per cent above age 36.7. At age 60, just 9 per cent of those born to mothers in the highest decile group would have their mother still alive, whereas the corresponding figure for children of mothers in the lowest decile would be 74 per cent.

Mike then summarised the overall effect of these findings. Mortality improvement has led to a substantial increase in the probability of a child having an elderly parent alive over the past century. This trend will continue for many years, but will start to reverse for children born from around 1970 (i.e. aged 60 in 2030). Viewed from the other end of the relationship, the proportion of women aged 80 and over with one or more living children should increase for at least two decades, and still be higher in 2040 than today.

The availability of kin particularly children, which is a prerequisite for informal family care, is determined by trends in mortality and fertility. He concluded that the position at the moment is rather better than in the past. In the short and medium term, the position is likely, on balance, to remain favourable, although there is the possibility of the position worsening in the longer term – in fifty years or more.

Mike finished by briefly talking about possible future developments and about other possible factors affecting the availability of informal care. These included the potential for divergence between different groups (geographical, social etc), the role of partnership disruption, and other influences on intergenerational relations such as the increased mobility of the population (therefore potentially not living close enough to provide care), the greater proportion of women in full time employment, and the increase in older working age women still having young children living at home when they may be called on to provide care.

The next presentation by **Elsbeth Graham** and **Paul Boyle** (University of St Andrews entitled '*Fertility variations in Scotland: causes, concerns and policy options*') was part of a new project to examine Scottish fertility decline and what policy options might be used to reverse the decline. They began by outlining the demographic background. The Scottish population has declined gradually, with some fluctuations, since the mid-1970s. It is now experiencing population ageing, in the decade 1993 to 2003, the population aged under 15 decreased by 8 per cent, while those aged 75 and over increased by 11 per cent. Population ageing has been exacerbated by a net loss of 16-34 year olds and a net gain of over 55 year olds through migration. However, population change is not uniform across Scotland, with declines in the larger urban areas, apart from parts of Edinburgh which is seeing increases together with areas north of the central belt. One of the main drivers of population decline and ageing in Scotland has been the fall in fertility, which has been accompanied by a rise in the mean age of childbearing. Unlike other low fertility countries in the EU15, average net inward migration is close to zero in Scotland.

Demography has become a political issue in Scotland, with the Scottish National Party including a target for population growth of 3 per cent in the next 10 years in its election manifesto. There is also the Scottish Administration's Fresh Talent initiative which aims to attract new migrants from abroad and retain indigenous population. However, Wilson and Rees have pointed out that very

large numbers of migrants are needed to halt population decline and ageing in Scotland. There has been a reluctance to embrace overtly pro-natalist policies, partly as they have not been proven to have a major effect in other countries and also the UK government has never actively sought to influence population size or composition. This study is part of an attempt to understand reasons for fertility change by looking at those areas in Scotland where fertility is increasing compared with those where fertility is decreasing. In this presentation they addressed the question of how fertility varies by socio-economic circumstances and by urban-rural residence by analysing small-area TFRs broken down by Carstairs deprivation quintile (1981-2001) and by urban-rural classification (1981-2001). The study used vital registration data on births linked to small area census geography. The average annual number of births over the three year period around census year (i.e. 1980-82, 1990-92, 1999-2001) was used to calculate TFRs. The study used around 10,000 geographic areas created to be consistent through time with a size of around 500.

Fertility rates fell over the 1981-2001 period (although there has been a small rise since). The 'U-shaped' relationship between TFRs and deprivation strengthened over this period (although rates remain highest in the poorest places). The broad geography of TFRs has remained similar, but there is some suggestion that they are falling faster in the inner cities. Statistical models of local area births show, unsurprisingly, that areas with high percentages of married women and children under 5 have more births. Also women's employment is no longer negatively associated with births. In 2001, clusters of low fertility were less widespread than in 1981 and much more focused on inner city areas, although gentrification can alter this pattern (e.g. Leith in Edinburgh). Clustering of high fertility in the periphery of cities was more evident in 2001 than in 1981.

Paul concluded by raising some further research questions. Scotland has areas of low fertility in cities, controlling for census variables, but there are also clusters of areas with high fertility. Are these clusters related to local attitudes, or 'cultures of fertility'? What is the role of population sorting? Do house prices play a role? Is it desirable to have these clusters?

The presentations concluded with a talk by **Linda Hantrais** entitled '*Policy Responses to Changing Patterns of Family Formation in Europe*'. She began by saying that the twentieth century left a strong legacy for governments of the impact of demographic change. The high mortality in the World Wars followed by the baby boom severely disrupted the European demographic profile, creating labour shortages while demand was being generated for schools and housing. In the 1970s and 1980s as birth rates were slowing down and life expectancy increasing, the focus was on schools and the demand for higher education and jobs at time when the World economy was slowing down and suffering from the oil crises, resulting in rising unemployment. During the 1990s, in the context of welfare retrenchment, declining fertility, greater life expectancy and the fall in net migration, questions about the social, political and economic impact of population ageing became prominent. At the turn of this century few EU member states were expressing concern about population decline per se: most were addressing the symptoms of demographic change rather than their causes. The major challenge was to deal with the post-war baby

boomers as they reach retirement age and how to resolve labour shortages they leave behind them, and how to cope the resulting age imbalance in the population.

The main policy issues in the twenty-first century are:

- As population ages, the demand for social services, pensions and healthcare increases. The fear is that this could become unmanageable given the future ratio of working age groups to older inactive population
- The sustainability of social protection systems
- Ethical issues such as healthcare priorities and the legalisation of euthanasia

In the short term, an upturn in fertility rates might exacerbate the problem further by increasing the dependency ratio and the burden on the sandwich generations. Pressures to increase female employment under the EU employment strategy are intensifying the care deficit and the dilemmas for individuals and societies in how to enable the combination of paid work and parenting - the policies are work-friendly rather than family-friendly. Attitudes towards multi-generational living and solidarity between the generations are also changing. The strain on the generational contract is being felt in several countries especially in Southern Europe where families are morally and legally obliged to care for their relatives. After many years of dependence on the state for welfare in the Central and Eastern European countries, current reforms are premised on further self-reliance, against the background of economic restructuring. Migration, which can be problematic for the host population as well as possibly causing racial tension, could also negatively affect donor countries, such as new EU members from Central Europe, by stimulating outward migration of younger people and further upsetting their age balance and skills base.

She went to discuss the diversity of policy challenges in Europe: the countries that should be most concerned in the short-term about population stagnation and decline are those having the lowest fertility rates and where migration is not compensating for the losses: Austria, Germany, Greece and Italy. High dependency ratios are imposing unacceptable burdens on employers and employees in countries where pensions are linked to earnings as in France, Germany and Italy. In Denmark, Sweden and the UK, where there is a broader funding base, the funding of pensions, health and social care is less subject to changes in the dependency ratio although it can be affected by the wider economic situation.

Linda then looked at countries' different national responses, especially since new EU member states brought increasing diversity with them. There are ideological differences within and between countries, but there are three main underlying policy issues: income redistribution, pro-natalism, and equal opportunities. A few states have pursued all options simultaneously, while others have focused on single issues. Family life and population issues are areas where states still have independence, but few have pursued pro-natalist objectives, although religion remains a strong force in areas such as liberalisation of abortion in countries such as Ireland and Poland. However, the general public in Europe remains suspicious of pro-natalism, and state intervention is reluctant or ambivalent.

She questioned whether activity at EU level had much impact on

national policies concerned with demographic trends, and whether any Union convergence would increase its influences. Electorates have difficulties agreeing with what the policies should be, and social laws are implemented at national level to accommodate differences in welfare systems. Statistical analysis shows that fertility rates probably did fall less where pro-family policy programmes exist, but these studies have been criticised for not taking into account all the variables and imputing rather than observing the effects of policies. There is also evidence to suggest that welfare arrangements have more impact on the timing of births, rather than the total number of births.

Linda then considered the public perceptions of policy impacts. She suggested that factors such as levels of benefit, isolated policies, family policy measures and public care are not perceived as encouraging family building, whereas the wider socio-economic climate, bundles of policies, economic factors, especially economic security, and access to convenient working arrangements and family support are important. Thus, economics will have a greater impact than family policy.

Linda concluded by pointing out that it could be no coincidence that France, where the policy environment is openly supportive of family life, has maintained fertility rates above the EU15 average, and that levels have fallen to an all-time low in Southern Europe where state support is limited. But this does not mean that EU policies to promote parental leave and extend childcare provision will automatically result in higher fertility rates. Data showing high levels of financial support for families and a high completed fertility cannot be assumed to demonstrate causality between policy and outcomes. This is illustrated by the fact that two of the EU states with the highest completed fertility, France and Ireland, offer very different levels of policy provision for families. Nor would extensive universal provision such as Sweden seem to be sufficient to prevent fluctuations in total fertility rates. When female employment rates are added into the equation the results are even more ambivalent. Supportive public policy that targets families is a necessary but not a sufficient condition to ensure high fertility rates.

The meeting concluded with a panel discussion chaired by Baroness Greengross.

Steve Smallwood  
Office for National Statistics

*Note that in order to get the write up into this newsletter there has not been time to clear this write up with all the presenters. A final write up will be placed on the web with access both from the BPS and ILC websites. We are grateful to Mike Murphy, Emily Grundy, Helen Bray (GAD), Jessica Chamberlain (ONS) and Abidin Muhriz (ILC) for assistance with material for this report.*

\*\*\*

**Population Association of America (PAA)  
2005 Annual Meeting  
Philadelphia Marriott, Philadelphia,  
Pennsylvania  
31 March - 2 April**

I was very grateful to receive funding from BPS and the Department of Human Sciences, Loughborough University to enable me to present a poster based on my qualitative and preliminary quantitative work from my PhD – *Sputis, Stuijs and Saline Drips*: Health-seeking behaviour for childhood illnesses in urban South Africa.

This was the first time I had ever attended such a conference and I was quite overwhelmed by the number of topics and sessions being run. It was just not possible to listen to all the paper presentations and see all the posters I would have liked. Some sessions I chose because of topics similar to my own, others out of general interest or because of an interesting Discussant or Chair. This is a taster of my PAA experience and papers and abstracts are available from <http://paa2005.princeton.edu>.

The first day I attended the AIDS Pandemic session (Chair: Susan Watkins; Discussant: John Bongaarts), in which the talks were centred around biases found in national HIV estimates, the accuracy of modelling by some international agencies, changes in family structure and improving data collection. I enjoyed all of these talks, but in particular the latter on the comprehension of survey questions in an AIDS indicator survey in Tanzania. A plea was made by Paul Yoder of Macro International for researchers to vigorously test their survey instrument before rushing into data collection.

The Child health and SES session was the most useful to me, particularly in terms of methodologies. I heard a very interesting paper by Mirchandani and Bishai (John Hopkins University) on the association of household SES and provider characteristics with health care utilization and choice of provider for children in Uganda. Wealthier households were more likely to travel further for health care, whilst more educated households were less likely to seek treatment at providers with greater travel time as well as bypass the primary health care facility for the hospital. User fees were also important in choosing a provider. The Discussant, William Dow (University of California, Berkeley) provided an excellent discussion of all of the papers.

Sexual behaviour in developing countries was the last but by no means least interesting session I attended at the Conference. I was particularly interested in attending this session as my MSc dissertation had focused on marriage and its links with HIV transmission in Zimbabwe. The first 2 talks, Bloom & Singh on husband's behaviour in India and Clark's paper on perception of risk amongst married couples in Malawi emphasized the female disadvantage in settings where husbands may have riskier behaviour, or where wives think they are more at risk than their spouse. It provided an interesting topic of debate for the Discussant, Alex Ezech (African Population and Health Research Center). The Williams paper on sexual violence against women in Moshi, Tanzania was extremely interesting, although disheartening, with 15.3% of women in a representative household survey reporting unwanted first sexual intercourse.

Immigrant health: selection and acculturation mostly focused on Mexican migrants to the USA. Although not relevant to my field of research, I wanted to hear Noreen Goldman (Princeton University) present a paper as she had previously done work on health-seeking behaviour for childhood illnesses in Guatemala which I had

found very useful. Other interesting sessions I attended included 'Community Influences on Health and Mortality', 'Educational patterns in developing countries' and 'Impacts of neighbourhoods and communities'.

My poster presentation was held in poster session 6: Applied Demography, Methods, Health and Mortality. Unfortunately this coincided with other interesting posters I wanted to view but I was lucky enough to be positioned near a few. Although at the end of the alphabet and therefore stuck at the back of the room in a poorly-lit area, there was a fair amount of traffic past the poster! These sessions are an excellent way of summarizing your work to a wider audience (you just never know who might walk past) and sharing information with other researchers. I was fortunately next to a poster which complemented my own. Catherine Stiff Andrzejewski (Brown University) presented work on child health-related behaviours in Southern Ghana with emphasis on health knowledge. This highlighted the importance of beliefs in health-seeking which was also central to my own conceptual framework on health-seeking in urban South Africa. I had interest in my poster from researchers looking at religious affiliation and health outcomes, which is also an important aspect of my research. Other poster sessions I attended included Poster session 2: Education, Gender, Religion, Language and Culture; Poster session 3: Fertility, Family Planning, Unions and Sexual behaviour; Poster session 5: Union formation and dissolution, fertility.

In-between poster sessions and talks, there was an excellent display of literature from various organizations such as the Population Council, Macro International, USAID and information on research centres such as the Max Planck Institute.

All in all, the whole process of preparing and presenting a poster at PAA, being exposed to different calibres of research and presentations and meeting many interesting individuals, has given me an excellent opportunity to improve my own work and prepare for the IUSSP conference in July. It was also great to meet up with old friends from LSHTM, Southampton University and the Max Planck Institute as well as make new friends from across the pond.

Natalie Spark-du Preez  
Loughborough University