Ethnicity and Intergenerational Differentials in Family Formation Patterns

Siew-Ean Khoo
Australian Demographic and Social Research Institute
The Australian National University

Paper for presentation at the European Population Conference,
Vienna, 1-4 September 2010

Introduction

The integration of immigrants and their children is an important research and policy issue in countries that have been the recipients of migrants of diverse ethnic backgrounds in the past and recent years. The family formation behaviour of immigrants and the second generation can be seen as an important indicator of their social and cultural integration as it reflects the extent of maintenance of social norms, ethnic family values and cultural identity. The paper examines the family formation patterns of the first and second generations in Australia – a country of immigration – using data from the 2006 population census.

Since the end of the 'White Australia' policy in the early 1970s, immigrants to Australia have come from all regions of the world. The structure of Australia's immigration program – with its family reunion, skilled and humanitarian components – has brought settlers from a great diversity of ethnic, religious, social and economic backgrounds. It is expected that this diverse group will have different patterns of settlement and adjustment in Australia, and their family formation patterns may provide some indications of these differences. Furthermore, intergenerational changes – from the first to the second, and from the second to the third generations – may also indicate the extent of their integration into Australian society.

Measures of family formation that are examined in this paper include the timing of first marriage, the extent of partnering by unmarried cohabitation and intermarriage, the age pattern of childbearing and fertility outcomes. Comparisons by ethnic origin and across generations will highlight the extent of convergence with the family formation behaviour shown by Australians who are of the third or more generations. The implications of the observed ethnic and generational differences for the social and cultural integration of immigrants and the second generation will be discussed.

Previous studies

Because of Australia' long history as a country of immigration, there has been particular interest in the demographic behaviour of immigrants. Early studies of marriage and fertility patterns of immigrants focused on comparisons by country of birth, and among immigrants from European countries. With the arrival of immigrants from non-European countries after 1975, it is only recently that studies have compared the family formation patterns of European and non-European immigrants.

Previous studies of marriage and fertility patterns of immigrants by country of birth based on census data have shown differentials among the different birthplace groups. Studies of marriage patterns in the 1980s showed that women born in Southern European and Middle Eastern countries such as Italy, Greece, the former Yugoslavia and Lebanon tended to marry at a younger age than Australian-born women (Khoo 1984; Carmichael 1988). It had been suggested that women from these countries were affected by more traditional family values than were Australian women in that parents exercised more influence over courtship and sex roles were more clearly defined (Bertelli 1985; Hearst 1985). There were indications of change over time as a comparison of 1976 and 1981 censuses showed some decline in the percentage ever married among 20-24 year old Southern European women (Carmichael 1988).

An older age pattern of marriage was observed for women of the second generation of Southern European origins compared with the first generation (Price 1982). There was also an increase in intermarriage in the second generation compared to the first generation, and it was suggested that the second generation, having been born and grown up in Australia might have been influenced more by their peers and less by their immigrant parents compared to the first generation.

Earlier studies of fertility patterns among migrants from European countries based on the 1954 and 1961 censuses showed that women born in the Netherlands had the highest fertility (Day 1965; 1971). However, data from later censuses showed that Middle Eastern women had the highest fertility among immigrant women and women born in Eastern European countries had the lowest fertility (Yusuf and Rockett 1981).

After the end of the 'White Australia' policy in the early 1970s, the source countries of migration to Australia became more diverse. Non-European countries such as Lebanon, Vietnam, Malaysia, Philippines and Sri Lanka were some of the top ten sources of settler arrivals in the late 1970s and 1980s, followed by China and India in the 1990s. Later studies of immigrant family formation patterns have included some of these birthplace groups in comparison with European migrants.

A study of immigrant family formation patterns based on 1991 census data showed similar patterns among the European migrants as the earlier studies but also some changes over time (Khoo and Shu 1996). Women born in Lebanon or Turkey had a younger age pattern of marriage, an earlier start to childbearing and had higher fertility rates than other overseas-born women.

Data and approach

The paper is based on data from the 2006 population census. The census is the only national data source in which successive generations can be identified by their ethnic origin. Data on ethnicity is based on self-identification in response to the census question, "What is the person's ancestry?" Each person can identify up to two ancestries. The ethnicity data in this paper is based on the single or first ancestry response.

In the paper, the first generation refers to overseas-born people who have migrated to Australia. The second generation refers to persons who are born in Australia who have one or both parents who are born overseas. The third or more generation refers to persons born in Australia whose parents are also born in Australia. It is not possible to differentiate the third generation from the fourth or more generations in the census data. Census data on partnering patterns include marital status by age and whether partnering is by marriage or de facto relationship (unmarried cohabitation) or by inter-ethnic marriage. The age pattern of childbearing and fertility outcomes are based on the census question on children ever born to women aged 15 and over. Partnering patterns are examined by ethnicity for first and second generation men and women in the age groups 15-24 and 25-29 in the main ancestry groups of Western, Southern and Eastern European, Middle Eastern and Asian origins in Australia. Patterns of childbearing are examined for women aged 15-24, 25-34 and 35-44 by ethnicity for the first and second generations. Comparison is also made with persons of the third or more generation who identify themselves as having Australian ancestry to see if there is a trend of convergence from the first to the second generation with the third or more generation.

The 1% sample file from the census is used in multivariate statistical analyses to examine if the observed ethnic and intergenerational differences are related to differences in social and economic characteristics and whether ethnicity and generation are significant correlates of social and cultural integration. Control variables included in the statistical analysis include level of education (having degree qualifications, other post-school qualifications or no qualifications), religion (Christian, other religion and no religion), age and marital status (in the analysis of childbearing patterns).

The 1% sample file has some limitations for the current analysis. The first is that the marital status variable identifies only registered marital status and does not identify partnering by de facto relationship. Therefore, the multivariate logistic regression analysis of partnering considers the dichotomous relationship of whether a person is married or not married. It is not possible to analyse whether partnering is by marriage or de facto relationship. The second limitation relates to the coding of the ancestry variable. Because of small numbers, particularly when data analysis is restricted to specific age groups, ancestry is coded specifically for the larger ethnic groups only; the smaller groups are aggregated into regional categories. The third limitation is that there is no information on the partner of individuals in the sample file so that it is not possible to examine the intermarriage patterns by ancestry and generation controlling for other covariates in multivariate regression analyses.

Ethnicity and intergenerational differentials in partnering

The percentage married or in a de facto relationship in the age group 15-24 is examined as an indicator of the extent of early or late age in partnering and whether partnering is more likely by marriage or unmarried cohabitation. Table 1 shows the percentage of men and women aged 15-24 who are married or in a de facto relationship according to their ancestry, comparing the partnering patterns of the first and the second generations and also with young people of the third or more generation who identified as ‘Australian’ in the census ancestry question. There are considerable differences by ancestry in the

percentage who are either married or in a de facto relationship in this age group of men and women. Differences are also observed in partnering patterns between the first and second generations in young people of some ethnicities.

In the first generation, men and women of Lebanese or Turkish origin have the highest percentage married in the 15-24 age group, indicating an early age at marriage (Table 1). They also have the lowest percentage in de facto relationships. This pattern is the same as observed in earlier census data (Khoo and Shu 1996). Women of Macedonian, Indian or Vietnamese ancestry also have a relatively high percentage married in the 15-24 age group. All other ancestry groups examined show much lower percentages married in this age group for both men and women.

In all the ancestry groups shown in Table 1, there is a decrease in the proportion married from the first to the second generation and the percentage married is closer to that for Australians of the third or more generation. This is observed among both men and women. The decline in the percentage married was quite substantial from the first to the second generation for Lebanese and Turkish men and women, showing a later age at marriage in the second generation compared to the first generation. They still have a higher proportion married in the second generation compared with men and women in the other ancestry groups; however, the difference is not as large as in the first generation.

The percentage married is relatively low for men and women of the second generation of many Southern European and Asian ancestries. This may be related to their higher participation in education, particularly the second generation of Asian ancestries (Khoo 2007). Among the first and second generations of Western European origins, men and women of Dutch ancestry have an earlier age pattern of marriage than others. This is also similar to the pattern observed in earlier studies (Khoo et al. 2002). It was thought that their earlier age at marriage might be related to their location of residence. Australians of Dutch origin are more likely than other groups to settle outside the metropolitan areas and the men are more likely to work in trades occupations. These factors may be related to their early marriage pattern (Khoo et al. 2002).

Partnering by de facto relationships is more likely among young men and women of Western European origins and not common among the Southern European, Middle Eastern and Asian groups with the exception of the first generation of Chinese ethnicity where the percentage in de facto relationships is greater than the percentage married. Some of the first generation Chinese are overseas students who are not living with their parents and this may be a factor in their greater likelihood of being in a de facto relationship compared with the other Asian ancestry groups. The partnering patterns of men and women of Western and Eastern European ancestries are more similar to the Australian third or more generation.

Another aspect of partnering that is particularly relevant to a discussion of the social and cultural integration of migrants and the second generation is intermarriage. Table 2 shows the percentage of partnered men and women with a spouse of different ancestry. In the first generation, men and women of Middle Eastern, Asian and Southern European

ancestries have much lower rates of intermarriage than men and women of Western or Eastern European ancestries. The low proportions intermarried in these groups partly reflect the migration of family units from these respective regions.

There is an increase in intermarriage from the first to the second generation for both men and women in all the ancestries examined. These patterns indicate greater social interaction in the second generation with people outside their ethnic group. Similar patterns were observed in analysis of the 2001 census data (Khoo 2004). The increase is quite significant for the Middle Eastern, Asian and Southern European groups that have low rates of intermarriage in the first generation, indicating that social integration is occurring in the second generation of these groups.

Ethnicity and intergenerational differentials in childbearing

The percentage with one or more children among women aged 15-24 and 25-34 is examined to show the likely age at which women of different ancestries and generation begin childbearing. Consistent with their early age at marriage, women of Lebanese or Turkish origin who are aged 15-24 are the most likely to have children compared with women of other ethnicities who are in the same age group (Table 3). More than one-third of women of the first generation of Lebanese origin and one-quarter of women of Turkish origin in this age group already have children, compared with about 10-12 per cent of women of most other ancestries. The other first generation women with percentages greater than this are women of Macedonian or Vietnamese origin, with 17 per cent and 14 per cent respectively who are already mothers. The early age at childbearing observed for Lebanese and Turkish women aged 15-24 in 2006 is similar to that observed for Lebanese and Turkish women aged in their 20s in earlier censuses (Khoo and Shu 1996). The early age at family formation of women of Lebanese and Turkish origins observed in these earlier censuses appears to have continued with successive cohorts of migrant women of these ethnicities.

There is a decline in the percentage with children from the first to the second generation among women aged 15-24 in almost all the ancestry groups shown in Table 3. The decline is particularly large for women of Lebanese or Turkish origin and is consistent with the decline in the percentage married in this age group from the first to the second generation shown earlier. Compared to the first generation, the second generation of these Middle Eastern origins are more similar to women of other ethnicities in their age at becoming mothers. Nonetheless, the percentage with children is still higher for second generation women of Lebanese background than second generation women of other ethnic origins. A significant decline in the percentage with children is also seen for women of Macedonian and Vietnamese origins from the first to the second generation. With the exception of women of Western European ancestries where the percentage with children is similar to the Australian third or more generation, the second generation of most Southern and Eastern European and Asian ethnicities have a lower percentage with children in the 15-24 age group than women who identified as ‘Australian’ in the third or more generation. As mentioned earlier, the greater likelihood of participation in education among these second generation young women may be a factor in their later age at family formation.

The percentage with children among women aged 25-34 shows a similar pattern by ancestry as for women aged 15-24. The percentage with children is still highest for first generation Lebanese and Turkish women and relatively low for Polish, Chinese and Sinhalese women. A decrease is observed in the percentage with children from the first to the second generation in most of the Southern European, Middle Eastern and Asian ancestry groups. Among the second generation, Vietnamese and Chinese women show a much later age at childbearing with a relatively low percentage (20 per cent or less) with children in the 25-34 age group. The decline from the first to the second generation in the percentage with children is particularly steep for Vietnamese women. In contrast, there was an increase from the first to the second generation in the percentage with children among women of Western European ancestries to more closely approximate the percentage for women of the third or more generation.

In the age group 35-44, women of most ethnicities in both the first and second generations have about 2 children (Table 4). The exception is first generation Lebanese women who have more than three children on average. However, the average number of children of Lebanese women in the second generation is just over two children and similar to that of the Australian third or more generation. There is also a decline in the average number of children from the first to the second generation among women of Southern European ancestries, while a small increase is observed among women of Western European ancestries. Among the second generation of European origins, women of Dutch ancestry have the highest average number of children at 2.1. This finding is consistent with that from an analysis of 1996 census data (Khoo et al. 2002). There is a pattern of convergence to about two children in the second generation of all ethnic origins to that of the Australian third or more generation. Lowest fertility in this age group is among Chinese and Polish women, with about 1.5 children in both first and second generations. Average number of children ever born is not calculated for the second generation of some of the more recent migrant groups because most of their second generation is still aged less than 35.

Results of multivariate statistical analyses

The above analyses show considerable differences by ancestry or ethnic origin in patterns of partnering and childbearing, particularly among the overseas-born first generation in Australia. To evaluate whether these differences are due partly to differences in education and religious affiliation among the various ancestry groups, statistical analysis of data from the 1% sample file from the 2006 census was carried out in relation to the some of the measures of family formation to control for any differences in these characteristics by ancestry. The data analyses also examine whether there is convergence in these measures of family formation patterns from the first to the second generation – that the differences by ancestry are smaller in the second generation than in the first generation – that indicates social and cultural integration.

Multivariate logistic regression analyses are carried out to examine the proportion married in the age group 15-24 for men and women in the first and second generations by ancestry controlling for age, sex, education and religion as covariates. Significant

differences by ancestry remain even after controlling for these variables (Table 5). The differences are also larger in the first generation than the second generation. The Middle Eastern and South-Eastern European groups, together with the Vietnamese, Indians and other South Asian groups are more likely to be married, while the Chinese first generation are much less likely to be married than the reference group in the logistic regression analysis, the first generation of British or Irish origin. The first or second generation of British or Irish ancestry is chosen as the reference category in these analyses because their family formation patterns are very similar to those of the Australian third or more generation. In the second generation, only the Middle Eastern and Southern European groups have significantly higher proportions married compared with the reference category. The other ancestry groups are not significantly different from the reference group, suggesting some convergence in the second generation compared with the first generation. The second generation of Southern European origins are mainly those of Maltese origin and analysis of the 1996 census data also shos this group to have a relatively low age at marriage (Khoo et al. 2002).

Differences in the proportion married in the age group 15-24 by ancestry are greater among women than men. When males and females are analysed separately, South-Eastern and Lebanese men still show a greater likelihood to be married before age 25 than men of other ethnicities but differences for the other ancestry groups are not significantly different from the reference group (results not shown in table). The results of the regression analysis for women show the same pattern of significant coefficients as in Table 5.

Multivariate analysis of the next measure of family formation, the likelihood of an early start to childbearing, also shows that differences by ancestry remain even after controlling for education and religion (Table 6). Of women under age 35, the first generation of Lebanese, other Middle Eastern, Indian and other South Asian origins are significantly more likely, and women of Chinese and other East Asian origins significantly less likely, to have children than the reference group, women of British or Irish origins. Differences between the Middle Eastern and South Asian ancestries and the reference category in the second generation are not significant. However, the second generation of Italian, Greek and other South-Eastern European origins as well as those of Chinese and other East Asian origins are less likely to have children compared to the reference group in the analysis. These findings confirm the patterns shown in the earlier descriptive results. They are also consistent with those from an analysis of data from the 1996 census. The regression analyses also show an inverse relation between education and start of childbearing; women in both the first and second generations with lower levels of education are more likely to have children than those with degree or higher qualifications.

The multivariate ordinal logit regression[1] results on children ever born to women aged 35-44 also show that differentials by ethnic origin remain among women in both the first and second generations after controlling for education and religion. The regression

[1] Ordinal logit regression is used because the dependent variable was coded as 1 for no children, 2 for one child, 3 for two children and 4 for three or more children.

analysis is restricted to married women only to control for marital status. First generation women of Middle Eastern origins have significantly higher fertility and Western European and East Asian women have significantly lower fertility compared to the reference group of British or Irish origin. In the second generation it is women of Italian, Greek and other Southern and Eastern European origins who have significantly lower fertility than other women. The regression analyses show that differences in completed fertility by ethnicity in the second generation are smaller than those in the first generation. This confirms the patterns shown in the earlier descriptive analyses. As expected, there is an inverse relation between children ever born to this age group of women and level of education. Higher fertility is also seen in women who report a religious affiliation than women reporting no religious affiliation.

Conclusion

As in earlier analyses of the family formation patterns by origin of overseas-born and second generation women in Australia, the current analysis of data from the most recent census in 2006 also show significant differences by reported ancestry in patterns of partnering and childbearing. Differences by ethnicity are larger in the first generation than in the second generation for most of the measures of family formation examined. There is also evidence of some convergence in the second generation to a pattern that is more similar to that of the third or more generation, particularly in childbearing patterns.

However, partnering by de facto relationships remains relatively less common in both the first and second generations of Southern European, Middle Eastern and most Asian origins compared to those of Western European origins and the Australian third or more generation. The percentage intermarried is also lower in the Southern European, Middle Eastern and Asian groups, although there is an increase from the first to the second generation. The influence of ethnicity on the partnering patterns of the second generation in these groups appears to be still strong. It may also be that the immigrant parents in these ethnic groups still have some influence on their children's partnering patterns, but less so in relation to their children's fertility decisions. It has been suggested that the fertility patterns of the second generation may be less tied to cultural values and more amenable to change according to their economic circumstances and aspirations (Khoo et al. 2002). These differential effects of ethnicity on different aspects of family formation warrant further study with more detailed data than those available from the census.

References

Bertelli, L., "Italian families," in D. Storer (ed.), *Ethnic Family Values.* Sydney: Prentice-Hall , pp. 33-73

Carmichael, G. 1988. *With This Ring: First Marriage Patterns, Trends and Prospects in Australia.* Canberra: ANU Printing Press.

Day, L., 1965. "Family size and fertility," in A.F. Davies and S. Encel (eds.), *Australian Society: Sociological Introduction*. Melbourne: Cheshire.

_____, 1971. "Differential fertility in Australia," in *International Population Conference, London, 1969,* vol 3. Liege: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, pp. 2043-52.

Hearst, S., 1985. "Greek families," in in D. Storer (ed.), *Ethnic Family Values*. Sydney: Prentice-Hall , pp. 121-45.

Khoo, S.E., 2004. "Intermarriage in Australia: patterns by ancestry, gender and generation," *People and Place,* 12 (2): 35-44.

_____, 2007. "Educational attainments, inter-ethnic marriage and social cohesion," in J. Jupp and J. Nieuwenhuysen, with E. Dawson (eds.) *Social Cohesion in Australia*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 10, pp. 114-130.

Khoo, S.E., P. McDonald, D. Giorgas and B. Birrell, 2002. *Second Generation Australians.* Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs.

Khoo, S.E. and J. Shu, 1996. *Immigrant Family Formation Patterns in Australia*. Canberra: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.

Price, C., 1982. *The Fertility and Marriage Patterns of Australia's Ethnic Groups.* Canberra: Australian National University.

Yusuf, F. and I. Rockett, 1981. "Immigrant fertility patterns and differentials in Australia, 1971-76". *Population Studies*, 35 (3): 413-24.

Table 1. Proportion married or living together, men and women aged 15-24 by ancestry and generatio Australia 2006 (%)

Ancestry	Generation	Men			Women		
		% married	% cohabiting	% partnered	% married	% cohabiting	%partnered
English	1st	2.6	8.1	10.6	5.8	14.4	20.3
	2nd	1.9	7.3	9.2	4.4	12.6	17.0
Irish	1st	2.3	10.1	12.5	4.7	16.2	20.9
	2nd	1.4	6.2	7.5	2.9	10.5	13.5
Dutch	1st	5.3	8.5	13.8	8.6	13.4	21.9
	2nd	4.5	10.2	14.7	7.0	13.8	20.8
German	1st	3.6	7.7	11.3	8.5	17.6	26.1
	2nd	2.5	8.5	11.0	4.8	14.7	19.5
Italian	1st	5.5	6.5	12.0	8.0	12.1	20.2
	2nd	1.6	3.8	5.5	4.4	5.9	10.3
Croatian	1st	1.4	2.8	4.2	8.5	5.3	13.8
	2nd	1.2	3.5	4.6	4.9	5.3	10.2
Greek	1st	4.0	3.7	7.7	9.1	3.6	12.7
	2nd	1.7	1.6	3.4	4.1	2.9	7.0
Macedonian	1st	6.5	1.5	8.1	21.8	1.9	23.8
	2nd	1.7	1.5	3.2	5.7	2.3	8.0
Serbian	1st	3.1	1.5	4.6	9.9	2.8	12.7
	2nd	1.2	3.5	4.7	4.5	4.8	9.3
Polish	1st	2.4	5.9	8.3	9.1	10.0	19.1
	2nd	0.9	4.2	5.1	2.3	6.1	8.4
Lebanese	1st	18.2	1.1	19.3	44.8	0.7	45.5
	2nd	4.0	1.0	5.0	14.9	1.0	15.9
Turkish	1st	13.1	1.4	14.5	38.2	1.3	39.5
	2nd	4.2	1.1	5.4	11.8	1.3	13.1
Vietnamese	1st	3.7	1.9	5.6	14.4	2.8	17.2
	2nd	0.6	0.8	1.4	1.3	2.0	3.3
Chinese	1st	2.0	4.7	6.7	4.2	6.3	10.5
	2nd	1.5	0.9	1.4	1.0	2.2	3.2
Indian	1st	3.2	1.5	4.7	21.7	2.6	24.3
	2nd	1.2	1.8	3.0	3.6	2.3	6.0
Sinhalese	1st	1.7	1.2	2.9	6.9	2.1	8.9
	2nd	0.9	2.1	3.0	1.2	2.9	4.1
Australian	3rd	1.6	6.3	7.9	3.5	10.1	13.6

Source: 2006 census

Table 2. Percentage of partnered men and women with spouse of a different ancestrya, by ancestry and generation, 2006

Ancestry	1st generation		2nd generation	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
English	41	36	49	48
Irish	62	59	86	83
Dutch	62	55	89	88
German	59	56	91	90
Greek	12	9	37	31
Italian	22	12	51	42
Croatian	26	21	60	59
Macedonian	10	8	39	35
Serbian	26	17	67	62
Polish	34	34	84	80
Lebanese	11	8	31	21
Turkish	11	7	25	16
Vietnamese	7	13	48	48
Chinese	6	13	35	48
Indian	11	11	56	58
Sinhalese	14	13	95	86

a. Based on sole ancestry response
Source: Khoo et al. (2009)

Table 3. Percentage with 1 or more children, women aged 15 -24 and 25-34, by ancestry and generation, Australia 2006

Ancestry	Generation	Aged 15-24	Aged 25-34
English	1st	12.6	48.3
	2nd	12.2	52.0
Irish	1st	9.1	36.6
	2nd	9.4	45.3
Dutch	1st	9.0	46.6
	2nd	10.6	54.4
German	1st	10.3	36.9
	2nd	11.0	50.1
Italian	1st	11.3	40.9
	2nd	7.8	43.1
Croatian	1st	10.9	52.2
	2nd	8.1	43.7
Greek	1st	12.3	51.4
	2nd	8.0	40.5
Macedonian	1st	17.0	67.2
	2nd	9.3	50.0
Serbian	1st	12.3	59.7
	2nd	9.0	46.7
Polish	1st	8.6	36.5
	2nd	6.3	37.1
Lebanese	1st	37.8	80.5
	2nd	17.1	58.3
Turkish	1st	26.7	73.8
	2nd	12.1	52.2
Vietnamese	1st	14.4	58.8
	2nd	8.2	16.6
Chinese	1st	5.4	32.3
	2nd	5.6	20.0
Indian	1st	11.2	53.4
	2nd	10.0	34.4
Sinhalese	1st	7.7	45.0
	2nd	8.4	34.1
Australian	3rd	12.4	56.5

Source: 2006 census

Table 4. Average number of children, women aged 35-44, by ancestry and generation, Australia 2006

Ancestry	First generation	Second generation
English	1.89	1.89
Irish	1.77	1.81
Dutch	1.81	2.08
German	1.61	1.77
Italian	1.82	1.70
Croatian	1.91	1.61
Greek	1.90	1.58
Macedonian	2.03	1.69
Serbian	1.85	1.56
Polish	1.59	1.55
Lebanese	3.17	2.10
Turkish	2.24	nc
Vietnamese	1.92	nc
Chinese	1.48	1.38
Indian	1.75	nc
Sinhalese	1.74	nc
Australian (3rd generation)		2.07

nc= not calculated, N<500.

Table 5. Logistic regression results (regression coefficients and standard errors): proportion married, first and second generation men and women aged 15-24 years.

Variable	1st generation		2nd generation	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Ancestry				
British, Irish	0		0	
German	0.403	0.564	0.283	0.443
Other NW European	0.518	0.512	0.661	0.419
Italian	-0.709	1.037	-0.148	0.324
Other Southern European	0.568	0.576	1.216**	0.377
Greek	-0.109	1.059	0.359	0.375
Other SE European	1.007**	0.323	-0.247	0.531
S. & E European	-0.276	0.622	-1.235	1.020
Lebanese	1.435**	0.488	0.786**	0.389
Other N. Afr. & Middle Eastern	1.225**	0.294	1.340**	0.351
Vietnamese	1.218**	0.321	-0.107	0.613
Chinese	-0.558**	0.250	-0.491	0.477
Other East Asian	0.404	0.254	-1.168	1.020
Indian	1.059**	0.281	-	-
Other South Asian	1.138**	0.303	-	-
Age group (years)				
15-19	0		0	
20-24	2.640**	0.295	2.921**	0.353
Sex				
Male	0		0	
Female	1.088**	0.150	1.060**	0.185
Education				
Degree or higher	0		0	
Diploma or Certificate	0.604**	0.217	-0.230	0.252
No post school qualifications	0.189	0.187	-0.356	0.232
Religion				
Christian	0		0	
Other	0.225	0.172	-0.072	0.256
No religion	-0.115	0.211	-0.462**	0.234
Constant	-6.077**	0.403	-6.052**	0.447
N	3694		5137	

0 = reference category
**p<0.05
* p<0.10

Table 6. Logistic regression results (regression coefficients and standard errors): proportion with one or more children, first and second generation women aged 15-34 years.

Variable	First generation		Second generation	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Ancestry				
British, Irish	0		0	
German	-0.404	0.291	0.121	0.185
Other NW European	-0.316	0.253	-0.393	0.239
Italian	-0.274	0.407	-0.583**	0.127
Other Southern European	-0.112	0.312	-0.118	0.235
Greek	-0.359	0.470	-0.445**	0.180
Other SE European	0.242	0.221	-0.495**	0.188
S. & E European	-0.268	0.248	-0.380	0.256
Lebanese	1.054**	0.310	0.135	0.222
Other N. Afr. & Middle Eastern	0.789**	0.193	-0.223	0.28
Vietnamese	0.422	0.189	-0.334	0.499
Chinese	-0.718**	0.127	-1.295**	0.352
Other East Asian	-0.208*	0.126	-1.015**	0.471
Indian	0.530**	0.176	-0.423	0.488
Other South Asian	0.480**	0.198	-0.703	0.506
Age group (years)				
15-19	0		0	
20-24	1.848**	0.283	3.061**	0.331
25-29	3.484**	0.275	4.560**	0.327
30-34	4.804**	0.275	5.606**	0.327
Education				
Degree or higher	0		0	
Diploma or Certificate	0.834**	0.110	0.805**	0.107
No post school qualifications	1.249**	0.096	1.224**	0.101
Religion				
Christian	0		0	
Other	-0.187*	0.102	-0.009	0.125
No religion	-0.376**	0.107	-0.019	0.098
Constant	-4.794**	0.289	-.5.813**	0.366
N	4455		4910	

0 = reference category
**p<0.05
* p<0.10

Table 7. Ordinal logit regression results (regression coefficients and standard errors): children ever born, first and second generation married women aged 35-44 years.

Variable	First generation		Second generation	
	Coefficient	SE	Coefficient	SE
Ancestry				
British, Irish	0		0	
German	-0.543**	0.213	-0.096	0.187
Other NW European	-0.561**	0.196	0.004	0.212
Italian	-0.272	0.208	-0.331**	0.116
Other Southern European	-0.122	0.243	-0.274	0.229
Greek	0.007	0.256	-0.478**	0.148
Other SE European	-0.177	0.157	-0.340	0.215
S. & E European	-0.962**	0.212	-0.597**	0.250
Lebanese	0.902**	0.217	0.141	0.402
Other N. Afr. & Middle Eastern	0.659**	0.167	1.235	0.889
Vietnamese	-0.584**	0.182		
Chinese	-0.632**	0.103	-0.193	0.417
Other East Asian	-0.674**	0.113	0.101	0.590
Indian	-0.282*	0.163	0.526	0.805
Other South Asian	0.007	0.177	0.188	0.766
Education				
Degree or higher	0		0	
Diploma or Certificate	0.307**	0.089	0.374**	0.162
No post school qualifications	0.607**	0.078	0.545**	0.129
Religion				
Christian	0		0	
Other	0.128	0.089	-0.093	0.121
No religion	-0.341**	0.089	-0.471**	0.110
N	3359		1909	

0 = reference category