

## **Family structure and educational attainment in Hungary**

Erzsebet Bukodi & Jaap Dronkers

Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Budapest, Hungary & European University Institute,  
San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy

Paper presented at the second conference of the European network for empirical and comparative research on the sociological aspects of divorce, Tilburg (Netherlands), November 13-16, 2003.

# Family structure and educational attainment in Hungary

Erzsebet Bukodi & Jaap Dronkers<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

In this paper we investigate the effect of parental divorce on educational achievement of children in Hungary. We use data of the Hungarian Youth survey from 2000, which is a sample of 8000 respondents born between 1971 and 1985. The dependent variable is the educational level of the respondents at the age of 17, 20 and 25, while the parental divorce variable is constructed on the combination of information on the family form until the age of 14 and the causes of not living with biological parents. We also control for parental occupation and education, number of siblings, extracurricular activities and religious socialisation. We find clear negative effects of parental divorce on educational outcomes at the age of 17 and 20, both for respondents living in a single parent family and for respondents living in a divorced family with a new (step-)parent. We don't find significant negative effects of living in a single parent family, if death is the cause of single-parenthood. Negative effects of divorce have become insignificant for the educational attainment at the age of 25, while the negative effects of living in a single parent family, caused by death, are now significant. These results suggest that the effects of parental divorce in Hungary, a former communist society, hardly deviate from those of other European societies.

## Introduction

Many scholars of different disciplines often reported intergenerational effects of parental divorce: for instance on the children's attained educational and occupational level, and on the risk of divorcing.

The common wisdom among the students of divorce is that there are no significant differences between countries in the magnitude of differences between children from separated and intact families. A recent example of this common wisdom is Pryor and Rodgers (2001), who compares outcomes of studies from the US, UK, Australia and New Zealand. Despite their very restricted sample of four countries (Anglo-Saxon, weak welfare states), they repeat their conclusion (no significant differences between countries in the magnitude of differences between children from separated and intact families) over and over again (59, 61, 64, 233).

But there are emerging indications that these intergenerational effects of divorce are not equal in all western societies. As an example Pong, Dronkers & Hampden-Thompson (2003), comparing the educational results of pupils with divorced parents in eleven developed countries, found that single-parenthood is associated with lower maths and science achievement among young children than their counterparts in two-parent families. However, they also found significant country level variations in this negative effect of single-parenthood on children's maths and science achievements. After controlling for family resources and other demographic variables, they found a significant relationship between the prevalence of single-parent families and the achievement gap between children from two- and single-parent families. The achievement gap was greater in countries where single-parent families are more common. In other words, children

---

<sup>1</sup> All correspondence to the second author: J. Dronkers, European University Institute, Department of Political and Social Sciences, Via dei Roccettini 9, I-50016 San Domenico di Fiesole (FI), Italy. E-mail: [jaap.dronkers@iue.it](mailto:jaap.dronkers@iue.it). Personal homepage: <http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>

from single-parent families are worse off academically in a society with many single-parent families than they are in a society with few single-parent families. Garib, Martin Gracia & Dronkers (2003) replicated the study of Pong et al., and extended it in four directions: 19 instead of 11 nations; more variables to control for parental resources; not only math and science outcomes, but also reading; four family-forms instead of two. Their first conclusion is that the relation between family-form and educational achievement is not equal in all the 19 OECD countries, also not after controlling for characteristics of parents and pupils and their behaviour and attitudes towards school. Especially the family-forms 'father, mother and grandparent or other' and 'single-mother' have no equal effects in these 19 countries. They could explain these differences by taking into account the percentage lone-parent families and the generosity of the maternity-leaves in these societies. The more lone-parent family in a society, the lower the reading and math score of pupils with single-mother. The longer the maternity leave in a society, the higher the reading scores of pupils living with father, mother and grandparent and the reading score of pupils with single-mothers. Pong et al. (2003) report the same demographical context and family-policy indicator as relevant for explaining cross-national differences in effects of single-motherhood on educational achievement of her children. Another example of the inter-countries differences in the intergenerational effects of divorce is provided by the study by Engelhardt, Trappe & Dronkers (2002). They compared the intergenerational effects of parental divorce in West and East Germany. They found that these effects were lower in East Germany despite its much higher divorce level, but that this difference in intergenerational effect disappeared by controlling for the differences in the religious composition of these two parts of Germany.

Despite the wealth of literature on the intergenerational effects of parental divorce, this research is mostly done in countries with a strong protestant history and culture, where divorce has long been a possibility in the majority of these states; furthermore, it is particularly concentrated on Anglo-Saxon countries. Therefore, most of this research has been done in the U.S.A. and in the north-western part of Europe: U.S.A. (for a review see Amato, 2001); Germany (Wagner 1997, Wagner & Weiss, 2003), the Netherlands (Borgers, Dronkers & van Praag 1996; Bosman & Louwes 1988; Dronkers 1994, 1999; Spruijt & Goede 1996; Goede, Spruijt & Maas, 1999; Spruijt, Goede & Valk, 2001), Sweden (Jonsson & Gähler 1997; McNab & Murray 1985; Murray & Sandquist 1990), Switzerland (Oggenfuss 1984), and the UK (Cherlin *et al.* 1991; Kiernan 1992; Kiernan, Land & Lewis 1998; Ní Bhrolcháin 2001; Ní Bhrolcháin, Chappell & Diamond, 2000). Only very recently have the first studies on the intergenerational effects of parental divorce have been published for three catholic societies, France (Martin, 1997: 121; Traag, Dronkers & Vallet, 2000; Archambault, 2002), Italy (Albertini & Dronkers, 2003) and Spain (Martinez, 2002). Thus analysing the intergenerational effects for non Anglo-Saxon countries may be fruitful, in order to avoid generalisation based on just a few, not necessarily representative, Anglo-Saxon societies.

The aim of the paper is to add to the research on intergenerational effects of divorce in mainly catholic countries: Hungary. Until now, in Hungary, no empirical research based on a large data-set has been done on the intergenerational effects of parental divorce on children education. But the Hungarian case may differ from Western-European societies for two reasons: their communist past and their religious diversity.

Communist regimes had a more liberal view on divorce and introduced the no-fault divorce and divorce by mutual consent early, compared to the Western-European societies and the US. These liberal divorce laws might reduce the length and amount of family conflict around the parental divorce, because the juridical battles will be shorter and less cumbersome. The level and duration of parental conflict before and after the divorce is one of the most important explanations of the negative effect of parental divorce on children. Thus a lower level and a shorter duration of parental conflict will be beneficial for children of divorced parents. Also the communist regimes had developed elaborate welfare system, which might be beneficial for children of divorced parents, because their financial situation deteriorate less dramatically after divorce. The bad financial situation of single-mothers after their divorce is one of the other important explanations of the negative effect of parental divorce on children. The results from the comparison of the intergenerational transmission of divorce risks between West- and East Germany by Engelhardt, Trappe & Dronkers (2002) support partly the more favourable situation of children of divorced parents in the communist East Germany.

Hungary is a more religious diver society, compared to the other parts of the former Austrian-Hungarian Imperium, like Austria, Northern-Italy or the Tsjech republic. Especially in the poorer, Eastern parts of Hungary are substantial protestant minorities (mainly Lutheran and Calvinists), dating back to the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century, when these parts still belonged to the Ottoman Imperium (Dronkers & Róbert, 2003). Protestant religions tend to be less opposed against divorce. As a consequence Protestants might divorce more easily and with less prolonged conflict. If this is the case the Hungarian case might deviate from the results from the other European catholic countries, like France, Italy and Spain.

Another consequence of the communist regime has been a relative weakening of the position of the Catholic Church in the daily Hungarian life. Although after the regime change in 1989, the Catholic Church has regain some of its former power and position, it has not regained the current power and position it still enjoys in some other parts of the former Austrian-Hungarian Imperium. A substantial part of the Hungarian population defines itself as non-religious or not observant. Therefore, divorce will not be seen by this part of the Hungarian population as a moral sin, and thus divorce more easily and with less prolonged conflict.

Despite these three reasons for deviant Hungarian outcomes, we assume that the results found in other European societies also apply in principal to Hungary (we will not review this literature, because there are sufficient recent reviews, for example Amato 2001; Wagner & Weiss, 2003). Therefore, our hypotheses are based on this international research.

## **The Hungarian context – previous research**

### *Trends in union dissolution*

The share of marriages ending in divorce has been rising gradually since the fifties in Hungary. Between the mid-seventies and mid-eighties the divorce rate increased even more rapidly. The relatively high separation rate, at least in part is due to the liberal divorce legislation which has a long tradition in Hungary. The no-fault divorce was introduced in the early 1950s; and in the mid-1970s the marriage law was reformed to allow divorce by mutual consent and the divorce rate began to rise. By the mid-eighties the legal procedure had become more complicated, but it has resulted only a temporary halt in the increase in the

separation rate. However, the most substantial increase can be detected after 1992. In the early nineties number of divorces per 1000 existing marriages was 'only' 375, by 2000 it has risen to 499. Thus, it appears to be very important to investigate the effect of parents' union dissolution on children's of 1990s different outcomes.

Similarly to other countries, couples' (and individuals') characteristics have significant impact on the odds of divorce in Hungary. Having children substantially influences individuals' decision about union separation: the more children one has, the less likely one's marriage will dissolve. Not only the number of children, but also the age of them affects individuals' probability of divorce: there is a postponing effect for couples with a preschool child (Bukodi and Róbert, 2003). In Hungary, education has no significant impact on the odds of union dissolution, either for females or for males. However, according to a very recent study an important change can be detected in the role of human capital in divorce risk. Firstly, for the younger cohorts the odds of separation appear to be the lowest on the top of educational hierarchy. Secondly, well-educated couples seem to postpone their divorce until their children adolescent ages (probably being aware of the fact that union dissolution may have a detrimental effect on child development) (Bukodi, 2002). As for the labour market involvement is concerned, the traditional sex-role specialisation appears to be working; although there are signs indicating changes into the direction of role combination. Namely, for women the hazard of union dissolution is higher when the female has greater labour force attachment, while for men stronger labour market participation and higher earning potential significantly decreases the risk of divorce (Bukodi and Róbert, 2003). In addition to couples' material resources cultural assets also influences the odds of divorce in Hungary. The higher the parents' educational attainment, the more likely the individual will cease his/her marriage in the case of serious problem. On the contrary, denomination has a negative impact on the risk of marital dissolution (Bukodi and Róbert, 2003).

#### *The effect of divorce on children's outcomes*

Little is known about the relationship between parental family structure and children's outcomes in Hungary. Most of the researches in this respect focus on the effect of living in a lone-parent family on children poverty. Since early nineties the extent of poverty among children has increased substantially; and it caused a particularly serious problem for those living in a single-parent families. By the end of the 1990s the income per capita in these households has dropped to the 75 per cent of the average (Spéder, 2002). Unfortunately, these studies do not disaggregate the lone parent families according to their "origin"; namely they do not investigate directly the impact of divorce on the odds of becoming poor.

According to the results from different studies in western societies, parents' marital experiences exert a substantial effect on the child's partnership history. Namely, parental divorce increases the odds of offspring's union dissolution (Amato 2001), or it may have a positive impact on the propensity of cohabitation instead of marriage. A recent paper has shown that these patterns – at least the latter one - can be observed in Hungary as well. In the end of the nineties young single women grown up in a non-intact family appeared to choose non-marital partnership at a higher rate than marriage. In addition, they entered into cohabitation at younger ages than they counterparts originated from two-parent families (Róbert and Bukodi, 2002). These findings underline the fact that parental divorce may have long-term effects on individuals' life chances.

According to our best knowledge, up to now only one paper investigated the impact of parental family structure on children's educational success or failure in Hungary. This study focused on the explanatory factors of schooling performance and educational plans of

student in their last year of secondary schools. Among other results, the effect of living in a lone parent family is particularly interesting and is in line with the previous findings all over the world: children in single parent families have worse grades than students living with their two biological parents, and the probability of continuing into university is lower for them than for their counterparts (Róbert, 2001).

### **Theoretical model and hypotheses**

As it has been argued before, the other main hypotheses are based on international research (Amato & Keith, 1991; Amato, 2001), and they are articulated as follows:

1. The educational level of children living with their divorced single-parent is lower than the educational level of children of still married parents.
2. The educational level of children of widowed single-parents is equal to the educational level of children of married parents their economic resources being equal.
3. The educational level of children living with their divorced biological parent and a step-parent is lower than the educational level of children of still married parents and equal to the level of children living with their divorced single-parent.
4. The positive effects of social and cultural resources on educational outcome **don't differ** between families with still married parents, a divorced single-parent, a divorced biological parent and a step-parent.
5. Given the more liberal divorce laws since the early '50, the religiously mixed population and the less strong position of the Catholic Church in Hungarian society, we expect smaller negative effects of divorce and even no significant effect for those generations, who longer during the communist regime.

### **Data and measurements**

The data for this study is obtained from the Hungarian Youth Survey (HYS) conducted in 2000. This is a cross-sectional survey carried out by Hungarian Central Statistical Office including 8000 individuals born between 1971 and 1985. The sample used in this analysis consist of respondents aged 17-29 (N=6980). In some points additional age restrictions were imposed (see bellow). The HYS data-set contain retrospective information on respondents' educational history, and on the details of their parental family structure, as well on some elements of their economic and cultural background.

As for the dependent variables are concerned, we have constructed three variables indicating the highest education of respondent at different ages (at the age of 17, 20, and 25). To analyse individuals' educational level at the age of 20, and 25, only respondents aged 20 (or 25) and over are considered.

In order to construct the variable on family structure, the following survey-questions were used: "By whom have you been grown up until the age of 14?" and "If by not your biological parents: what was the main reason for it?". There are – at least - two shortcomings of this type of question-wording: a) we have no information on the exact timing of the start of a spell in a lone parent or in a step-parent family (it could happen in the early childhood as well as at the age of 14, for instance), and consequently b) there is no information on the length of time spent in non-biological-parent family. However, according to the survey instruction the longest period experienced by the respondent should be considered as the 'typical' family situation between the age of 0-14. Being aware of this fact, a variables with following categories was developed: respondent 'typically' lived in their childhood 1) with their biological parents; in a lone-parent family derived from 2) parents' divorce; 3) a parent death; 4) in a step-family. Almost 15 per cent of the respondents reported that their

substantial part of their life until the age of 14 was spent in a non-intact family; either their mother's partnership dissolved before they reached age 14 (9.5 per cent); or one of their parents died (5 per cent).

To capture the effect of material resources on educational success, three variables are included in the analysis: two ones to measure parents' employment status and one to take into account the number of siblings. As for the former two are concerned, not only father's/mother's labour market participation is considered but also their occupational position by applying a modified version of EGP schema. There are a number of cases where parents' labour market status is unknown (for fathers this share is 21 per cent of the sample; for mothers it covers only 9 per cent); partly because the child did not know his/her father/mother; partly because respondent did not have any contact to his/her father/mother. We have decided to include these cases into the category of never-worked parent.

The following set of independent variables is designed to control for differences in cultural family background. Educational attainment of father and mother are discrete variables that can take five values from primary education to university diploma. In those instances where this information was not available, a dummy variable was constructed. Other two variables are used to capture the impact of cultural resources on educational attainment: the number of extra-curricular activities respondent was involved during his/her educational career, and a dummy for religious socialisation.

Table 1 presents the weighted descriptive statistics for dependent and independent variables used in this study by the family structure. This table shows that children grown up in an intact family (with two biological parents) have reached the highest education at the age of 17, and 20 as well as 25. For instance, the share of respondents aged 25-29 with tertiary diploma is 18 per cent for those lived with their biological parents in the childhood, but it covers only 8.4 per cent for people whom parents divorced and who lived in a step-family in the most of the time of their childhood. In other words, there are striking differences in youngsters' educational level according to the family structure.

These differences can be emphasised for background variables as well. If the parents divorced, and the child was grown up in a single parent family, information on father's employment status or education was not available for the majority of respondents; probably because there was no any significant association between the father and his son/daughter. This proportion is somewhat lower for young people lived in a stepfamily (due to the divorce of biological parents) in their childhood. However, in this cases the category of 'no information' may be a mixed one including respondents reporting data on his/her biological parent and individuals reporting information on his/her stepfather. When interpreting the results this fact should be kept in mind. In addition, according to descriptive results, youngsters came from stepfamilies have the 'worst' social background both in material and cultural sense.

This study employs ordered logit model to analyse the effect of family structure and economic as well as cultural background on educational attainment at different ages. Three different models are specified. The first one includes only the independent variable for family structure and the age as well as the sex of respondent. This model is design to test for any relationship between education and family structure. Assuming that parental time and financial resources increase the likelihood of achieving higher education and children living with their non-biological parents receive on average less time, parental efforts and money than their counterparts from traditional two-parent families (see the Hypotheses section of

the paper), we expect to see the likelihood of attaining higher education to be smaller for youngster living in the different forms of non-intact family.

The second model adds to Model 1 the control variables for parents' financial resources. Comparing the coefficients of the variable on family structure from Model 1 and 2, allows us to test the hypothesis on schooling differences between young people originating from traditional two-parent families and those from other types of the families is due primarily to differences of material background characteristics which are supposed to be correlated with family type. Model 3 is design to test the same phenomenon with respect of cultural background traits. In the last part of the study we disaggregate our sample according to the categories of family structure variables, and re-run our final model (Model 3) separately on these sub-samples. It will be done because we would like to investigate more deeply the impact of family background characteristics on educational attainment in different family settings.

## Results

### *The main effect of family structure*

Table 2 offers the first test of our hypotheses. As said before model 1 gives more or less the raw effect of the family-form on the educational outcome at the various ages (only controlling for age and sex of respondent). The three models 1 in table 2 give significant negative effects of the three family-forms in comparison with an intact family. This proves that also in Hungary there exists a relation between parental family-form and educational achievement of their children. There is a kind of order between the three family-forms in the strength of the negative effect: parent & step-parent < widowed parent < single parent < intact family. At all ages, the negative effect of the combination 'parent and step-parent' is stronger than the negative effect of single-parent and that of widowed parent (the latter is only not true at the age of 25). But the effect of widowed parent on educational outcome is always stronger than the effect of single-parent. This order deviates from the order we hypothesised. But the results of model 1 can be misleading because we didn't yet control for the differences in economic and cultural resources between the different family-forms.

Model 2 controls for these differences in economic resources between the family-forms. As a consequence the negative effects of the various family-forms in comparison with intact families become smaller, but the effect of divorced families (with or without step-parent) remain still significant negative. Thus, divorced families have less economic resources, but this doesn't fully explain the lower educational outcomes of children living in divorced families. Now the order of the negative effects resembles more the hypothesised order: parent & step-parent < single parent < widowed parent < intact family. But this is not true for the age of 25: widowed parent still has the strongest negative effect.

Model 3 builds on model 2, but also controls for the cultural resources. This hardly affects the negative effects of the divorced family-forms at the age of 17 and 20. But the negative effects of the divorced family-forms become insignificant at the age of 25, while the negative effect of widowed parent remain negative and significant.

Our first hypothesis (The educational level of children living with their divorced single-parent is lower than the educational level of children of still married parents) is confirmed at the age of 17 and 20 but not at the age of 25. Our second hypothesis (The educational level of children of widowed single-parents is equal to the educational level of children of married parents their economic resources being equal) is confirmed at the

age of 17 and 20 but not at the age of 25. Our third hypothesis (The educational level of children living with their divorced biological parent and a step-parent is lower than the educational level of children of still married parents and equal to the level of children living with their divorced single-parent) is not confirmed by our results at all ages: the educational level of children living with their divorced biological parent and a step-parent is lower and not equal than the level of children living with their divorced single-parent. The exceptional results at the age of 25, which is the generation which lived almost 14 year in a communist state gives some support to the fifth hypothesis, although the strong effect of having a widowed parent at the age only at the age 25 undermines this support.

*The effect of economic and cultural background in different family structures*

Table 3 gives the effects of financial and cultural resources on educational achievement at two ages for the four family forms.

The gender of the child tends to have the strongest impact for respondents in intact families or families with a widowed parent. The age of the child appears to have a stronger effect for respondents in families with a widowed parent. Father's and mother's occupation as well as their education has smaller effects for respondents in intact families.

On the whole we see that educational achievement is more depending on financial and cultural resources in divorced families, than in intact families. This suggests that the socialisation processes within divorced but also in widowed families are more vulnerable due to the upheavals of parental conflict or death. In such circumstances, the financial and cultural resources become more important for stabilising these socialisation processes within the family and at school.

### **Summary and discussion**

We find clear negative effects of parental divorce on educational outcomes at the age of 17 and 20, both for respondents living in a single parent family and for respondents living in a divorced family with a new (step-)parent. We don't find significant negative effects of living in a single parent family, if death is the cause of single-parenthood. Negative effects of divorce have become insignificant for the educational attainment at the age of 25, while the negative effects of living in a single parent family, caused by death, are now significant.

Thus the educational level of children living with their divorced single-parent is lower than the educational level of children of still married parents (first hypothesis accepted). The second hypothesis (the educational level of children of widowed single-parents is equal to the educational level of children of married parents their economic resources being equal) cannot be accepted in all cases. Especially at the age of 25 the effect of widowed parents is far stronger than we expected. The third hypothesis (the educational level of children living with their divorced biological parent and a step-parent is lower than the educational level of children of still married parents and equal to the level of children living with their divorced single-parent) can neither be always accepted, because the educational level of children with a divorced biological parent and a step-parent is mostly lower than that of children with divorced single-parents. The fourth hypothesis (the effects of material and cultural resources on educational outcome don't differ between families with still married parents, a divorced single-parent, a divorced biological parent and a step-parent) has to be rejected: the effects of financial and cultural resources are on the whole weaker in intact families. We find some indication that the negative effects of divorce are smaller for

the generation, who lived longest under the communist regime (out fifth hypothesis), but under results for that generation undermines this conclusion (the strong effect of widowed parents at the educational level at the age of 25)

These results suggest that the effects of parental divorce in Hungary, a former communist society, deviate only slightly from those of other European societies, although cross-national research still has to confirm this conclusion.

## Literature

Albertini, M. & Dronkers, J. (2003). *Intergenerational effects of divorce in a Mediterranean society: evidence from Italy*. Florence: European University Institute. EUI working paper SPS 2003/11. Paper presented at the second conference of The European network for empirical and comparative research on the sociological aspects of divorce, Tilburg (Netherlands), November 13-16, 2003. Available via:

<http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>

Amato, P. R. (2001). Children of Divorce in the 1990s: An Update of the Amato and Keith (1991) Meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15, 355-370.

Archambault, P. (2002). *Le devenir des enfants de familles dissociées*. Doctor. Université Paris V, Paris.

Borgers, N., Dronkers, J. & Praag, B. M. S. van (1996). The Effects of Different Forms of Two- and Single-Parent Families on the Well-Being of Their Children in Dutch Secondary Education. *Social Psychology of Education*, 1, 147-169.

Bosman, R. & Louwes, W. (1988). School careers of children from one-parent and two parent families. An empirical inquiry into the effects of belonging to a one-parent family on the educational attainment of children. *Netherlands' Journal of Sociology*, 24, 116-131.

Bukodi, E. (2002). *Házasság – élettársi kapcsolat – válás: társadalmi meghatározottságok*. [Marriage – cohabitation – divorce: social determinants.] Budapest: Hungarian Central Statistical Office.

Bukodi, E.- P. Róbert. (2003). Union disruption in Hungary. *International Journal of Sociology*, 33: 64-94.

Cherlin, A. J., Furstenberg, F. F., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., Kiernan, K. E., Robins, P. K., Morrison, D. R. & Teitler, J. O. (1991). Longitudinal studies of effects of divorce on children in Great Britain and the United States. *Science*, 252, 1386-1389.

Dronkers, J. (1994). The Changing Effects of Lone Families on the Educational Attainment of their Children in a European Welfare State. *Sociology*, 28, 171-192.

Dronkers, J. (1999). The Effects of Parental Conflicts and Divorce on the Well-being of Pupils in Dutch Secondary Education. *European Sociological Review*, 15, 195-212.

Dronkers, J. & Robert, P. (2003). Are the Newly Established Religious 'Gymnasiums' in Hungary More Effective? EUI working paper SPS 2003/ 13. San Domenico (FI): European University Institute. Available via: <http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>

Engelhardt, H., Trappe, H. & Dronkers, J. (2002). Differences in Family Policy and the Intergenerational Transmission of Divorce: A Comparison between the former East and West Germany. *Demographic Research*, 6, 296-324.

Garib, G., Martin Garcia, T. & Dronkers, J. (2003). *Are the effects of various family-forms on educational performance of children related to the demographic*

and social-policy characteristics of modern societies? Florence: European University Institute. Paper presented at the second conference of The European network for empirical and comparative research on the sociological aspects of divorce, Tilburg (Netherlands), November 13-16, 2003. Available via:  
<http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>

Goede, M. de, Spruijt, E. & Maas, C. (1999). Individual and Family Factors and Adolescent Well-being: A Multi-level Analysis. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 27, 263-281.

Jonsson, J. O. & Gaehler, M. (1997). Family Dissolution, Family Reconstruction, and Children's Educational Careers: Recent Evidence for Sweden. *Demography*, 34, 277-293.

Kiernan, K. E. (1992). The Impact of Family Disruption in Childhood on Transitions Made in Young Adult Life. *Populations Studies*, 46, 213-234.

Kiernan, K., Land, H. & Lewis, J. (1998). *Lone Motherhood in Twentieth-Century Britain, From Footnote to Front Page*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Martin, C. (1997). *L'apres divorce. Lien familial et vulnerabilite*. Rennes: Presses Universitaire de Rennes.

Martinez, Jose S. (2002). *Single-mother by divorce (or separation) and single-mother by widow: effects of educational attainment and occupational status in Spain*. Paper at the conference Divorce in a cross-national perspective: a European Research Network, European University Institute, Florence, November 2002.

McNab, C. & Murray, A. (1985). Family Composition and Mathematics Achievement. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 29, 89-102.

Murray, A. & Sandqvist, K. (1990). Father absence and children's achievement from age 13 to 21. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 34, 3-28.

Ni Bhrolchain, M. (2001). 'Divorce Effects' and Causality in the Social Sciences. *European Sociological Review*, 17, 33-58.

Ni Bhrolchain, M., Chappell, R., Diamond, I. & Jameson, C. (2000). Parental Divorce and Outcomes for Children: Evidence and Interpretation. *European Sociological Review*, 16, 67-92.

Oggenfuss, F. (1984). Jugendliche aus Scheidungsfamilien. *Familiendynamik*, 9, 71-83.

Pong, S.-I, Dronkers, J. & Hampden-Thompson, G. (2003). Family Policies and Children's School Achievement in Single- Versus Two-Parent Families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65, 681-699.

Pryor, J. & Rodgers, B. (2001). *Children in Changing Families. Life after Parental Separation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Róbert, P. (2001). Családösszetétel, társadalmi tőke és iskolai egyenlőtlenségek [Family structure, social capital and educational inequalities.] In: *Útközben. Tanulmányok a társadalomtudományok köréből* [In a way. Studies on social sciences.]. Budapest, Új Mandátum.

Róbert, P. & Bukodi, E. (2002). *The effect of globalization process on the transition to adulthood in Hungary*. GLOBALIFE Working Paper, 27.

Spéder, Zs. (2002). *A szegénység különböző arcai*. [Different faces of poverty.] Budapest: Századvég.

Spruijt, E. & Goede, M. de (1996). Changing Family Structures and Adolescent Well-Being in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 10, 1-16.

Spruijt, E., Goede, M. P. M. de & Valk, I. van der (2001). The well-being of youngsters coming from six different family types. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 45, 285-294.

Traag, T., Dronkers, J. & Vallet, L.-A. (2000). The intergenerational transmission of divorce risks in France. Paper presented to the Conference of Research Committee 28 - Social Stratification of the International Sociological Association in Libourne, France May 11-14, 2000. Available via: <http://www.iue.it/Personal/Dronkers>

Wagner, M. (1997). *Scheidung in Ost- und Westdeutschland. Zum Verhältnis von Ehestabilität und Sozialstruktur seit den 30er Jahren*. [Divorce in East- and West Germany. On the relation between marriage stability and social structure since the '30] Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

Wagner, M. & Weiss, B. (2003). Bilanz der deutschen Scheidungsforschung. Versuch einer Meta-Analyse. [Review of the German divorce research. A exploratory meta-analysis]. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 32, 29-49.

Table 1. Distribution of variables used in the analysis  
(Hungarian General Youth Survey, 2000; individuals aged 17-29)

	Parents divorced-single parent family	Parents divorced- stepparent	Parent(s) died	Intact family	Total
<i>Education at the age of 17</i>					
Primary	15.9	22.3	21.0	11.2	12.2
Basic vocational	33.3	38.6	31.6	32.8	32.9
Secondary vocational	30.4	21.7	29.4	30.0	29.8
Gymnasium	20.3	17.4	18.0	26.0	25.1
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Education at the age of 20</i>					
primary	15.8	19.2	22.2	11.3	12.3
basic vocational	34.4	39.7	32.9	33.3	33.6
secondary vocational	18.0	15.2	13.4	18.3	18.0
gymnasium	9.0	13.2	8.8	12.2	11.9
post-secondary	5.5	3.3	3.7	5.4	5.3
lower tertiary	11.7	5.3	10.2	12.1	11.8
higher tertiary	5.5	4.0	8.8	7.3	7.2
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Education at the age of 25</i>					
primary	17.1	22.5	23.8	12.5	13.6
basic vocational	39.0	29.6	39.4	36.2	36.3
secondary vocational	15.2	18.3	17.3	17.8	17.7
gymnasium	11.0	19.7	6.0	11.2	11.0
post-secondary	5.5	1.4	3.8	4.4	4.3
lower tertiary	8.5	4.2	3.8	10.4	9.8
higher tertiary	3.7	4.2	5.8	7.5	7.2
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Father's occupation</i>					
manager, professional	6.5	4.9	3.7	10.9	10.2
routine nonmanual	4.6	7.7	1.5	8.6	8.1
self-employed	5.5	9.8	..	11.3	10.4
skilled worker	14.7	25.1	2.2	30.0	27.8
unskilled worker	11.6	14.2	5.1	21.0	19.5
never worked/no information	57.1	38.3	87.5	18.1	24.0
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Mother's occupation</i>					
manager, professional	10.1	5.4	5.8	10.9	10.5
routine nonmanual	23.6	18.5	12.0	22.5	22.1
self-employed	6.5	6.0	3.3	6.3	6.2
skilled worker	15.4	13.0	9.9	15.3	15.1
unskilled worker	31.0	34.2	33.9	29.1	29.5
never worked/no information	13.3	22.8	35.0	15.9	16.6
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Siblings (mean, standard dev.)</i>	1.22 (1.32)	1.84 (1.57)	1.49 (1.45)	1.34 (1.27)	1.35 (1.29)

Table 1. continued

	Parents divorced-single parent family	Parents divorced- stepparent	Parent(s) died	Intact family	Total
<i>Father's education</i>					
Primary	12.8	15.3	4.4	18.9	17.8
basic vocational	17.9	25.7	4.4	38.1	35.1
Secondary	10.5	13.7	1.5	16.5	15.5
lower tertiary	3.6	3.3	2.2	5.2	4.9
higher tertiary	3.8	4.4	1.5	6.8	6.3
no information	51.4	37.7	86.1	14.5	20.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Mother's education</i>					
Primary	29.5	35.9	34.6	31.1	31.3
basic vocational	21.9	16.8	12.1	21.4	21.0
Secondary	30.7	21.2	19.5	27.6	27.3
lower tertiary	7.4	6.0	2.2	7.2	7.0
higher tertiary	2.1	1.1	1.8	4.0	3.7
no information	8.4	19.0	29.8	8.6	9.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Number of extracurricular activities at primary school (mean, standard dev.)</i>	.68 (.98)	.66 (.96)	.59 (1.05)	.71 (1.05)	.67 (1.04)
<i>Number of extracurricular activities at secondary (mean, standard dev.)</i>	.36 (.80)	.32 (.76)	.37 (.78)	.47 (.90)	.45 (.89)
<i>Religious socialisation</i>					
brought up in a religion	29.3	27.9	36.6	36.8	36.1
no religious brought up	63.6	61.7	52.7	54.8	55.5
no information	7.2	10.4	10.6	8.4	8.5
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of cases	476	183	273	6049	6980

Table 2. The effect of parental family status, financial resources, and cultural capital on educational attainment in 2000; individuals aged 17-29 (ordered logit estimates)

Explanatory variables	Educational attainment at the age of 17			Educational attainment at the age of 20			Educational attainment at the age of 25		
	Model 1.	Model 2.	Model 3.	Model 1.	Model 2.	Model 3.	Model 1.	Model 2.	Model 3.
Cut (primary)	-4.325(.154)*	-4.178(.187)*	-3.985(.200)*	-5.090(.224)*	-4.759(.251)*	-4.753(.273)*	-3.882(.645)*	-3.788(.682)*	-4.235(.701)*
Cut (basic vocational)	-2.480(.148)*	-1.930(.180)*	-1.622(.193)*	-3.234(.218)*	-2.498(.244)*	-2.320(.256)*	-2.003(.642)*	-1.464(.678)*	-1.753(.696)*
Cut (secondary vocat.)	-1.121(.146)*	-.217(.179)	.188(.193)	-2.464(.216)*	-1.516(.243)*	-1.214(.255)*	-1.246(.601)*	-.487(.678)	-.653(.695)
Cut (gymnasium)	—	—	—	-1.875(.215)*	-.789(.243)*	-.398(.255)	-.674(.641)	.238(.678)	.169(.696)
Cut (post-secondary)	—	—	—	-1.555(.215)*	-.397(.243)	-.038(.256)	-.390(.641)	.597(.679)	.585(.696)
Cut (lower tertiary)	—	—	—	-.418(.217)	.942(.246)*	1.529(.260)*	.597(.643)	1.804(.681)*	1.989(.700)*
Sex	-.601(.044)*	-.754(.046)*	-.714(.047)*	-.435(.048)*	-.536(.049)*	-.444(.050)*	-.373(.068)*	-.525(.071)*	-.431(.072)*
Age	-.082(.006)*	-.064(.007)*	-.054(.007)*	-.114(.009)*	-.089(.009)*	-.088(.009)*	-.065(.024)*	-.041(.020)*	-.062(.025)*
<i>Parental family status</i>									
parents divorced - single parent family	-.316(.087)*	-.357(.094)*	-.380(.095)*	-.275(.097)*	-.278(.103)*	-.271(.105)*	-.306(.165)	-.207(.153)	-.178(.156)
parents divorced - stepparent	-.690(.137)*	-.447(.143)*	-.476(.145)*	-.611(.150)*	-.446(.154)*	-.471(.156)*	-.363(.178)*	-.462(.228)*	-.420(.232)
parent(s) died	-.482(.113)*	-.088(.123)	-.098(.126)	-.412(.125)*	.112(.135)	.164(.137)	-.914(.184)*	-.531(.197)*	-.468(.201)*
intact family	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]
<i>Financial resources</i>									
Father's occupation	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
manager,professional		1.276(.104)*	.353(.164)*		1.347(.107)*	.434(.170)*		1.601(.154)*	.740(.253)*
routine nonmanual		.651(.102)*	.238(.146)		.567(.108)*	.134(.154)		.693(.157)*	.228(.220)
self-employed		.534(.093)*	.393(.133)*		.446(.100)*	.279(.138)*		.397(.143)*	.188(.201)
skilled worker		.088(.073)	.139(.121)		.086(.078)	.103(.131)		.001(.111)	-.058(.185)
unskilled worker		-.501(.077)*	-.168(.123)		-.534(.084)*	-.273(.133)*		-.565(.115)*	-.474(.186)*
never worked/no info.		[.000]	[.000]		[.000]	[.000]		[.000]	[.000]
Mother's occupation									
manager,professional		1.805(.107)*	.784(.155)*		1.864(.113)*	.967(.164)*		1.643(.167)*	.978(.256)*
routine nonmanual		1.097(.083)*	.548(.113)*		1.130(.089)*	.607(.123)*		1.033(.125)*	.562(.172)*
self-employed		.746(.114)*	.351(.133)*		.643(.124)*	.323(.144)*		.453(.175)*	.203(.205)
skilled worker		.482(.087)*	.293(.115)*		.522(.095)*	.451(.127)*		.369(.132)*	.392(.181)*
unskilled worker		-.089(.074)	.211(.198)		-.116(.080)	.323(.107)*		-.301(.209)	.206(.148)
never worked/no info.		[.000]	[.000]		[.000]	[.000]		[.000]	[.000]
Number of siblings		-.338(.020)*	-.317*		-.324(.021)*	-.295(.022)*		-.349(.029)*	-.317(.029)*

Table 2. continued

Explanatory variables	Educational attainment at the of 17			Educational attainment at the age of 20			Educational attainment at the age of 25		
	Model 1.	Model 2.	Model 3.	Model 1.	Model 3.	Model 3.	Model 1.	Model 2.	Model 3.
<i>Cultural capital</i>	–	–		–	–		–	–	
Father's education									
primary			-.478(.133)*			-.345(.143)*			-.028(.198)
basic vocational			-.049(.129)			-.008(.139)			.174(.194)
secondary			.517(.138)*			.478(.148)*			.650(.208)*
lower tertiary			.762(.185)*			.626(.195)*			.390(.296)
higher tertiary			.999(.191)*			.956(.201)*			.905(.295)*
no information			[.000]			[.000]			[.000]
Mother's education									
primary			-.469(.122)*			-.621(.131)*			-.664(.177)*
basic vocational			.134(.132)			-.069(.144)			-.177(.201)
secondary			.559(.132)*			.405(.144)*			.309(.198)
lower tertiary			.844(.184)*			.500(.198)*			.148(.301)
higher tertiary			1.363(.222)*			.854(.225)*			.952(.339)*
no information			[.000]			[.000]			[.000]
Extracurricular activities									
at primary school			.245(.024)*			–			
at secondary school			–			.717(.031)*			.827(.047)*
Religious socialisation									
yes			[.000]			[.000]			[.000]
no			-.129(.050)*			-.156(.054)*			.026(.141)
no information			-.198(.089)*			-.251(.098)*			-.074(.077)
-2Loglikelihood									
initial	1794.374	12798.904	17379.105	2154.969	14208.758	18686.297	991.281	6891.655	8999.945
model	1381.188	10213.159	14282.426	1871.874	12008.521	15574.723	921.582	5795.522	7427.767
Ch <sup>2</sup>	413.186	2585.744	3096.678	283.095	2200.236	3111.574	69.699	1096.134	1572.178
Degree of freedom	5	16	29	5	16	29	5	16	29
Number of cases	6980			5726			2857		

\*: significance et .05 level

Table 3. The effect of financial resources and cultural capital on educational attainment in 2000 according to parental family status; individuals aged 17-29 (ordered logit estimates)

Explanatory variables	Parents divorced-single parent family		Parents divorced-stepparent		Parent(s) died		Intact family	
	at age 17	at age 20	at age 17	at age 20	at age 17	at age 20	at age 17	at age 20
Cut (primary)	-3.546(.745)*	-4.805(1.08)*	-2.834(1.28)*	-3.319(1.95)	-4.291(1.03)*	-6.843(1.40)*	-4.038(.217)*	-4.698(.283)*
Cut (basic vocational)	-1.228(.724)	-2.24(1.052)*	-.388(1.265)	-.462(1.932)	-2.337(1.01)*	-4.629(1.35)*	-1.612(.210)*	-2.213(.275)*
Cut (secondary vocat.)	.715(.727)	-.966(1.050)	1.229(1.269)	.743(1.939)	-.403(.999)	-3.653(1.34)*	.203(.209)	-1.094(.274)*
Cut (gymnasium)	–	-.228(1.050)	–	2.300(1.956)	–	-2.850(1.34)*	–	-.271(.274)
Cut (post-secondary)	–	.283(1.052)	–	3.001(1.966)	–	-2.413(1.34)	–	.168(.275)
Cut (lower tertiary)	–	2.061(1.073)	–	4.639(2.01)*	–	-.727(1.35)	–	1.667(.279)*
<i>Sex</i>	-.424(.183)*	-.443(.205)*	-.567(.320)	-.221(.358)	-.821(.245)*	-.346(.269)	-.742(.051)*	-.453(.054)*
<i>Age</i>	-.045(.026)	-.090(.048)	-.076(.047)	-.117(.072)	-.103(.037)*	-.216(.052)*	-.051(.007)*	-.080(.010)*
<i>Financial resources</i>								
<i>Father's occupation</i>								
manager,professional	1.405(.652)*	1.869(.868)*	1.204(1.199)	2.171(1.899)	1.912(1.769)	1.695(2.121)	.408(.175)*	.567(.181)*
routine nonmanual	.830(.509)	.674(.757)	1.402(1.101)	1.304(.874)	-.387(1.503)	1.736(1.906)	.221(.156)	.240(.164)
self-employed	.174(.434)	.302(.541)	1.278(.948)	.246(.976)	..	..	.380(.143)*	.330(.153)*
skilled worker	.123(.468)	-.703(.542)	-1.079(.797)	-.127(1.226)	.875(1.329)	1.097(1.722)	.138(.132)	.223(.142)
unskilled worker	-.147(.819)	-.967(.578)	-1.217(.829)	-.270(1.200)	-.914(1.189)	-1.034(1.41)	-.194(.133)	-.190(.143)
never worked/no info.	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]
<i>Mother's occupation</i>								
manager,professional	1.466(.670)*	2.379(.740)*	.943(.788)	1.049(.904)	2.173(.920)*	.981(1.102)	.783(.167)*	.921(.175)*
routine nonmanual	.709(.474)	1.255(.534)*	.295(1.063)	.325(.880)	1.499(.713)*	.489(.822)	.532(.121)*	.580(.131)*
self-employed	.341(.536)	.108(.613)	.718(.835)	-.136(1.074)	1.230(.879)	..	.384(.143)*	.411(.154)*
skilled worker	.091(.471)	.500(.528)	-.252(.760)	-.226(.638)	.925(.715)	.405(.805)	.338(.124)*	.448(.137)*
unskilled worker	.033(.438)	.314(.500)	-.458(.579)	-1.338(.893)	.884(.553)	.528(.614)	.248(.105)*	.306(.115)*
never worked/no info.	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]
Number of siblings	-.300(.079)*	-.223(.084)*	-.359(.116)*	-.139(.123)	-.089(.090)	-.150(.101)	-.331(.022)*	-.309(.024)*

Table 3. continued

Explanatory Variables	Parents divorced-single parent family		Parents divorced-stepparent		Parent died		Intact family	
	at age 17	at age 20	at age 17	at age 20	at age 17	at age 20	at age 17	at age 20
<i>Cultural capital</i>								
Father's education								
primary	-.747(.456)	-.228(.532)	-.288(1.358)	.819(1.465)	-.122(1.214)	-1.314(1.466)	-.488(.150)*	-.458(.160)*
basic vocational	-.651(.422)	-.062(.461)	1.264(.812)	1.091(1.046)	-.484(1.148)	.316(1.402)	-.011(.146)	-.025(.156)
secondary	.131(.484)	1.431(.541)*	1.355(.843)	1.347(.883)	.709(1.554)	.377(3.232)	.539(.154)*	.412(.164)*
lower tertiary	.469(.811)	2.031(.848)*	1.512(.941)	1.449(.974)	1.817(1.631)	1.595(1.978)	.750(.202)*	.486(.212)*
higher tertiary	.808(.899)	3.144(1.01)*	5.351(1.63)*	4.502(1.44)*	.693(2.029)	..	.955(.207)*	.843(.217)*
no information	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]
Mother's education								
primary	-1.253(.534)*	-1.527(.599)*	.479(.632)	-1.215(1.272)	-1.135(.509)*	-1.062(.444)*	-.471(.139)*	-.590(.149)*
basic vocational	-.040(.525)	-.138(.587)	.907(.785)	.492(.704)	-.038(.734)	.697(.810)	.061(.146)	-.153(.162)
secondary	.207(.534)	.258(.594)	1.853(.831)*	1.956(.970)*	.297(.696)	1.034(.760)	.534(.149)*	.367(.162)*
lower tertiary	.344(.916)	.677(1.001)	1.352(1.096)	.945(.895)	.273(1.228)	.336(1.686)	.881(.203)*	.651(.217)*
higher tertiary	.656(.745)	1.862(.940)	3.023(1.49)*	7.573(1.96)*	1.710(1.163)	3.075(1.569)	1.451(.243)*	.849(.243)*
no information	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]
Extracurricular activities								
at primary school	.356(.100)*	–	.370(.155)*	–	.281(.134)*	–	.232(.026)*	–
Extracurricular activities								
at secondary school	–	.877(.150)*	–	1.707(.268)*	–	1.385(.247)*	–	.692(.033)*
Religious socialisation								
yes	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]	[.000]
no	.195(.201)	.285(.228)	.815(.562)	.972(.693)	.021(.262)	.557(.405)	-.181(.054)*	-.228(.057)*
no information	.254(.376)	.221(.404)	-.211(.571)	-.516(.650)	-.188(.429)	-.195(.457)	-.202(.096)*	-.260(.106)*
-2Loglikelihood								
initial	1252.772	1244.703	480.898	486.813	724.109	745.549	14863.448	16158.796
model	1024.381	990.793	383.037	363.066	611.458	579.386	12147.411	13449.704
Ch <sup>2</sup>	228.392	253.909	97.861	123.747	112.651	166.163	2716.038	2709.093
Degree of freedom	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
Number of cases	476	364	183	151	273	217	6049	4877

\*: significance et .05 level