
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN HOUSEHOLD STRUCTURE AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION*

István Harcsa and Judit Monostori

1. Introduction

During the past few decades, the structural changes taking place in Hungarian society have led to fundamental changes in living arrangements. Direct effects include the realignment of society according to age: the dynamic decrease in the proportion of children and youth within the population over the past decade, and the steady increase in the proportion of the elderly. Consequently, whereas in 1990, 39 per cent of households included a child aged under 19, by 2016 this figure had dropped to 26 per cent. At the same time, the proportion of households consisting of the elderly had increased. Since the majority of the elderly live in a single-person or two-person household, their increased presence has led to a higher proportion of such living arrangements. In 1990, 18 per cent of households included one or two elderly people, but by 2016 the figure had risen to 24 per cent. Apart from these obvious correlations, age restructification has also resulted in one kind of living arrangement losing ground: households with three or more generations. This household type is typically tied to living arrangements that include children, and the drop in the percentage of households with children has also led to a decrease in the percentage of households with three or more generations.

In addition to age restructification, several other notable structural changes have occurred, affecting the household structure features of Hungarian society. Structural changes according to level of education are among the most important of these. In 1990, 56 per cent of the population over the age of 15 had elementary education only; by 2016, this had fallen to 24 per cent. Over the same period, the proportion of people with high-school certificates rose from 19 to 32 per cent, and the proportion of people with academic degrees went from 9 to 22 per cent (*Table 1*). This is of the utmost importance, since research indicates that among people with various levels of education living in different strata of society there are considerable differences in fertility; in when and in what type of relationship they start a family of their own; in the break-up risk of couple relationships; and in life expectancy (on these issues, see Monostori et al., 2018). Evidently, these affect living arrangement trends as well.

*The authors would like to express their gratitude to Marcell Kovács and Mónika Vörös for their assistance in relation to the census database.

Table 1 *Education level distribution in the non-student population, 1990–2016 (per cent)*

	1990	2001	2011	2016
<i>15+ population</i>				
Elementary school	55.8	42.9	28.5	23.5
Technical school	15.9	20.1	23.5	22.7
High-school certificate	18.9	24.9	29.7	31.8
Academic degree	9.4	12.0	18.4	22.0
<i>Total</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>
<i>Ages 18–39 population^a</i>				
Elementary school	29.9	23.6	15.9	13.9
Technical school	32.4	33.3	26.1	20.5
High-school certificate	26.9	30.3	35.1	38.2
Academic degree	10.8	12.8	23.0	27.4
<i>Total</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>100.0</i>

^a Since hereafter we consider those aged 18–39 to be ‘youth’, we calculated restructuring according to level of education for this age group, too.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

It is important to determine to what extent changes in the household structure are due to these restratification processes, and to what extent the living arrangement patterns alter according to level of education. For example, clearly if the group of people with elementary education only – characterized by higher fertility – shrinks, then the rate of families with children declines, even if the fertility of people at all levels of education remains the same. Conversely, if the rate of people with an academic degree increases, then that adds to their weight of characteristic demographic behaviour, values and attitudes in society. Differences along the level of education are interesting from another perspective as well, since the labour-market value of various education levels (placement and wage opportunities) – as well as other things related to education level (e.g. prestige) – may vary in certain time periods. While hierarchy according to level of education still plays a significant role, the relative value of an academic degree is evidently lower when almost a quarter of the population has one, than when only 10 per cent do. At the same time, the overall low level of education can fall even further after educational expansion.

In our study, we seek to determine the extent to which living arrangements are altered according to level of education. What kinds of changes have taken place in the household structure of people with various levels of education? Among people with various educational levels, have the living arrangements typical of certain stages of life drawn closer together or moved further apart?

In our study, we use data from the 1990, 2001 and 2011 censuses, plus the 2016 micro census. As these are not panel data, but cross-sectional, their analysis looks not at life courses but at the living arrangements of various cohorts at a certain stage in life. We worked with a data file covering the full population in the case of the censuses between 1990 and 2011, and with a sample representing 10 per cent of the population in the case of the 2016 micro census.

In our research, we examined the characteristics of living arrangements in various phases of life, along with correlations with the level of education. We highlight those stages in life where the most significant changes have occurred in recent decades, and which we assume show differences according to level of education. One of these is the age of youth; the other is the stage of having children and fulfilling the role of a parent.

2. The living arrangements of the youth

Temporal changes in the household structure of Hungarian society can be substantially accounted for by the transformation of the living arrangement patterns of the youth. The ‘youth’ stage abounds in changes to living arrangements: this is when young people leave the parental household, form their first lasting partnerships, and have children of their own. Partnerships have become more fragile, and at this stage in life a larger proportion of relationships break up (compared to other life periods). Consequently, some become single, and some move back to the parental household. If children are involved in the break-up of a relationship, then we see the formation of single-parent or ‘mosaic’ families, with some young people living in a household with a child that is not their biological offspring.

2.1 Youth in the parental household

In the population under consideration – young people aged 18–39 – the most important change in recent decades has been that an ever-increasing proportion are living with the status of a ‘child’ – that is, without a partner or a child of their own – in the parental household (*Table 2*).

Table 2 *Household structure distribution in the population aged 18–39 between 1990 and 2016 (per cent)*

	Ages 18–39 full population				Ages 18–39 non-student population			
	1990	2001	2011	2016	1990	2001	2011	2016
1. Lives in a single-person household	6.2	5.9	9.3	8.6	6.0	5.6	9.5	8.7
2. Lives with a spouse	5.6	4.4	4.0	4.6	5.7	4.8	4.5	5.2
3. Lives with a cohabiting partner	1.2	3.8	5.7	8.1	1.2	4.0	6.3	8.9
4. Lives with a spouse and child	49.8	36.4	23.8	20.2	51.2	40.1	27.3	22.9
5. Lives with a cohabiting partner and child	2.6	5.9	9.7	10.5	2.6	6.5	11.1	11.9
6. Lives with a child as a single parent	6.3	4.2	4.3	3.2	6.5	4.6	4.9	3.6
7. Lives with parents without a partner or a child (in a child status)	23.8	35.5	37.8	38.5	22.3	30.5	31.0	32.7
8. Lives in another status	4.5	3.9	5.4	6.3	4.4	3.9	5.4	6.0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

Data between 1990 and 2016 indicate that the proportion of youth living with their parents increased most dynamically in the 1990s; the trend tailed off from the 2000s among men, while it continued to show a slight increase among women. In 2011 and 2016, almost 40 per cent of this age group lived in the parental household. This proportion was around 30 per cent in both years among non-students, but the indicator value is much higher among men. In 2016, 40 per cent of non-student men aged 18–39 lived in the parental household, while the corresponding figure for women was 25 per cent (*Table 3*).

Table 3 *The proportion of people living without a partner or a child in the parental household,* 1990–2016 (18–39-year-old non-student population, per cent)*

Year	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
<i>Women</i>					
1990	9.3	17.5	17.7	10.9	14.0
2001	15.4	20.8	26.5	19.6	21.4
2011	16.3	17.4	28.4	21.1	22.4
2016	20.3	21.4	30.8	21.1	24.8
<i>Men</i>					
1990	33.3	33.0	30.0	14.4	30.6
2001	41.8	40.2	42.1	25.1	39.4
2011	42.1	38.2	46.2	26.5	39.4
2016	42.8	40.9	46.4	27.2	40.2

*Category 7 of *Table 2*.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

Essentially, this phenomenon has to do with the youth becoming independent late on; but some of those living without a partner or child in the parental household had previously moved out of the parental home and had a stable cohabiting partnership – and possibly even a child. Detachment from the parental household is not necessarily a single act and moving out cannot be considered final. Other research indicates that there is a higher proportion of men and of people with lower education among those ‘moving back’.

In addition to relationship problems, financial hardship and unemployment can also play a significant role in young people moving back (Monostori and Murinkó, 2018). These conclusions are supported by the fact that 5 per cent of those living in the parental household in the status of a child already had a child of their own (among those with elementary education only, the figure was 10 per cent, and among those who had completed vocational school it was 7 per cent). This group consists not only of those who have moved back: some will never have left the parental household. And among those moving back there will also be many without children. In any case, we can ascertain that the increase in the proportion of people living with the status of a child has to do with more than simply young people becoming independent late on.

In some measure, what we have discussed above may explain the high proportion of people with lower educational levels living in the parental household (*Table 3*),

even though they complete their education much earlier than those who go on to earn an academic degree. Between 1990 and 2016, the highest figures for those living in the parental household are to be found in the group of people with a high-school certificate. For men, this is true only between 2001 and 2016: in 1990, there was scarcely any difference in the (high) proportion of those with a high-school certificate and of those with lower qualifications (*Table 3*).

In addition to level of education, participation in the labour market may also play a vital role, since that exerts a major influence both on the chances of young people becoming independent, and on the forces that prompt them to move back to the parental household. If we compare students, workers and non-working inactive people, we discover that since 1990 the proportion of those living with their parents as adult children has increased least among students. The increase is greater among workers and is even more dynamic among non-working inactive people. In 1990, 15 per cent of non-working young women aged 18–39 lived with their parents in the status of a child; by 2016, this figure had increased to 38 per cent. Among men, the indicator rose from 50 to 62 per cent (*Table 4*). In addition, the proportion of those in the non-student, non-working category also increased: from 6 per cent in 1990 to 12 per cent in 2016 among men, and from 11 per cent to 16 per cent among women. Hence, we can ascertain that in 2016, alienation from the labour market was a stronger background factor for young people living in the parental household than it had been in 1990.

Table 4 *The proportion of people living without a partner or child in the parental household, according to gender and economic activity, 1990 and 2016 (population aged 18–39, per cent)*

	1990	2016
<i>Women</i>		
Studies	72.3	79.4
Works	16.6	27.5
Does not study, does not work	15.2	37.5
<i>Men</i>		
Studies	78.5	82.8
Works	29.4	37.0
Does not study, does not work	49.3	61.5

Note: Women on maternity leave are not included in the table.

Source: 1990: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

2.2 Youth in an independent household

A large proportion of the young people who move out of the parental household live in a family. Single-person households are less widespread: between 1990 and 2016, the proportion of youth living in single-person households ranged from 6 to 10 per cent. The higher we go on the education scale, the more frequently we find single-person households: in 2016, only 3 per cent of those with an elementary education

lived in such a household, whereas the figure was 8 per cent for those with a high-school certificate and 15 per cent for those with a degree (*Table 5*). Differences according to level of education increased between 1990 and 2016.

Table 5 The proportion of people living in a single-person household according to level of education, 1990–2016 (population aged 18–39, per cent)*

Year	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
1990	5.9	4.9	6.0	9.8	6.0
2001	3.8	3.9	6.4	11.7	5.6
2011	5.0	7.1	9.2	15.9	9.5
2016	3.4	5.6	8.2	14.5	8.7

* Category 1 of *Table 2*.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

Significant changes have occurred in the composition of single-person households that clearly reflect the circumstances of the household. In 1990, almost a third of people living alone already had a child, whereas by 2016 that figure had dropped to 6 per cent. In 1990, a quarter of them were divorced, but in 2016 the proportion was only 5 per cent. Formerly, the proportion of those working was higher, but by 2016 the proportion of students had increased (most of these are probably closely attached to – and financially dependent on – the parental household).

Reflecting the shift to later independence, the problems in forming a stable relationship and the fact that those partnerships are becoming more fragile, the proportion of young people living in the same household as their partner decreased between 1990 and 2016. In 1990, 61 per cent of youth lived in the same household as their partner; by 2016 this figure was down to 49 per cent. The most significant decrease can be observed among people with a high-school certificate: while the figure fell by about 10 percentage points between 1990 and 2016 in other education-level categories, the decline among those with a high-school certificate was 16 percentage points (*Table 6*).

From *Table 3* it is clear that the highest proportion of people living in the parental household are those with a high-school certificate. This leads us to the conclusion that – as far as starting a family is concerned – the high-school certificate is becoming less and less valuable, primarily because it guarantees only a weak labour market position. If we take a look at the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO) statistics on employment, we see that the employment rates of both women and men with a high-school certificate are regularly lower than the rates for skilled workers, for example (HCSO, 2018). Thus, the financial and existential disadvantages that accompany this qualification are increasingly burdensome for these people.

Table 6 *The proportion of people living in the same household as their partner*, according to level of education, 1990–2016 (population aged 18–39, per cent)*

Year	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
<i>Living with his/her partner or his/her partner and child only</i>					
1990	61.6	58.9	60.1	65.8	60.8
2001	56.7	55.6	52.3	59.7	55.4
2011	50.2	51.8	44.2	53.2	49.2
2016	50.7	50.0	43.9	54.3	49.0
<i>Living with his/her partner only</i>					
1990	6.0	6.4	7.6	9.5	6.9
2001	6.1	7.5	10.0	14.4	8.8
2011	6.0	8.6	11.1	15.9	10.7
2016	7.0	10.7	14.5	19.6	14.1

*Categories 2, 3, 4, 5 of Table 2.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

Between 2011 and 2016, the steady decline in the proportion of people living in a partnership seems to have come to a halt. We can even observe a slight increase among people with an academic degree. The process described above was most likely prompted by increased opportunities for employment and correspondingly better financial conditions, along with family support measures that were initiated during this period and which provided better chances for entering into a stable relationship.

Across the various levels of education, there are significant differences in the proportion of people living with their partner but without children in the household. The higher the level of education, the more characteristic is this type of living arrangement. In 2016, the overall proportion of those living with their partner but without children was 29 per cent: 14 per cent of people with elementary education; 21 per cent of skilled workers; 33 per cent of people with a high-school certificate; and 36 per cent of people with a degree. Education-level differences expanded greatly between 1990 and 2016, caused by a dynamic increase in the proportion of couples without children among people with high-school certificates or academic degrees (Table 6).

The proportion of people living in a cohabiting relationship instead of a marriage increased steadily between 1990 and 2016 among the various groups of people living with their partner. In 1990, 6 per cent of those young people in a partnership lived in a cohabiting relationship; by 2016, the figure was 43 per cent. There was a marked increase in all educational levels, but since 1990 it has remained a feature that we find the highest proportion of cohabiting couples at the bottom of the educational hierarchy, with a declining proportion the further up the educational scale we go. In 2016, among people living with their partner, 62 per cent of those with elementary education were in a cohabiting relationship, whereas the figure was 48 per cent among people who had graduated from a technical school; 43 per cent among people with a high-school certificate; and 29 per cent among people with a degree.

The proportion of those who are in the role of parents – those who have established a new family and live with their children – plays an essential part in the changes in

living arrangements. In parallel with more young people living in the parental household, the proportion of those living with their partner and children has declined. In 1990, 70 per cent of non-student women and 51 of non-student men lived in such households, but by 2016 these rates had dropped to 47 per cent and 30 per cent. This form of living arrangement decreased most among people with a high-school certificate or a degree (*Table 7*).

This trend leads us to conclude that, among graduates, the drive to build a career is growing at the expense of having children; meanwhile, among young people straight out of high school, the process may be related to worsening labour market conditions and status. From the perspective of future birth numbers, it is a matter of key importance whether or not the growing middle strata among the younger generations can be encouraged to have more children. International experience indicates that the only real chance is if we can attain a substantial improvement in the reconciliation of work and family life.

Table 7 The proportion of people living with their child(ren), according to level of education (non-student population aged 18–39, per cent)*

Year	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
<i>Women</i>					
1990	77.0	67.7	65.1	66.8	69.9
2001	71.4	65.0	54.5	53.2	61.0
2011	67.3	64.5	47.5	44.8	52.9
2016	64.0	58.8	41.7	42.2	47.3
<i>Men</i>					
1990	46.1	51.4	50.8	60.6	50.8
2001	41.7	43.8	36.5	43.8	41.5
2011	37.5	38.8	26.7	35.0	34.0
2016	37.2	34.9	23.4	30.0	29.9

*Categories 4, 5, 6 of *Table 2*.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

In addition to the level of education being an influencing factor in stable relationships and in having children, the risk of relationships breaking up also reveals a tight connection with the level of education.

There are no administrative data available on cohabiting relationships, but from the HCSO's Demographic Yearbooks, we do know that the rate of divorce where minors are involved in the break-up has stood at 60 per cent for many years. In practice, the majority of minors with divorced parents are placed with their mothers. The proportion of mothers raising their children alone did not change significantly between 1990 and 2016. There was a slight increase in the 2000s, but the proportion of parents raising their children alone decreased again between 2011 and 2016. However, we can observe significant restratification according to level of education: whereas in 1990 the figures did not vary much across the different levels of education, by 2016 there

were twice as many single parents in the group that lacked even a high-school certificate as among graduates; meanwhile the difference between those with a high-school certificate and tertiary graduates had also increased. While there was already a difference emerging in the 2000s between those with and without a high-school certificate, those with an academic degree remained unaffected: in both 2001 and 2011, the proportion of single mothers was 12–13 per cent among graduates; by 2016 this figure had dropped to 10 per cent (*Table 8*).

Table 8 *The proportion of mothers raising their child alone among all mothers,* according to level of education (non-student population aged 18–39, per cent)*

Year	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
1990	15.9	13.1	15.2	15.9	15.1
2001	15.4	13.7	14.5	12.2	14.2
2011	20.8	19.4	18.0	13.2	17.7
2016	18.4	17.1	14.9	9.7	14.4

*Category 6 within categories 4, 5, 6 in *Table 2*.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

3. Households with children

A clear consequence of the continuously dwindling fertility rates after 1990 is that the proportion of households raising children decreased drastically between 1990 and 2016. At the same time, we should look at the differences in how the children born are allocated across the various household types. Even if the fertility rates are the same in two different years, the proportion of households with children can vary, since that depends on the stability of relationships, the frequency of establishing a new family after a relationship breaks up, the likelihood of mosaic families being formed, and the number of children in these families. The trends indicate that the dominance of the two-child family model decreased between 1990 and the 2011 data collection, while the proportion of households with only one child increased. At the same time, the proportion of households raising three or more children also increased, albeit slightly. Between 2011 and 2016, this trend seems to have come to a halt (although the demographic processes can never be interpreted definitively in such a short run). Among households with children, the proportion of those raising two children increased between 2011 and 2016, and the proportion of large families also showed a slight increase (*Table 9*).

In *Table 9*, following the low point of 2011, we can observe an upswing in the birth rate, halting the decline in the two-child family model. At the same time, we also have to recognize that this is not true for all groups of parents across the various education levels. Between 1990 and 2011, the two-child family model declined most among those who had completed technical school and among those with a high-school certificate, where the proportion of people raising a single child increased dynamically.

Meanwhile the proportion of people with larger families increased more significantly among those with elementary education only. Among people with elementary education, the proportion of those raising three or more children has grown from 16 per cent in 1990 to 30 per cent.

Table 9 *Proportion of households with children, according to the parental level of education (household-level data, per cent)*

	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
<i>Proportion of households with one child</i>					
1990	51.1	37.8	46.8	46.3	45.9
2001	48.0	44.1	50.5	46.9	47.6
2011	44.4	51.2	55.1	50.2	51.4
2016	42.0	51.5	54.9	47.1	50.2
<i>Proportion of households with two children</i>					
1990	32.7	49.8	46.3	46.2	43.0
2001	29.1	41.4	40.9	43.0	39.3
2011	27.0	33.9	35.4	38.5	34.8
2016	28.2	32.8	34.5	40.1	35.3
<i>Proportion of households with three or more children</i>					
1990	16.2	12.4	6.9	7.5	11.1
2001	22.9	14.5	8.6	10.0	13.1
2011	28.6	14.9	9.5	11.3	13.8
2016	29.8	15.7	10.6	12.8	14.4

Note: Data in the table pertains to households raising children up to 24 years of age. If the parents had different levels of education, we counted the higher level one.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

Trends in the proportion of traditional, multi-generation households have always been an issue in relation to household structure. Looking back over the last quarter of a century or more, how one evaluates the trend observed depends on perspective. Even though the proportion of households containing three or more generations has decreased within the population as a whole, the changes have not been all that significant within households with children. One household in ten with children also includes at least one grandparent. We can observe a clear tendency only among parents with a degree, where the proportion of multi-generation households is decreasing slightly but steadily. In other groups, periods of stagnation and slight change have alternated over the past few decades (*Table 10*).

The study of mosaic families is considered a blind-spot in domestic household structure research. The phenomenon is important, because parents raising their children in a couple relationship are in very different situations depending on whether they are raising their biological children exclusively, or also have children in their families with only one biological parent present. Several psychological studies research the educational career of children growing up in intact versus mosaic families, the roles developing in mosaic families, the decision-making mechanisms, and how

the children keep in touch with the parent living outside the household. However, sociological studies are very rare (one exception is Kovács and Vörös, 2013).

Table 10 *The proportion of households with three or more generations among households with children, according to the parental level of education (household-level data, per cent)*

Year	Elementary school	Technical school	High-school certificate	Academic degree	Total
1990	10.4	13.1	12.1	10.3	11.5
2001	13.1	15.0	12.3	8.5	12.4
2011	13.6	14.0	12.2	7.5	11.5
2016	11.7	11.9	10.2	5.7	9.2

Note: Data in the table pertain to households raising children up to the age of 24. If the parents had different levels of education, we counted the higher-level one.

Source: 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

The proportion of mosaic families cannot be calculated from the 1990 census data, but the data from between 2001 and 2016 indicate no increased trend. This is because the formation of new partner relationships after break-up has not increased over the past few decades. We can observe a slight increase in the proportion of mosaic families between 2011 and 2016, which might be related to the decrease in the proportion of single-parent families, although we cannot prove this definitively from the cross-sectional data.

In 2016, two thirds of all households were intact; mosaic families accounted for 13 per cent of households; and single parents accounted for 23 per cent (*Table 11*). There are significant differences according to the level of education. Among parents with elementary education, only every second household is intact, while this proportion is almost two thirds among people with a high-school certificate and almost three quarters among graduates. The proportion of mosaic families does not reveal such great differences, but the proportion of single-parent families shows significant differences according to parental education level: a single parent is raising a child in 16 per cent of households where that parent has a degree, but in 39 per cent of households where the parent has only elementary education.

A larger proportion of parents in mosaic families than in intact families live in a cohabiting relationship: the proportion of cohabitation without marriage was 19 per cent in intact families but 46 per cent in mosaic families. This means that parents are more likely to choose cohabitation as their second/third relationship. In mosaic families, one third of people with a degree, less than half of people with a high-school certificate and almost two thirds of people with elementary education do not live within a marriage. In 2016, 43 per cent of mosaic families also included mutual children; this was least likely among people with a high-school certificate or a degree, and most likely among people with elementary education.

Table 11 *Household types among households with children, according to the parental level of education (household-level data, per cent)*

Household type	2001	2011	2016
<i>Elementary school</i>			
Intact	51.5	47.0	49.5
Mosaic	12.4	9.2	11.5
Single parent	36.1	43.8	39.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Technical school</i>			
Intact	72.4	63.5	60.1
Mosaic	12.5	10.6	14.4
Single parent	15.1	25.9	25.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>High-school certificate</i>			
Intact	70.1	66.5	64.9
Mosaic	10.4	8.6	12.6
Single parent	19.5	24.9	22.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Academic degree</i>			
Intact	75.1	75.2	73.0
Mosaic	10.2	6.6	11.4
Single parent	14.8	18.3	15.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
<i>Overall</i>			
Intact	68.3	65.7	64.8
Mosaic	11.3	8.6	12.5
Single parent	20.4	25.7	22.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: Data in the table pertain to households raising children up to the age of 24. If the parents had different levels of education, we counted the higher-level one. Intact families were taken to be those where all the biological parents of children living there lived in that household. In the case of multi-generation households, classification was determined by assigning the different categories different numbers (intact – 1; mosaic – 2; and single-parent family – 3) and then choosing the lowest number. For example, if an intact family and a single-parent family lived together in one household, that household was classified as an ‘intact’ family. The census and the micro-census do not ask specifically whether or not the children living in a household are the biological children of the parents. At the same time, we have data on the birth date of each biological child belonging to these parents. The same is available in relation to children living in these households. We compared these two and decided if the child belonged to both parents, to just one of them, or to neither. Due to data inaccuracy, we believe that the proportion of mosaic families was overestimated. *Source:* 1990, 2001, 2011: census; 2016: micro census, calculated by the authors.

4. Summary

Our study has sought to draw attention to correlations between social divisions, and more specifically the education-level structure and changes in living arrangements. The relevance of the study comes from a characteristic element of the present government’s social programme to boost fertility rates, preparatory to which the government is trying in various ways to facilitate the plans of young people to start a family. Our research highlights the fact that the transformation of the education structure (for example, the growing proportion of people with a degree) and the devaluation of certain

qualifications (for example, the high-school certificate) essentially operate against these endeavours. For graduates, competing values, the expansion of the consumer society and the importance of a career can all serve as barriers to starting a family. For those with a secondary or lower level of education, hardships on the labour market can have the same effect.

Our analysis revealed that the proportion of people living with their parents without a cohabiting partner and without children increased dramatically in the 1990s. The high level reached by the 2000s remained stable in the period that followed. This increase took place with similar dynamics at all educational levels, but it was even steeper among people who neither study nor work. This indicates that the high proportion of youth living in the parental household is only partially connected to the fact that more and more people are studying for longer periods. Among those with a lower level of education, financial hardships, housing problems and labour market integration difficulties can all contribute to them still living in the parental household as adults without a family of their own. Presumably, a large proportion of such people have moved back to the parental household. An indication of this is that this stratum includes a higher proportion of people who already have children, but do not live with them. Presumably, this also explains why this status is more characteristic of men.

The majority of young people who move out of the parental household go to live in a family: the proportion of single-person households is rather low and there is no clear trend. The proportion of single-person households is much higher among people with an academic degree. It is also more characteristic of people with higher education that they live with their partner, but do not have children in the household. It seems that the link between becoming independent and having children is much stronger among people with a lower education than among those with higher qualifications. Decreasing fertility rates, the prevalence of not having children, and the vulnerability of relationships have all led to a decrease in the proportion of youth with children in their households. This decrease is most significant among people with a high-school certificate or a degree. The decrease has also been especially sharp among men: in 2016, the number of men with a high-school certificate or degree who were living with their child was around half of what it was in 1990.

Between 1990 and 2011, there was a decline in the two-child family model among families with children. This declining trend would appear to have come to a halt between 2011 and 2016, since there was a rise in the proportion of people raising two or more children. However, this could be interpreted as a continuation of the earlier tendency, since the proportion of people with *two* children decreased, while the proportion of those with *three or more* children increased.

Between 1990 and 2011, the proportion of families with one child increased most sharply among people with a high-school certificate. The increase was much more modest among people who had completed technical school or who had earned a degree, and there was a decrease among people with elementary education. In this latter case, there was a significant increase among the least qualified in the number of people with large families.

The proportion of multi-generation families has decreased in the population as a whole, but this is not generally evident among families with children: only in the households of graduates has there been any significant decrease.

In 2016, less than two thirds of households raising a child under the age of 24 were intact (meaning a household where the parents of all the children present were also their biological parents). We could observe changes in the proportion of intact households only during a brief period (2001–16), but there we saw a decline in the proportion of intact households.

After relationship break-ups, only a small proportion of young people – and especially of men – form a new family. This leads to a very high proportion of single-parent households, especially among people with low education levels. This also influences the fertility rates, since the number of children is always lower in single-parent households, where ‘plans for having children are interrupted’. If the re-marriage rates are low, and the young people do not form new cohabiting relationships, then this becomes a cause of low fertility rates.

REFERENCES

- Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO) (2018). STADAT database.
https://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xstadat/xstadat_eves/i_qlf045.html (downloaded 21 July 2018).
- Kovács, Marcell and Mrs Csaba Vörös (2013). A változó család a népszámlálási adatok tükrében [The changing family in light of the census data]. *Statisztikai Szemle [Statistical Review]*, 91(12), pp. 1213–27.
- Monostori, Judit and Livia Murinkó (2018). Család- és háztartásszerkezet [Family- and household structure]. In Judit Monostori, Péter Óri and Zsolt Spéder (eds), *Demográfiai portré [Demographic Portrait]*. KSH NKI: Budapest, pp. 177–197.
- Monostori, Judit, Péter Óri and Zsolt Spéder (eds) (2018). *Demográfiai portré [Demographic Portrait]*. KSH NKI: Budapest.