

Population Review

Volume 56, Number 2, 2017

Type: Article pp. 102-135

Dynamic Analysis of the Long-term Relationships between Mortality and Marital Fertility in the Developed World

Authors: Jesús J. Sánchez-Barricarte and Luis F. García-Espinal

Affiliations: Department of Social Analysis, Carlos III University of Madrid (Sánchez-Barricarte); Department of Social Analysis, Carlos III University of Madrid (García-Espinal)

Corresponding author/address: Jesús J. Sánchez-Barricarte, Department of Social Analysis, Carlos III University of Madrid; email: jesusjavier.sanchez@uc3m.es

Abstract

According to the traditional theory of the demographic transition, the drop in mortality was the main mechanism which accounted for the subsequent decline in fertility. This basic idea was questioned by the results of the well-known Princeton European Fertility Project, but even now there is relatively little empirical research providing solid evidence that can shed light on the determinants of fertility in modern times. We examine the long-term relationship between marital fertility, mortality and gross domestic product per capita (GDPpc) using panel cointegration techniques for a group of 15 developed countries from the 19th century until the present day. The statistical models used show that mortality plays a major role in fertility reductions.

Keywords

Demographic transition, fertility, mortality, historical demography, European Fertility Project, panel cointegration

Introduction

It is generally believed that before the demographic transition, decisions about having children were socially determined (basically through control exercised over access to marriage). Once the transition had begun, social norms gave way to individual or family decisions (Mason, 1997; Reher, 2011). The mortality rate has traditionally been seen as a decisive factor affecting reproductive decisions, but this apparently logical relationship is no more than a theoretical proposition. Coale (1986) believed that a drop in mortality was a necessary condition for a lasting decline in marital fertility. Empirical studies associated with the Princeton European Fertility Project (PEFP), however, raised serious questions concerning the idea that, as the theory of the demographic transition proposes, the decline in fertility is a response to an earlier decrease in mortality rates. One of the main conclusions set forth at the end of the PEFP was expressed thus: “At the end of this quest, we cannot report that the historical evidence confirms that the declines of infant mortality led to the decline of fertility” (van de Walle, 1986: 233).

Many other researchers have reached the same conclusion (Watkins, 1986: 436; Knodel, 1974: 167-185; Lesthaeghe, 1977: 171-176; Teitelbaum, 1984; Haines, 1998). In a study on the state of the question concerning the transition and the theory of fertility, van de Kaa (1996: 409) concluded: “Notestein’s notion that a mortality reduction would automatically lead to a significant decline in fertility through a series of pre-existing social mechanisms is untenable.” In his review, Kirk (1996: 368) attempted to show the diverse approaches to causation: socio-economic, economic, institutional, cultural and ideational, concluding: “It is perhaps surprising that while mortality decline is usually cited as the *raison d’être* [reason for being] for fertility decline, it is not often accorded a primary place as a *cause* of fertility decline. This is understandable, since efforts to establish a direct close connection have had mixed results. Whilst definitive proof of this connection may not be possible, there exist cogent reasons for supposing that it exists.”

In recent years, studies using longitudinal microdata have made important contributions towards clarifying the relationship between mortality and fertility during the demographic transition (Bengtsson and Dribe, 2006; Knodel, 1988; Wrigley et al., 1997; Van Bavel, 2003 and 2004; Van Bavel and Kok, 2010; Reher and Sanz-Gimeno, 2007; Reher and Sandström, 2015; Van Poppel et al., 2012; Schellekens and van Poppel, 2012; Reher et al., 2017).¹ These studies showed that couples continually regulated their fertility, and that those who lost a child were significantly more likely to face the hazard of an additional birth. Reher et al. (2017: 18) considered the view that mortality played a major role in the decline in fertility, and concluded that it went from being a cornerstone of demographic transition theory to being considered almost anecdotal as a result of the use of inadequate data, mainly because “the only way to show how mortality affected reproduction was by means of linked micro data.” However, family reconstruction techniques, which provide micro data that can be used to carry out longitudinal studies, also have their limitations. First, it is practically impossible to apply them to long periods of time and large geographical areas. In the best case scenario, micro studies can analyze the reproductive behavior of a few thousand couples. The doubt therefore arises as to

¹ Some studies using aggregated data also found a strong association between child mortality and fertility rates (Galloway et al., 1998).

whether the information that is obtained for a small set of villages is representative of the whole country. It is very hard to build general theories about the decline in fertility on the basis of patterns observed in a small number of towns. Moreover, the differences in reproductive behavior between rural and urban areas cannot be ignored. In other words, rich data provided by longitudinal micro studies have to be complemented by other studies based on aggregated data covering much larger areas and longer time periods.

This study attempts to show the historical relationship that has existed between decreases in mortality and fertility. It aims to do so by making use of aggregated data for a set of 15 countries,² using modern econometrics. Historical studies in the context of the PEFP did not use panel data techniques. Brown and Guinnane (2007) point out that when this statistical method is used, the role of socioeconomic factors (including mortality and gross domestic product per capita) is restored. Recently, several studies have been published in which panel data techniques are used to analyze the relationship between mortality and fertility over long periods of time and in a wide range of countries. Ángeles (2010) analyzes 118 countries in the period 1960-2005; Herzer et al. (2012) focuses on 20 countries over the 20th century, and Murin (2013) covers 70 countries from 1870 to 2000. Their conclusions concur that mortality rates do indeed function as a statistically significant predictor of fertility rates throughout history. These studies are, however, based on a series of demographic indicators which may be problematic. First, they use as their fertility indicators the crude birth rate (CBR) (Herzer et al., 2012; Murin, 2013) and the total fertility rate (Ángeles, 2010). It is well known that, in the western world, the vast majority of children have generally been born within marriage, and so nuptiality is also a key factor in regulating the total number of births that take place. It was only in the 1980s that the percentage of illegitimate births began to rise considerably. That is, historically speaking, fertility rates depended not only on how many children married women had, but also on what percentage of women actually got married. In other words, in developed countries a rise in births was caused by an increase in nuptiality. Thus, the influence of nuptiality on total fertility was considerable. If we want to neutralize the possible influence of nuptiality in order to analyze the relationship between mortality and fertility alone, we need to confine our analysis to the impact of mortality on the rates of marital fertility.

Second, the indicators used in this earlier research to measure the general intensity of mortality, such as the crude death rate (CDR), are not refined. Both the CDR and the CBR are heavily affected by the age structure of the population, and their use is not advisable for analyzing lengthy periods of time over which the age structure undergoes substantial changes, as was the case in Western countries over the 20th century. Equally, it is not recommended to use them when comparing countries with different demographic structures. Furthermore, some of these studies also rely on values such as infant mortality and child mortality rates as the only indicators of mortality in the general population. Some experts (Reher, 1999) consider that this

² In this study, we shall focus exclusively on analyzing aggregated data on a national level, but we have also applied the same econometric techniques to provincial data from several European countries. Although some researchers have suggested that aggregated data from countries as a whole conceal the wide variation present in each country (Brown and Guinnane, 2007), we can reveal that the results obtained using provincial information are similar to those from national studies; that is, the level of aggregation of the data does not alter the historical relationship between mortality and fertility (the results obtained using data from provinces will be presented in our forthcoming publications).

was one of the main shortcomings of the PEFP. At the very least, only taking account of the deaths of children aged less than 1 year might be thought to be somewhat reckless, since this figure cannot possibly tell us much about the whole story.³ Matthiessen and McCann (1978) and Wrigley (1969) indicated that in most European countries, the mortality rate among children aged 1 to 14 years fell long before the infant mortality rate.

According to Reher et al. (2017: 6), one of the mechanisms through which mortality influences fertility is related to the couple's family size preference.⁴ Parents' main aim as far as reproduction is concerned is to reach a number of surviving children rather than a number of children ever born. In the short-term there is a replacement effect (where parents have more births in order to compensate for losing children). In the long-term, "if couples had fertility goals and the ability to implement them, their fertility decisions would tend to be based on the overall survival status of their sibset rather than solely on the outcome of the previous birth".

We consider that an indicator that reflects more accurately the long-term behavioral responses to childhood mortality is ${}_{25}q_0$ (that is, the likelihood of dying in the first 25 years of life). The survival to this age could be a good indicator of the way couples perceived the long-term patterns of mortality around them when they took decisions concerning reproduction. Basically, decisions parents make about the number of children to have depend on the mortality rates present during the first decades of life in the social environment where they live. Further, it is very likely that the adjustment that parents make in terms of fertility will depend on the mortality rates observed not when they actually have their children, but during the years prior to that. For this reason, we should expect a relationship between the fertility level in a particular year and the mortality level observed 5-10 years previously. It takes several years for people to adjust to the idea that the change in mortality is permanent, not merely due to chance, and it is a common feature of the demographic transition in Western countries that the drop in mortality precedes the decline in fertility by several years.

Some researchers have pointed out that when fertility rates are very high, the relationship between childhood mortality and fertility can be two-way. Children in large families may suffer from higher mortality, because their mothers have less time to take care of them (Oris et al., 2004; Knodel, 1988; Van de Kaa, 1996). However, recent studies based on micro data do not

³ Very probably the reason why the PEFP researchers used the infant mortality rate as the indicator for the general mortality rate is that it is easy to calculate, and it is relatively simple to obtain the historical information needed to work it out. But now we have historical life tables for a large number of Western countries (and even for many of the provinces within them) which give use much richer and more reliable data about general mortality patterns. For this reason, we consider that it is more appropriate to use this method.

⁴ There are another two mechanisms which might explain the influence of the decline in mortality on the historical decrease in fertility. One of these has a biological basis: the death of a baby who is breastfeeding means that the infertile postpartum period comes to an end (Knodel and van de Walle, 1967). The third mechanism operates at community level: the decrease in child and youth mortality may transform the unwritten rules within the community, and change people's reproductive behavior. For example, institutional structures (such as the systems of inheritance) are placed under pressure as a result of raised life expectancy, leading to a process of adaptation in which birth control becomes more acceptable (Reher and Sandström, 2015).

support the hypothesis that fertility transitions influence the decrease in infant mortality (Fernihough and McGovern, 2014).

Our aim in this study is to know how mortality affects marital fertility in the long-term, controlling for other potential determinants discussed in the literature, using more reliable mortality indices, and making use of modern econometric techniques.

Data

For the purposes of this study, we collected information on the marital fertility and mortality in 15 developed countries over a very long period of time (in some cases, from the early decades of the 19th century until 2008). The fertility indicator we used is known as the Princeton index of marital fertility I_g . This index is widely used in historical studies and consists of the ratio of the number of births occurring among married women to the number that would occur if married women were subject to maximum fertility (married Hutterite women).⁵ Most of the data on marital fertility was obtained from Coale and Watkins (1986). These data are also available from the following University of Princeton website: <http://opr.princeton.edu/archive/pefp/>. Despite the fact that this index presents certain limitations (Caldwell et al., 1982; Burch and Ashok, 1986; Brown and Guinnane, 2007), we made use of this information because it is the most comprehensive database that includes statistics for all European countries and provinces over a period of more than 100 years. The values of I_g were calculated for the census years. We used a simple linear interpolation to fill in the gaps for the years between censuses.⁶ The Annex to the present document provides details on the sources that we consulted in order to gather the information for each of the countries in the study.

Regarding the mortality index ${}_{25}q_0$, in the Annex we also list the large number of sources that we had to consult in order to complete the information for the group of countries in our study. We have included the largest number of countries for which we were able to find historical data of proven reliability from (at least) the end of the 19th century up to the present day: Belgium, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United States of America.

We also made a great effort to fill in the gaps in the information that was not yet available. For example, we calculated the Princeton marital fertility index for some non-European countries, such as New Zealand and the United States. We also obtained various kinds of socio-economic information (GDP per capita) needed to apply the statistical models specified below. All the details concerning the sources that we consulted and the calculations that we carried out are specified in the Annex.

All the statistical analyses in this study are based on aggregated data from specific countries, even though some scholars (Guinnane and Brown, 2002; Reher and Sanz-Gimeno, 2007; Brown

⁵ See Coale and Watkins (1986: 153-162) for information on how this index is calculated.

⁶ We did not carry out this interpolation in cases where more than 11 years elapsed between censuses.

and Guinnane, 2007; van Poppel et al., 2012) have expressed great skepticism as to the usefulness of aggregated data for understanding changes in reproductive behaviors in the past.

Methodology

When time series are used to measure the relationship between two trending variables one often obtains spurious regression results. Often detrending helps to eliminate these, but this technique does not work when the variables are difference-stationary, also labeled $I(1)$. Tests of cointegration can be used to test whether the relationship between two $I(1)$ variables is true or spurious (Engelhardt et al., 2001: 11-12).

Recently a series of studies was published which apply modern panel cointegration techniques, such as Vector Error Correction (VEC) models, Dynamic Ordinary Least Squares (DOLS) and Fully Modified Ordinary Least Squares (FMOLS), to analyze the relationship between different sociodemographic variables in the long term (Hondroyiannis and Papapetrou, 2002 and 2005; Narayan and Peng, 2006; Hondroyiannis, 2010; Ángeles, 2010; Frini and Muller, 2012; Herzer et al., 2012; Hafner and Mayer-Foulkes, 2013; Murtin, 2013; Bakar et al., 2014; Hartani et al., 2015).

VEC models are a development on VAR models (vector autoregression) (Engle and Granger, 1987). When two variables of interest are endogenous, they develop a divergent or convergent trend in the long term. These models have been perfected in the area of economics, in order to address issues such as the relationship between different variables (e.g., inflation, interest rates and unemployment). These economic variables are found to have an endogenous relationship and feed back onto each other. In this case, a VAR model can be used if the variables are stationary. However, we could be interested in analyzing the long-term equilibrium of the two variables (as long as they are all of the first order of integration), rather than the short-term equilibrium, because this could be subject to distortions. In this research, we are interested in observing the long-term relationship between variables I_g and ${}_{25}q_0$ (which are integrated in order 1), and our hypothesis is that these will have a positive relationship, following a similar trend. This tendency to develop together is known as cointegration. Once these relationships of cointegration have been found, we intend to show the sign of this relationship, since this will tell us whether the relationship is convergent (positive, where both variables have the same trend) or divergent (negative, where the course taken by one variable diverges from that of the other). On the other hand, this kind of model also allows us to observe the relationship of one of the variables when the other is exposed to a shock or an innovation (a short-term change or increase). These reactions are known as Impulse/Response functions and are shown in Graph A4 in the Annex (in order to provide further details about our results).

On the other hand, to show that the trend is homogeneous for the different countries, we also implemented the FMOLS and DOLS models (Saikkonen, 1992; Phillips and Hansen, 1990). While these have the same purpose as the VEC models (i.e., the main aim is to observe the relationships and trends for two variables in the long term), the FMOLS models modify OLS

methodology (which is non-parametric⁷) to take into account the negative effects of serial correlation and endogeneity as a product of cointegration relations. We also incorporated the DOLS models (a parametric method) for the panel data, which, though dealing with similar problems, introduce lags and leads to solve issues related to the order of integration and the existence (or not) of cointegration, and are computationally more efficient.

Panel studies offer many advantages over time series and cross-section analysis. Having data from a large number of years increases the sample size and may lead to more reliable estimates. Also, having multiple observations for each country enables researchers to include country-specific fixed effects, thereby controlling for a wide range of time-invariant country characteristics whose omission might otherwise bias the estimated relationship between the variables (Hondroyannis and Papapetrou, 2005: 145).

We were able to use our data to perform an analysis of time series for 15 countries and to model the long-term relationship between the relevant variables (I_g and $_{25}q_0$).

Cointegration equation by country

The analysis of the time series was performed in the field of econometrics because of the benefits of using VEC when the variables are endogenous. The advantages stem from the fact that the calculation is performed using a system of equations in which each variable is dependent and independent in turn, so that we can avoid the circularity resulting from using endogenous variables. This approach helps us to model short- and long-term patterns and incorporate tests of causality.

Table A1, in the Annex, presents detailed descriptive statistics of the datasets involved, and Graphs A1 to A5 (also in the Annex) may be helpful to readers for graphical examination of the long-run trends in the variables of interest.

In order to model our hypothesis (that the drop in mortality caused the subsequent decline in marital fertility), we followed the steps set out below:

- Checking structural breaks in our dependent variable of interest (I_g). These tests were carried out in those countries that present a positive sign in the correction term error. As we shall see, only England and Wales, and Sweden, still have a positive sign, which means that some other demographic dynamics may be being ignored in our models.
- Testing for unit root by Augmented Dickey-Fuller test (ADF) (Dickey and Fuller, 1979), Phillip-Perron test (PP) (Phillips and Perron, 1988) and Kwiatkowski-Phillips-Schmidt-Shin test (KPSS) (Kwiatkowski et al., 1992) and taking differences when necessary.

⁷ The DOLS method is a parametric approach to correct autocorrelation by adding leads and lags as the first difference. By contrast, FMOLS is a non-parametric approach to autocorrelation correction, but this method is quite biased in small estimator results. In this regard, DOLS method can be used in cases with small samples. FMOLS uses a parametric approach, not OLS, as the standard methodology.

- Computing VAR models to outline the short run and obtain the proper lag length.
- Testing for cointegration equations by using the information about ADF, PP and KPSS as well as lag length from VAR.
- Computing the VEC model using the information from the Johansen-cointegration test (Johansen and Juselius, 1990; Johansen, 1991 and 1995).

The formal expression of the model is as follows:

$$\Delta \Pi_t = \theta \beta' \Pi_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha \Delta \Pi_{t-j} + e_t \quad (1)$$

Where Π_t is the set of endogenous variables I_g , ${}_{25}q_0$ and gross domestic product per capita (GDPpc)⁸ at time t , $\theta \beta' \Pi_{t-1}$ is the expression that determines the long-term relationship, $\Delta \Pi_{t-j}$ is the short-term and e_t is the error term with zero-mean of serially uncorrelated innovations.

An important prior step when modeling VEC models is to determine the allocation of variables from the most endogenous moving to exogenous variables. As our dependent variable of interest is I_g , we allocate GDPpc in second place and ${}_{25}q_0$ as the more exogenous variable. Hence, the long-run we are interested in is:

$$\Delta I g_t = \theta (I g_{t-1} - \beta_1 GDPpc_{t-1} - \beta_2 {}_{25}q_{0,t-1} - \mu) \quad (2)$$

Where θ is the error correction term or the speed of adjustment to the long-run equilibria which correct distortions from one period to the next. This coefficient must be between -1 and 0, so by simple algebra, the interpretation of the long-run coefficient should be interpreted with the opposite sign.

As Table 1 (next page) shows, the tests indicate that GDPpc and ${}_{25}q_0$ are I(1) as a constant. The variable I_g is more problematic, since the tests do not yield a common, stable result, even though it is true that some of them indicate that the series is stationary as a constant or constant and trend. A large number of the differences between the tests are probably due to the interpolation of the census data that we had to perform in order to carry out the study. For this reason, as well as because of the similarities between graphs I_g and ${}_{25}q_0$, we made I_g stationary at the first difference, always taking into account the constant or constant and trend when the test indicated that this was necessary. However, we must stress that we allowed ourselves to be guided by the ADF results. Where neither ADF nor PP rejected the null hypothesis, we transformed the variable into a stationary one, taking into account the KPSS test.

⁸ The variable GDPpc was from Maddison (2009) and is expressed with inflation adjustment in 1990 International Geary-Khamis dollars.

Table 1. P-values of unit root test

	I _g			25q ₀			GDPpc		
	ADF	PP	KPSS	ADF	PP	KPSS	ADF	PP	KPSS
Belgium	0.277	0.611	0.676 *** c	0.059	0.000	0.045 b	0.000	0.000	1.172 *** c
Denmark ^d	0.066	0.277	0.238 *** tc	0.001	0.000	0.236 *** tc	0.000	0.000	1.411 *** c
England and Wales	0.693	0.908	0.220 *** tc	0.000	0.000	0.063 b	0.000	0.000	1.309 *** c
Finland	0.034	0.371	0.148 ** tc	0.000	0.000	0.121 b	0.000	0.000	1.166 *** c
France ^a	0.004	0.098	0.109 b	0.000	0.000	0.040 b	0.000	0.000	0.027 b
Germany	0.504	0.472	0.218 *** tc	0.621	0.377	0.665 ** c	0.000	0.000	1.230 *** c
Italy	0.022	0.323	0.208 ** tc	0.000	0.000	0.035 b	0.000	0.000	1.105 *** c
Netherland	0.021	0.084	0.115 b	0.000	0.000	0.497 ** c	0.000	0.000	1.167 *** c
New Zeland	0.065	0.101	0.101 b	0.379	0.007	1.049 *** c	0.000	0.000	0.513 ** c
Norway	0.206	0.060	0.419 * c	0.027	0.000	0.124 * tc	0.000	0.000	1.371 *** c
Portugal	0.027	0.114	0.066 b	0.120	0.029	0.145 ** tc	0.000	0.000	1.230 *** c
Spain	0.044	0.125	0.420 * c	0.036	0.000	0.163 ** tc	0.000	0.000	1.097 *** c
Sweden	0.009	0.046	0.236 *** tc	0.000	0.000	0.099 b	0.000	0.000	1.350 *** c
Switzerland	0.126	0.163	0.700 ** c	0.042	0.000	0.135 * tc	0.000	0.000	0.888 *** c
USA	0.014	0.085	0.066 b	0.000	0.000	0.126 ** c	0.000	0.000	1.250 *** c

Notes: In this table only, the asterisk means that we do not reject the null hypothesis of KPSS (series is stationary).

Significance level: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%.

(^a) time-frame 1875-2008, (^b) not significant at 10% with or without trend, (^l) trend included, (^c) constant included, (^d) time frame 1870-1970. ADF and PP were computed in first difference with constant as prior analysis in levels revealed unit root in the three series.

The parameters employed for the lag length of the unit root tests are as follows:

- 1) ADF- Automatic selection Schwarz information Criteria with a maximum of 30
- 2) PP- Spectral estimation method (Bartlett Kernel); Automatic selection by Newey-west bandwidth
- 3) KPSS- Spectral estimation method (Bartlett Kernel); Automatic selection by Newey-west bandwidth

Table 2 (next page) shows the lags indicated by the different tests that are generally used in the bibliography on time series. We used the AIC test to model the variables in the subsequent VEC model, mainly because SC and HQ often yield very small lags. We deviate from the parsimonious rule when selecting the optimal lag length because we consider that the theoretical relationship between the variables requires a greater lag interval. Nearly all classical representations of demographic transition depict a lagged decline of birth rates (Cleland, 2001: 60). Couples' reproductive decisions are conditioned by the mortality level that they experienced some years before in the places where they lived. In periods when mortality falls swiftly (as was the case during the demographic transition) couples cannot be certain whether the improved mortality rates will last or whether this is just a passing phenomenon. It is

understandable that couples will adjust their fertility according to the mortality levels that they observed 8-10 years previously. Hence, the decision on increasing the family is not just based on short term changes over periods such as 3 to 5 years, as has been pointed out by SC and HQ.

Table 2. Lag length criteria

	LR	FPE	AIC	SC	HQ	Interval
Belgium	8	8	8	3	3	1870-2008
Denmark	8	8	8	3	3	1875-2008
England and Wales	8	8	9	3	3	1853-2008
Finland	8	8	8	3	3	1882-2008
France	8	8	9	3	4	1875-2008
Germany	8	8	9	3	4	1868-2008
Italy	10	10	10	3	5	1870-2008
Netherlands	9	9	9	3	3	1861-2008
New Zealand	10	10	10	3	10	1870-2008
Norway	9	9	9	3	4	1820-2008
Portugal	8	9	9	3	3	1870-2008
Spain	8	8	8	3	8	1862-2008
Sweden	8	8	8	3	8	1820-2008
Switzerland	8	9	9	3	8	1870-2008
USA	10	10	10	3	3	1850-2008

Once the cointegration relations had been analysed (Table 3, next page) we proceeded to model the variables in the short term using the lags indicated, and introducing the equations of cointegration proposed by the Johansen test (1991 and 1995). Table 4 (p.113) shows the results of the relations between the variables in the long term. The short-term results are not shown, because they were not significant and because the aim of this study was to test the convergence of variables in the long term.

As the notes to Table 4 suggest, some countries were modelled taking into account structural changes, since these may at times affect the respective error correction term, resulting in positive values.⁹ Once the structural changes are included in the form of exogenous binary variables, the error correction term returns to its usual range between -1 and 0, expressing the rate of correction of shocks from one period to another for each cointegration equation. We considered the ordering of the variables within the equation based on the expected

⁹ We tested the residuals of the cointegrated regressions from Table 4 on autocorrelation, and we display the results on Table A4 in the Annex.

contemporaneous and lagged impact of any shock in the variables. I_g can have a contemporaneous effect on GDPpc and ${}_{25}q_0$, but our working assumption is based on the idea

Table 3. Cointegration test

Finland (8 lags)					Denmark (8 lags)					England and Wales (9 lags and trend)				
Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.	
None	32.943	29.787	0.021 **		None	35.088	29.787	0.011 **		None	73.107	42.915	0.000 **	
At most 1	8.134	15.494	0.451		At most 1	14.693	15.494	0.064		At most 1	36.891	25.782	0.001 **	
At most 2	0.494	3.841	0.481		At most 2	0.052	3.841	0.818		At most 2	12.085	12.517	0.06	
Belgium (8 lags)					France (9 lags)					Germany (9 lags and trend)				
Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.	
None	42.782	29.787	0.001 **		None	47.625	29.787	0.000 **		None	65.646	42.915	0.000 **	
At most 1	16.314	15.494	0.037 **		At most 1	11.577	15.494	0.178		At most 1	28.418	25.782	0.023 **	
At most 2	1.139	3.841	0.285		At most 2	3.287	3.841	0.07		At most 2	8.956	12.517	0.183	
Italy (10 lags)					Netherlands (9 lags)					Norway (9 lags)				
Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.	
None	36.794	29.787	0.006 **		None	34.340	29.787	0.014 **		None	31.575	29.787	0.030 **	
At most 1	16.286	15.494	0.037 **		At most 1	14.534	15.494	0.069		At most 1	10.984	15.494	0.212	
At most 2	3.28	3.841	0.070		At most 2	2.813	3.841	0.100		At most 2	0.207	3.841	0.649	
Sweden (8 lags)					Spain (8 lags)					Switzerland (9 lags)				
Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.	
None	36.69	29.787	0.006 **		None	45.189	29.787	0.000 **		None	46.773	29.787	0.000 **	
At most 1	17.183	15.494	0.027 **		At most 1	10.793	15.494	0.224		At most 1	9.895	15.494	0.288	
At most 2	0.311	3.841	0.577		At most 2	1.113	3.841	0.291		At most 2	0.205	3.841	0.650	
New Zealand (10 lags)					USA (10 lags)					Portugal (9 lags)				
Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.		Null	Trace statistic	0.05 Critical value	Prob.	
None	36.574	29.787	0.007 **		None	40.784	29.787	0.001 **		None	37.197	29.787	0.005 *	
At most 1	16.404	15.494	0.036 **		At most 1	13.013	15.494	0.114		At most 1	10.952	15.494	0.2145	
At most 2	3.841	3.841	0.298		At most 2	1.572	3.841	0.209		At most 2	0.179	3.841	0.671	

Significance level: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%.

Reject null hypothesis at 5% level.

that neither GDPpc nor ${}_{25}q_0$ has a contemporaneous effect on I_g . This ordering is also outlined in Nicolini (2007). In our case, our working assumption is that ${}_{25}q_0$ is, in comparative terms, more exogenous than the GDPpc, since the sources of change of GDPpc are an uncountable, and ${}_{25}q_0$ merely comes from biological sources, alongside diseases and casualties from war. GDPpc will thus have the second position and ${}_{25}q_0$ will hold the third. Second, following this order, the cointegration rank was tested by means of the Johansen cointegration test, reported in Table 3. Where cointegration was found between two variables, the notation in Table 4 is as follows: 1 is for the first variable entering the cointegration, and the second variable entering the regressions is the one that is significant. When the three enter a single cointegration, I_g shows 1 as before, but now the two other variables are significant. Finally, when two cointegrations are found 1 points out which variable is entering the cointegration, while 0 points out which one is not entering, as explained below the table.

One aspect that is particularly noticeable is the high coefficient of determination (R^2). In the analysis of time series, this coefficient often lacks the information load that is found in the non-dynamic models, as it is influenced by the number of coefficients in the regression (number of

Table 4. Cointegrated regressions

	ΔI_g	ΔGDP_{pc}	Δ_{25q0}		C	Error Correction	Adjusted R^2	Obs.	Period
Belgium (8 lags) ¹	1	0	-1.99 *** <i>0.350</i>		-0.04	-3.00E-03 *** <i>8.00E-04</i>	0.99	92	1870-2008
	0	1	3745.3 *** <i>2296.7</i>		-5434.3	-1.14E-09 <i>1.20E-07</i>			
Denmark (8 lags)	1	-9.42E-06 ** <i>5.40E-06</i>	-1064.0 *** <i>0.222</i>		-0.20	-1.00E-03 ** <i>5.00E-04</i>	0.99	180	1875-2008
	0	1	-64785.4 *** <i>5963.7</i>		24321.1	1.80E-07 ** <i>6.00E-08</i>			
England and Wales (9 lags and trend)	1	0	-4936.0 *** <i>0.969</i>		1532.0	-7.00E-04 *** <i>3.00E-04</i>	0.99	146	1853-2008
	0	1	-64785.4 *** <i>5963.7</i>		24321.1	1.80E-07 ** <i>6.00E-08</i>			
Finland (8 lags) ²	1	2.89E-06 <i>2.50E-06</i>	-1096.0 *** <i>0.278</i>		-0.28	-7.00E-03 *** <i>2.00E-03</i>	0.99	118	1882-2008
	0	1	-64785.4 *** <i>5963.7</i>		24321.1	1.80E-07 ** <i>6.00E-08</i>			
France (9 lags) ³	1	9.29E-06 <i>5.90E-06</i>	-1572.0 *** <i>0.337</i>		-0.15	-5.00E-03 ** <i>2.00E-03</i>	0.94	122	1875-2008
	0	1	-64785.4 *** <i>5963.7</i>		24321.1	1.80E-07 ** <i>6.00E-08</i>			
Germany (9 lags and trend)	1	0	-1487.0 *** <i>0.094</i>		-0.14	-1.60E-02 *** <i>4.00E-03</i>	0.99	130	1868-2008
	0	1	-63251.3 *** <i>2924.57</i>		2731.8	-2.94E-07 ** <i>1.40E-07</i>			
Italy (10 lags) ⁴	1	0	-1150.0 *** <i>0.152</i>		-0.20	-3.00E-03 ** <i>1.00E-03</i>	0.99	126	1870-2008
	0	1	34784.5 *** <i>7411.3</i>		-13342.5	-4.98E-08 ** <i>2.10E-08</i>			
Netherlands (9 lags)	1	-4.81E-07 <i>6.10E-06</i>	-0.91 *** <i>0.133</i>		-0.37	-3.00E-03 ** <i>1.00E-03</i>	0.98	138	1861-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			
New Zealand (10 lags)	1	0	-10285.0 *** <i>2255.0</i>		0.26	-1.20E-02 *** <i>3.00E-03</i>	0.98	101	1870-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			
Norway (9 lags)	1	0.001 <i>4.00E-04</i>	-56165.0 *** <i>16672.0</i>		1.00	-2.38E-05 * <i>1.40E-05</i>	0.98	179	1820-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			
Portugal (9 lags)	1	1.73E-05 *** <i>2.80E-06</i>	-0.76 *** <i>0.038</i>		-0.36	-9.00E-04 *** <i>3.00E-03</i>	0.99	98	1870-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			
Spain (8 lags)	1	3.25E-05 *** <i>4.30E-05</i>	-1010.0 *** <i>0.081</i>		-0.40	-2.62E-04 *** <i>9.90E-04</i>	0.99	137	1862-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			
Sweden (11 lags)	1	0	-3333.0 *** <i>0.440</i>		-0.10	-4.00E-03 *** <i>1.00E-03</i>	0.98	180	1820-2008
	0	1	-60641.2 *** <i>23545.60</i>		3872.1	7.16E-08 *** <i>2.00E-08</i>			
Switzerland (9 lags)	1	1.19E-05 <i>2.80E-05</i>	-2231.0 *** <i>0.897</i>		0.02	-5.00E-04 * <i>3.00E-04</i>	0.99	123	1870-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			
USA (10 lags)	1	5.29E-06 *** <i>1.33E-06</i>	-1401.0 *** <i>0.080</i>		-0.27	-4.00E-03 * <i>2.00E-03</i>	0.98	129	1850-2008
	0	1	469625.8 *** <i>106257.0</i>		-37685.9	-2.49E-07 *** <i>8.20E-08</i>			

Significance level: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Standard error in italics.

Note: 1 in first column means that I_g is the dependent variable in the cointegration equation. 0 means that the variable does not get into the long-term equilibria.

[1] Including one dummy 1870-1930 = 1

[2] Including 3 dummies 1882-1912 = 1; 1913-1931 = 2; 1932-1962 = 3.

[3] Including 3 dummies, 1875-1912 = 1; 1913-1930 = 2 and 1931-1972 = 3

[4] Including one dummy, 1975-2008 = 1

Time-frames were chosen by estimating least squared breakpoints

lags for each variable) or by the time progression. In this case, the coefficient obtained was so high because of the high explanatory load of the lags in I_g included as independent regressors, which meant that the dependence between the value of I_g at t and $t-j$ is very high.

Lastly, the dynamics of each country are captured by the different cointegration equations obtained. While for most countries, GDPpc and ${}_{25}q_0$ have a long-term relationship with I_g , in a few there is a long-term relationship between I_g and ${}_{25}q_0$, and a different one between GDPpc and ${}_{25}q_0$.

The results shown in Table 4 allow us to confirm that in the 15 countries analysed there was indeed a long-term causal relationship between the intensity of mortality and the trends in marital fertility. That is, an increase (or decrease) of ${}_{25}q_0$ in the long term means an increase (or decrease) of I_g (the variables move together and do not follow different paths).¹⁰

On the other hand, the results shown in Table 4 also point to the existence of other long-term relationships. In England and Wales, Sweden, Italy and New Zealand, we may note a relationship between ${}_{25}q_0$ and GDPpc which differs from the relationship between ${}_{25}q_0$ and I_g . This indicates that the heterogeneity of the countries in question leads to different specific dynamics, without detriment to the expected relationship between ${}_{25}q_0$ and I_g .¹¹

Panel cointegration

As a complement to the statistical tests explained above, we also carried out a panel dynamics study of the same 15 countries shown in Table 4. To do this, we first obtained the cointegration equations by using tests, such as those of Kao (1999) and Fisher (1932).¹²

Table 5 (next page) shows the results of the unit root tests including both the constant and the trend in an individualized way. The results point to an order of integration $I(1)$ that is a constant.

The results shown in Table 6 (p.116) illustrate the cointegration relations in the panel and individually. In the case of panel cointegration, we find sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no cointegration, which means that we accept the alternative hypothesis of cointegration in the panel of countries. In the individual case, we find results which warrant special attention. To summarize the results that are stable across the different time lags, we need to mention that Sweden has no cointegration relationship; Spain, USA, Portugal and Germany

¹⁰ These results are obtained by multiplying the error correction term (significant and negative) with the coefficient of the variable ${}_{25}q_0$ (also significant and negative) from Table 4.

¹¹ The cases of England and Wales and Sweden should be stressed, where the error term in the second equation of cointegration is not within the expected range (-1 to 0). This issue could not be solved by including exogenous binary variables, and better specification of this model is certainly needed. Such a detailed study falls outside the scope of this article, although the problem of lack of specification could be solved – at least partly – by the panel study of countries explained later in this paper.

¹² For Fisher's tests we extracted 3 lags obtained from Table 2. We will thus focus on lags of 8, 9 and 10.

Table 5. Panel unit root test (15 cross-sectional units)

		Level constant		Level, constat and trend	First difference and constant	
I_g	<i>Im, Pesarant and Shin Wstat</i>	0,797		0,985	0	***
	<i>ADF-Fisher</i>	0,787		0,721	0,002	***
	<i>PP-Fisher</i>	0,099		1	0,000	***
$_{25}q_0$	<i>Im, Pesarant and Shin Wstat</i>	0,178		1	0	***
	<i>ADF-Fisher</i>	0,063	*	1	0	***
	<i>PP-Fisher</i>	0,001	** *	0,987	0	***
GDPpc	<i>Im, Pesarant and Shin Wstat</i>	1		1	0	***
	<i>ADF-Fisher</i>	1		1	0	***
	<i>PP-Fisher</i>	1		1	0	***

have a cointegration relationship, while Denmark, England and Wales have two cointegrations. The other countries vary if we change the time lag. For this reason, we adopted the following analytical strategy: First, we computed a cointegration regression for the whole panel (15 units); second, we analysed only the case of countries with a cointegration equation (4 units); third, we added those countries with 1 and 2 cointegrations (6 units); and finally, we added Sweden, which is the only country with no cointegration.

Table 7 (p.117) shows the results of the panel cointegration to explain the dependent variable I_g (marital fertility). One result shared by all the models calculated is that the relationship between I_g and $_{25}q_0$ is always significant at a level of 1% and has a positive impact. In other words, an increase (or decrease) in mortality raises (or depresses) marital fertility in the long term (i.e., these two variables do not go in different directions).

On the other hand, it is evident that the long-term impact of GDPpc on I_g is negative and highly significant, but with some exceptions in the dynamic models (DOLS).¹³ This means that the increase in the GDPpc has a negative impact in the long term on marital fertility. Although the relationship between the GDPpc and marital fertility does not fall within the scope of this article, we consider that it is interesting to draw attention to the causal relationship that emerged here. What these data are telling us is that, from the time of the earliest available information in the second half of the 19th century until the present day, the increase in GDPpc has been pushing marital fertility lower and lower. Historically, children were the safest investment that a couple could make to insure against future difficulties in life (illness, accidents, ageing). When parents' purchasing power increases, they become economically more independent from their

¹³ This sporadic loss of significance can be explained by the fact that the model is calculated with a constant and a trend. In dynamic cases where only the constant is taken into account, GDPpc is highly significant and negative.

Table 6. Panel cointegration tests

	Residual variance	HAC Variance		t-statistic		Prob.
Kao Residual cointegration Test ¹	3.00E-05	0.00018		-3.052		0.0011
Fisher ² (combined Johansen test)	Null: none		Null: at most 1 cointegration		Null: at most 2 cointegrations	
		<0.05	>0.05	<0.05	>0.05	<0.05
	8 lags	Denmark England and Wales Finland France Germany Netherlands Norway Portugal Spain Switzerland USA	Italy Belgium New Zealand Sweden	Denmark England and Wales New Zealand Sweden Switzerland	Belgium Finland France Germany Italy Netherlands Norway Portugal Spain USA	Belgium Denmark England and Wales Finland France Germany Italy Netherlands New Zealand Norway Portugal Spain Sweden Switzerland USA
	9 lags	Belgium Denmark England and Wales Finland France Germany Italy New Zealand Portugal Spain USA	Netherlands Norway Sweden Switzerland	Belgium Denmark England and Wales New Zealand Sweden Switzerland	Finland France Germany Italy Netherlands Norway Portugal Spain USA	Belgium Denmark England and Wales Finland France Germany Italy Netherlands New Zealand Norway Portugal Spain Sweden Switzerland USA
	10 lags	Belgium Denmark England and Wales Germany Netherlands New Zealand Norway Portugal Spain Switzerland USA	Finland France Italy Sweden	Belgium Denmark England and Wales New Zealand Switzerland	Finland France Germany Italy Netherlands Norway Portugal Spain Sweden USA	Belgium Denmark England and Wales Finland France Germany Italy Netherlands New Zealand Norway Portugal Spain Sweden Switzerland USA

[1] Null: no cointegration. Automatic lag length criteria based on AIC with a maximum of 12.

[2] Countries are mentioned in the null hypothesis column if it would be rejected in their case at a 5% level of significance.

children, finding alternatives to the traditional strategy of procreation as the only way of preparing for future adversities.

Table 7. Country panel cointegrating regressions (ΔI_g dependent variable)

		All countries				Countries with 1 cointegration equation			
		FMOLS ¹		DOLS ²		FMOLS		DOLS	
		Constant	Constant and trend	Constant	Constant and trend	Constant	Constant and trend	Constant	Constant and trend
ΔGDP_{pc}		-8.21E-06 ***	-3.74E-06 ***	-5.01E-06 ***	-6.92E-07	-7.49E-06 ***	-3.49E-06 *	-7.04E-06 ***	2.91E-07
		<i>9.73E-07</i>	<i>1.11E-06</i>	<i>6.97E-07</i>	<i>1.08E-06</i>	<i>1.23E-06</i>	<i>1.91E-06</i>	<i>1.28E-06</i>	<i>2.32E-06</i>
$\Delta_{25}q_0$		1.033 ***	0.0793 ***	1.145 ***	0.881 ***	0.09 ***	0.856 **	0.946 ***	0.637 ***
		<i>0.043</i>	<i>0.094</i>	<i>0.032</i>	<i>0.084</i>	<i>0.906</i>	<i>0.124</i>	<i>0.049</i>	<i>0.166</i>
Adjusted R ²		0.88	0.92	0.91	0.93	0.91	0.93	0.92	0.94
Obs.		2267	2267	2248	2246	550	550	546	545
		(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)
Units.		15	15	15	15	4	4	4	4
Period		1856-2008	1856-2008	1856-2008	1856-2008	1871-2008	1871-2008	1871-2008	1871-2008

		Countries with 1 and 2 cointegration equations				Countries with 1, 2 and no cointegration equation			
		FMOLS		DOLS		FMOLS		DOLS	
		Constant	Constant and trend	Constant	Constant and trend	Constant	Constant and trend	Constant	Constant and trend
ΔGDP_{pc}		-7.99E-06 ***	-5.62E-06 ***	-5.57E-06 ***	-1.21E-06	-8.38E-06 ***	-8.05E-06 ***	-5.55E-06 ***	-4.52E-06 **
		<i>1.09E-06</i>	<i>1.65E-06</i>	<i>1.05E-06</i>	<i>1.81E-06</i>	<i>1.28E-06</i>	<i>1.94E-06</i>	<i>1.00E-06</i>	<i>1.52E-06</i>
$\Delta_{25}q_0$		0.985 ***	0.971 ***	1.072 ***	0.973 ***	1.007 ***	1.229 ***	1.11 ***	1.3104 ***
		<i>0.039</i>	<i>0.123</i>	<i>0.044</i>	<i>0.138</i>	<i>0.047</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>0.04</i>	<i>0.119</i>
Adjusted R ²		0.90	0.92	0.92	0.94	0.9	0.92	0.92	0.94
Obs.		893	893	886	886	1081	1081	1074	1072
		(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)	(unbalanced)
Units.		6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7
Period		1860-2008	1860-2008	1860-2008	1860-2008	1854-2008	1854-2008	1854-2008	1854-2008

Significance level: * 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%

Standard error in italics.

[1] Fully-Modified OLS. Lag specification based on AIC information to compute long-run covariance and allowing for heterogeneous first-stage long-run coefficients.

[2] Dynamic OLS. Automatic AIC information to select number of lags and leads.

These results are important for two reasons: on the one hand, they support the trend found in the study for each country, overcoming possible omissions or lack of specification; and on the other hand, we obtain robust general causal results in the long term, controlling for different groups of countries (despite the discrepancies in the results of the cointegration tests, as can be seen from Table 6).

Conclusions

This article analyzes the long-term relationship between mortality and marital fertility, controlling for other potential determinants (GDPpc), in a panel of 15 countries from the early 19th century onwards. Although the positive relationship between mortality and fertility was questioned by the results of research carried out under the auspices of the PEFP, when modern econometric techniques (panel cointegration) are applied they allow us more accurately to assess the changes in demographic phenomena over time. These methods were practically unknown at the time of the PEFP. Brown and Guinnane (2007) were right pointing out that when these statistical methods are used the role of socioeconomic factors in the historical decline of fertility is restored.

The results of the present study using aggregated data on a national scale are fully in line with those of recent projects using micro data from family reconstructions (Van Bavel and Kok, 2010; Reher and Sanz-Gimeno, 2007; Reher and Sandström, 2015; Van Poppel et al., 2012; Reher et al., 2017), and they confirm one of the basic tenets of the classical theory of the demographic transition, which posits that the decline in mortality led to a decrease in fertility.

The results of our study justify the considerable efforts made to gather the information collected in order to obtain as detailed an overview as possible of the demographic transition in these countries. Although some researchers have advised against using aggregated data to analyze reproductive decision (which are individual in nature), the truth is that the results we obtained confirm, to a high degree of statistical significance, the traditional hypothesis concerning the theory of the demographic transition. Despite the doubts voiced by some researchers about the use of aggregated data for analyzing the demographic transition, our study shows that the use of macro data (even on a national level) can be extremely useful for developing our understanding of the historical decline in fertility, when the appropriate time analysis techniques are applied. One task for the future will be to test whether the application of the methodology used here to aggregated data from smaller areas (from provinces, for example) also confirms the relations we have detected in this study of the historical relationship between mortality and fertility.

In other studies similar to our own, mortality and fertility indicators have been used which we consider to be less than appropriate, either because they are affected by the changing population structure (CBR and CDR) or because they may be heavily influenced by the changes in marriage rates (as are all the indicators of total fertility). We made use of more refined indicators of mortality ($_{25}q_0$) and marital fertility (I_g), and found that declining mortality leads to declining marital fertility. These results are the same, irrespective of whether the VEC, DOLS or FMOLS models are used. The conclusions of our research leave little room for doubt that both before and during the transitional period mortality played a fundamental role in conditioning historical marital fertility levels.¹⁴ With these new econometric techniques, we have confirmed the main paradigm of the classic demographic transition theory that was questioned by the PEFP.

¹⁴ This statement does not rule out the possibility that there were also other factors that might have had some bearing on the fall in fertility.

References

- Ángeles, L. (2010). "Demographic transitions: Analyzing the effects of mortality on fertility", *Journal of Population Economics*, 23: 99-120.
- Bakar, N., M. Haseeb and N. Hartani (2014). "The dilemma of female labour force participation (FLFP) and fertility rate in Asian-6 countries: A panel cointegration approach", *Life Science Journal*, 11(8s): 584-590.
- Bengtsson, T. and M. Dribe, (2006). "Deliberate control in a natural fertility population, Southern Sweden: 1766-1864". *Demography*, 43(4): 727-746.
- Brown, J. C. and T. W. Guinnane (2007). "Regions and time in the European fertility transition: problems in the Princeton Project's statistical methodology", *Economic History Review*, 60(3): 574-595.
- Burch, T. K. and K. M. Ashok (1986). "A Note on the components of Coale's I_g and other indirectly standardized indices", *Canadian Studies in Population*, 13(2): 151-166.
- Caldwell, J. C., P. F. McDonald, and L. T. Ruzicka, (1982). "Nuptiality and fertility in Australia, 1921-1976", In Ruzicka, L. T. (Ed.), *Nuptiality and Fertility: Proceedings of a seminar held in Bruges (Belgium), 8-11 January 1979*, pp. 211-241. Liège: Ordina Editions.
- Cleland, J. (2001). "The Effects of Improved Survival on Fertility: A Reassessment", *Population and Development Review*, 27: 60-92 (Supplement: Global Fertility Transition)
- Coale, A. and S. Watkins (ed.) (1986). *The decline of fertility in Europe*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Coale, A. J. (1986). "The decline of fertility in Europe since the eighteenth century as a chapter in demographic history", in Coale, A. and S. Watkins (Eds.), *The decline of fertility in Europe*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 1-30.
- Davis, K. (1945). "The world demographic transition", *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 237: 1-11.
- Dickey, D. A. and W. A. Fuller (1979). "Distribution of the Estimators for Autoregressive Time Series with a Unit Root," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74: 427-431.
- Engelhardt, H.; T. Kögel, and A. Prskawetz (2001). "Fertility and female employment reconsidered: A macro-level time series analysis", MPIDR Working Paper WP 2001-021.
- Engle, R. and C. Granger (1987). "Co-Integration and Error Correction: Representation, Estimation, and Testing", *Econometrica*, 55(2): 251-276.

- Fernihough, A. and M. McGovern (2014). "Do fertility transitions influence infant mortality declines? Evidence from early modern Germany", *Journal of Population Economics*, 27:1145-1163.
- Fisher, R. A. (1932). *Statistical Methods for Research Workers*, 4th Edition, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.
- Frini, O. and Ch. Muller, (2012). "Demographic transition, education and economic growth in Tunisia", *Economic Systems*, 36: 351-371.
- Galloway, P.; R. Lee, and E. Hammel (1998). "Infant mortality and the fertility transition: macro evidence from Europe and new findings from Prussia", in Montgomery, M. and B. Cohen (eds.), *From death to birth. Mortality decline and reproductive change*, Washington, D.C.: National Academic Press, pp. 182-225.
- Galor, O. (2012). "The demographic transition: causes and consequences", *Cliometrica*, 6: 1-28.
- Guinnane, T. and J. Brown (2002). "Fertility transition in a rural Catholic population: Bavaria 1880-1910", *Population Studies* 56(1): 35-49.
- Hafner, K. and D. Mayer-Foulkes (2013). "Fertility, economic growth, and human development causal determinants of the developed lifestyle", *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 38: 107-120.
- Haines, M. (1998), "The relationship between infant and child mortality and fertility: some historical and contemporary evidence from the United States", in Montgomery, M. and B. Cohen (ed.), *From death to birth: mortality decline and reproductive change*, Washington, DC: National Academy Press, pp. 227-53.
- Hartani, N.; N. Bakar, and M. Haseeb (2015), "The nexus between female labor force participation and female total fertility rate in selected ASEAN countries: panel cointegration approach", *Modern Applied Science*, 9(8): 29-39.
- Herzer, D., H. Strulik, and S. Vollmer (2012). "The long-run determinants of fertility: one century of demographic change 1900-1999", *Journal of Economic Growth*, 17: 357-385.
- Hondroyannis, G. (2010). "Fertility determinants and economic uncertainty: An assessment using European panel data", *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 31(1): 33-50.
- Hondroyannis, G. and E. Papapetrou (2002). "Demographic transition in Europe", *Economic Bulletin*, 10(3): 1-8.
- Hondroyannis, G. and E. Papapetrou (2005). "Fertility and output in Europe: new evidence from panel cointegration analysis", *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 27: 143-156.
- Im, K. S., M. H. Pesaran, and Y. Shin (2003). "Testing for Unit Roots in Heterogeneous Panels," *Journal of Econometrics*, 115: 53-74.

Johansen, S. (1991). "Estimation and Hypothesis Testing of Cointegration Vectors in Gaussian Vector Autoregressive Models," *Econometrica*, 59: 1551–1580.

Johansen, S. (1995). *Likelihood-based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Johansen, S. and K. Juselius (1990). "Maximum Likelihood Estimation and Inferences on Cointegration—with applications to the demand for money," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 52: 169–210.

Kao, Ch. (1999). "Spurious Regression and Residual-Based Tests for Cointegration in Panel Data", *Journal of Econometrics*, 90: 1–44.

Kirk, D. (1996). "Demographic transition theory", *Population Studies*, 50(3): 361-87.

Knodel, J. (1988). *Demographic behavior in the past: A study of fourteen German village populations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knodel, J. and E. Van de Walle (1967). "Breast feeding, fertility and infant mortality: An analysis of some early German data". *Population Studies*, 21(2). 109-131.

Kwiatkowski, D.; P. Phillips; P. Schmidt, and Y. Shin (1992). "Testing the Null Hypothesis of Stationary against the Alternative of a Unit Root," *Journal of Econometrics*, 54: 159-178.

Lesthaeghe, R. (1977). *The decline of Belgian fertility, 1800-1970*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Maddison, A. (2009). *Historical Statistics of the World Economy: 1-2008 AD* (available at: www.ggdc.net/maddison/Historical_Statistics/horizontal-file_02-2010.xls, accessed May, 2015).

Mason, K. O. (1997). "Explaining fertility transitions", *Demography*, 34: 443-454.

Matthiessen, P. and J. McCann (1978). "The role of mortality in the European Fertility transition: aggregate-level relations", in Preston, S. (ed.). *The effects of infant and child mortality on fertility*, New York, pp. 47-68.

Murtin, F. (2013). "The long-term determinants of the demographic transition, 1870-2000", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(2): 617-631.

Narayan, P. and X. Peng (2006). "An econometric analysis of the determinants of fertility for China, 1952-2000", *Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies*, 4(2): 165-183.

Nicolini, E. (2007). "Was Malthus right? A VAR analysis of economic and demographic interactions in pre-industrial England", *European Review of Economic History*, 11(1). 99-121.

- Notestein, F. (1945). "Population: the long view", in Schultz, T. (ed.). *Food for the world*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Oris, M., R. Renzo and M. Breschi (2004). "Infant and child mortality", in Bengtsson, T.; C. Campbell, J. Lee et al. (Eds.). *Life under pressure: Mortality and living standards in Europe and Asia, 1700–1900*. Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 359-398.
- Phillips, P. and B. Hansen (1990). "Statistical Inference in Instrumental Variables Regression with I(1) Processes," *Review of Economics Studies*, 57: 99-125.
- Phillips, P. and P. Perron (1988). "Testing for a Unit Root in Time Series Regression," *Biometrika*, 75: 335–346.
- Reher, D. (1999). "Back to the basics: mortality and fertility interactions during the demographic transition", *Continuity and Change*, 14(1): 9-31.
- Reher, D. (2011). "Economic and social implications of the demographic transition", *Population and Development Review*, 39(Suppl.): 11-33.
- Reher, D. and G. Sandström (2015). "Dimensions of rational decision-making during the demographic transition; Aranjuez (Spain) revisited", *Historical Life Course Studies*, 2: 20-36.
- Reher, D. and A. Sanz-Gimeno (2007). "Rethinking historical reproductive change: insights from longitudinal data for a Spanish town", *Population and Development Review* 33(4): 703-727.
- Reher, D.; G. Sandström; A. Sanz-Gimeno, and F. van Poppel (2017). "Agency in Fertility Decisions in Western Europe During the Demographic Transition: A Comparative Perspective", *Demography*: 54: 3-22.
- Saikkonen, P. (1992). "Estimation and Testing of Cointegrated Systems by an Autoregressive Approximation," *Econometric Theory*, 8: 1-27.
- Schellekens, J. and F. van Poppel (2012). "Marital fertility decline in the Netherlands: Child mortality, real wages, and unemployment, 1860-1939", *Demography*, 49: 965-88.
- Teitelbaum, M. (1984). *The British fertility decline: demographic transition in the crucible of the Industrial Revolution*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Van Bavel, J. (2003). "Birth spacing as a family strategy: evidence from 19th century Leuven, Belgium". *The History of the Family*, 8: 585-604.
- Van Bavel, J. (2004). Deliberate birth spacing before the fertility transition in Europe: Evidence from nineteenth-century Belgium. *Population Studies*, 58(1): 95-107.

Van Bavel, J. and J. Kok (2010). “A Mixed effects model of birth spacing for pre-transition populations. Evidence of deliberate fertility control from nineteenth century Netherlands”. *The History of the Family*, 15(2): 125-138.

Van de Kaa, D. (1996). “Anchored narratives: the story and findings of the half a century of research into the determinants of fertility”, *Population Studies*, 50(3): 389-432.

Van de Walle, F. (1986). “Infant mortality and the European demographic transition”, in Coale, A. and S. Watkins (ed.). *The decline of fertility in Europe*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 201-33.

Van Poppel, F.; D. Reher; A. Sanz-Gimeno; M. Sánchez-Domínguez, and E. Beekink (2012). “Mortality decline and reproductive change during the Dutch demographic transition: Revisiting a traditional debate with new data”, *Demographic Research*, 27: 299-338.

Watkins, S. (1986). “Conclusions”, in Coale, A. and S. Watkins (ed.). *The decline of fertility in Europe*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 420-49.

Wrigley, E. (1969). *Population and history*, New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Wrigley, E.; R. Davies; J. Oeppen, and R. Schofield (1997). *English population history from family reconstitution, 1580–1837*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Annex

This Annex includes a detailed list of sources that were consulted during our research. It covers a vast amount of information from 15 countries over an extremely long period of time.

A. Princeton marital index (I_g)

The provincial and national values for the Princeton marital index I_g were obtained from Coale and Watkins (1986). Data available from the following University of Princeton website: <http://opr.princeton.edu/archive/pefp/>. The authors of the present paper calculated the indices for Table A1.

Table A1. Years for which the present author calculated the Princeton marital fertility index

Belgium	Calculated by the present author: 1992, 1996, 2000, 2005, 2010
Denmark	1840 and 1847, Matthiessen (1985); Calculated by the present author: 1950, 1981, 1940, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010
England and Wales	From 1543 to 1850 using inverse projection techniques, Anderson et al. (2001); Calculated by the present author: 1939, 1951, 1991, 1995, 2001, 2010
Finland	Calculated by the present author: 1991, 2001, 2011
France	From 1740 to 1911, Weir (1994); Calculated by the present author: 1946, 1954, 1975, 1990, 1999, 2004, 2008
Germany	Calculated by the present author: 1946, 1950, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006, 2010
Italy	Calculated by the present author: 1981, 1991, 2001, 2006, 2010
Netherlands	Calculated by the present author: 1947, 1955, 1965, 1975, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010
New Zealand	Calculated by the present author: 1891, 1911, 1921, 1936, 1945, 1951, 1956, 1961, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981, 1986, 1991, 1996, 2001, 2006
Norway	Calculated by the present author: 1801, 1866, 1911, 1946, 1950, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2011
Portugal	Calculated by the present author: 1991, 2001, 2011
Spain	Calculated by the present author: 1860, 1877, 1950, 1991, 2001, 2006, 2011
Sweden	Calculated by the present author: 1750, 1800, 1850, 1870, 1890, 1910, 1920, 1940, 1945, 1965, 1970, 1975, 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010
Switzerland	Calculated by the present author: 1980, 1985, 1990, 1995, 2000, 2005, 2010
United States	The I_g values for the years 1848, 1858, 1868 and 1878 from Hacker (2003); Calculated by the present author: 1880, 1890, 1900, 1910, 1920, 1930, 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000, 2006, 2010

Note: The authors calculated the Princeton indexes for all the years in this table, except those where another author is given.

Table A2. Sources of information from which we obtained the probability of death in the first 25 years of life (${}_{25}q_0$)

Belgium	From 1827 to 1832, estimated from the e_0 provided by Quetelet (1851) taking into account the Regional Model Life Tables “West” by Coale and Demeny (1983); from 1841 to 2007, HMD.
Denmark	From 1665 to 1835 using inverse projection techniques, estimated from the values for e_0 provided by Johansen (2002) and Johansen and Oeppen (2001) taking into account the Regional Model Life Tables “West” by Coale and Demeny (1983); from 1782 to 1832, estimated using e_0 provided by Andersen (1979) taking into account the Regional Model Life Tables “West” by Coale and Demeny (1983); from 1835 to 2008, HMD
England and Wales	From 1541 to 1870 using inverse projection techniques, estimated from the e_0 values provided by Wrigley, Oeppen, and Schofield (1997) and taking into account the third English life table by Wrigley and Schofield (1981: 714); from 1841 to 2006 (England and Wales), HMD.
Finland	From 1751 to 1875, Turpeinen and Kannisto (1997); from 1878 to 2008, HMD
France	1745, Vallin (1991); from 1752 to 1802, Blayo (1975); from 1806 to 1901, Bonneuil (1997); from 1902 to 2007, HMD
Germany	From 1810 to 1850, Imhof (1990); from 1871 to 1933, HLTD; 1950 (only West Germany), HLTD; from 1956 to 2008, HMD.
Italy	From 1650 to 1881 (only North Italy) using inverse projection techniques, estimated from e_0 obtained in the annual inverse projection carried out by Galloway (1994) taking into account the Regional Model Life Tables “West” by Coale and Demeny (1983); from 1872 to 2006, HMD.
Netherlands	From 1820 to 1846, estimated from e_0 provided by Rothenbacher (2002) taking into account the Regional Model Life Tables “West” by Coale and Demeny (1983); from 1850 to 2008, HMD.
New Zealand	From 1876 to 1941 (only the non-Maori population), estimated from e_0 provided by Pool (1982, 1985 and 1993) and Pool and Cheung (2003 and 2005) taking into account the Regional Model Life Tables “West” by Coale and Demeny (1983); 1936, Statistics New Zealand (http://www.stats.govt.nz/); from 1948 to 2008, HMD
Norway	From 1738 to 1843, estimated using the Regional Model Life Tables “North” by Coale and Demeny (1983) from e_0 calculated by Brunborg (1976); from 1846 to 2008, HMD
Portugal	From 1890 to 1920, Rodrigues Veiga, Guardado Moreira and Fernandes (2004); 1930, Nazareth (1977); from 1940 to 2009, HMD
Spain	From 1860 to 1890, estimated using the Regional Model Life Tables “South” by Coale and Demeny (1983) from e_0 calculated by Dopico (1987) and Livi-Bacci (1968); 1900, Dopico and Reher (1998); from 1908 to 2006, HMD.
Sweden	From 1751 to 2007, HMD
Switzerland	From 1876 to 2008, HMD
United States	From 1795 to 1895 (only Caucasian population), Hacker (2010); from 1906 to 1930, HLTD; from 1933 to 2007, HMD

B. Sources of information for the variables used in Tables 1 to 7 and Graph A3.

GDPpc: Gross domestic product per capita (data for each country expressed in 1990 International Geary-Khamis dollars) (GDPpc): Maddison (2009)

Table A3. Fit statistics of the models by country


	Sum sq. resids	S.E. equation	F-statistic	Log likelihood	Akaike AIC	Schwarz SC	Mean dependent	S.D. dependent
Belgium	1.09E-05	3.26E-04	984.7	874.9	-13.03	-12.41	-4.13E-03	4.69E-03
Denmark	2.30E-05	3.86E-04	925.6	1173325.0	-12.75	-12.29	-2.41E-03	4.41E-03
England	1.56E-05	3.67E-04	769.7	964.4	-12.80	-12.19	-2.82E-03	4.57E-03
Finland	1.78E-05	4.47E-04	485.7	759.3	-12.38	-11.70	-3.66E-03	4.84E-03
France	1.22E-04	1.14E-03	47.0	675.7	-10.52	-9.85	-1.90E-03	3.87E-03
Germany	2.01E-05	4.49E-04	646.4	834.8	-12.38	-11.72	-4.30E-03	5.42E-03
Italy	8.24E-06	2.99E-04	608.9	863.4	-13.17	-12.40	-3.55E-03	3.80E-03
Netherlands	6.56E-05	7.76E-04	328.1	808.8	-11.30	-10.69	-4.41E-03	6.39E-03
New Zealand	5.41E-05	8.92E-04	148.7	585.9	-10.95	-10.09	-3.19E-03	6.19E-03
Norway	6.52E-05	6.59E-04	363.5	1072929.0	-11.66	-11.15	-2.62E-03	5.02E-03
Portugal	1.01E-05	3.83E-04	288.9	649.2	-12.66	-11.89	-5.09E-03	3.51E-03
Spain	1.46E-05	3.61E-04	607.9	912.4	-12.85	-12.29	-3.34E-03	3.82E-03
Sweden	1.04E-04	8.59E-04	248.1	1018490.0	-11.10	-10.46	-2.32E-03	6.08E-03
Switzerland	1.27E-05	3.67E-04	479.6	814.8	-12.78	-12.11	-3.72E-03	3.87E-03
USA	9.30E-05	8.96E-04	139.2	846.7	-11.01	-10.36	-3.43E-03	4.92E-03

Table A4. ECM Serial correlation LM test (null hypothesis: no serial correlation)

Country	Lags	LM stats	Prob	
Finland	1	2.884	0.96	
	2	5.047	0.83	
	3	4.360	0.88	
	4	6.807	0.65	
	5	14.476	0.10	
	6	7.612	0.57	
	7	7.891	0.54	
	8	5.857	0.75	
	9	26.032	0.00	
France	2	10.933	0.28	
	3	13.796	0.12	
	4	20.121	0.01	
	5	16.183	0.06	
	6	2.566	0.97	
	7	13.502	0.14	
	8	11.485	0.24	
	9	15.814	0.07	
	1	9.393	0.40	
England & Wales	2	13.492	0.14	
	3	14.040	0.12	
	4	11.415	0.24	
	5	36.639	0.00	
	6	5.283	0.80	
	7	11.410	0.24	
	8	14.487	0.10	
	9	4.167	0.90	
	1	24.165	0.00	
Germany	2	11.266	0.25	
	3	18.369	0.03	
	4	9.442	0.39	
	5	11.869	0.22	
	6	8.021	0.53	
	7	6.552	0.68	
	8	11.167	0.26	
	9	1.484	0.99	
	Italy	1	29.328	0.00
2		18.642	0.02	
3		8.345	0.49	
4		4.538	0.87	
5		22.944	0.00	
6		15.246	0.08	
7		10.347	0.32	
8		14.202	0.11	
9		6.460	0.69	
Spain	10	31.899	0.00	
	1	7.757	0.55	
	2	14.974	0.09	
	3	16.225	0.06	
	4	9.229	0.41	
	5	13.023	0.16	
	6	7.620	0.57	
	7	7.802	0.55	
	8	9.879	0.36	
USA	1	8.676	0.46	
	2	8.965	0.44	
	3	24.871	0.00	
	4	21.054	0.01	
	5	14.823	0.09	
	6	6.640	0.67	
	7	9.949	0.35	
	8	6.946	0.64	
	9	8.400	0.49	
Denmark	10	18.715	0.02	
	1	7.491	0.58	
	2	9.946	0.35	
	3	9.489	0.39	
	4	12.323	0.19	
	5	31.688	0.00	
	6	19.608	0.02	
	7	7.186	0.61	
	8	6.042	0.73	
Netherlands	1	23.858	0.00	
	2	12.716	0.17	
	3	7.241	0.61	
	4	6.207	0.71	
	5	28.486	0.00	
	6	10.085	0.34	
	7	8.981	0.43	
	8	3.497	0.94	
	9	7.764	0.55	
	1	10.434	0.31	
	2	9.350	0.40	
New Zealand	3	12.526	0.18	
	4	7.466	0.58	
	5	18.388	0.03	
	6	5.717	0.76	
	7	11.537	0.24	
	8	3.877	0.91	
	9	7.618	0.57	
	10	11.852	0.22	
	1	9.467	0.39	
	2	14.786	0.09	
	Norway	3	12.873	0.16
4		31.074	0.00	
5		33.782	0.00	
6		15.712	0.07	
7		7.073	0.62	
8		12.759	0.17	
9		6.834	0.65	
1		14.446	0.10	
2		11.942	0.21	
3		7.126	0.62	
Sweden		4	8.590	0.47
	5	15.699	0.07	
	6	13.973	0.12	
	7	9.671	0.37	
	8	3.342	0.94	
	9	6.561	0.68	
	10	39.494	0.00	
	11	15.754	0.07	
	Portugal	1	9.769	0.36
		2	12.968	0.16
		3	18.885	0.02
4		18.202	0.03	
5		19.392	0.02	
6		15.573	0.07	
7		10.977	0.27	
8		6.059	0.73	
Switzerland	9	15.288	0.08	
	1	15.412	0.08	
	2	9.335	0.40	
	3	6.364	0.70	
	4	5.563	0.78	
	5	14.901	0.09	
	6	16.722	0.05	
	7	4.257	0.89	
Belgium	8	6.262	0.71	
	9	6.906	0.64	
	1	12.278	0.19	
	2	11.183	0.26	
	3	16.984	0.05	
	4	10.794	0.29	
	5	36.871	0.00	
	6	1.368	0.99	
7	5.549	0.78		
8	11.632	0.23		


There are only 3 countries that show no autocorrelation in any of the lags: Finland, Spain and Switzerland. Denmark, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway and England show autocorrelation at the 5th lag (and in some others). These results may be due to the fact that we made linear interpolations using the available data (from the censuses, which are usually every 10 years). It then turns Portmanteau test to be potentially weak to shed light on this issue as well as other test (Lütkepohl, 1991). For this reason, it is more reliable to perform test autocorrelation on each lag rather than overall.

Graph A1. Historical development of the values of $_{25}q_0$




Source: See Table A2.

Graph A2. Historical development of the values of I_g




Source: See Table A1.

Graph A3. Historical trends in GDPpc (expressed in 1990 International Geary-Khamis dollars)




Graph A4. Response to Cholesky one S.D. innovations. Response of I_g to ${}_{25}q_0$



Orthogonal IRF should not be interpreted as the causal effect of independent variables on the dependent variables as it happens in standard interpretations of static models. Basically, the impulse response function is showing the behavior of our dependent variable of interest (I_g in this case) across time (the different periods on the x-axis) due to an innovation/impulse from the independent variables (in this case ${}_{25}q_0$). Again, it is worth noting that VECM models are not intended to check causality, but to look for short and long-term relationships between variables. In our case we find a positive relationship between I_g and ${}_{25}q_0$, meaning that when one increases the other one does so too, and when one decreases the other also does so. Usually IRF is performed with Y over X and the other way round. Since we find a positive relation, the response of ${}_{25}q_0$ to I_g will also be increasing and positive (but of course different in magnitude),

so for the sake of simplicity and bearing in mind the purpose of this study, we show in Graph A4 the response of I_g to ${}_{25}q_0$. In these graphs we can see that the trend is almost always positive. However, this is not the case with Sweden, England and the Netherlands. For these countries, the trend is opposite to the positive relationship of the variables. This points to the fact that in these countries the variables may behave slightly differently, as the variables may be impacted by other variables (institutional, individual or economic characteristics). It is also worth noting that these three countries show positive error correction terms, so this abnormality may be affecting the way the IRF behaves. For the other countries, an innovation/shock in ${}_{25}q_0$ in time 0 is translated into an almost exponential increase in I_g up to time 10 (our time unit is years, so the x-axis should be understood as years).

Graph A5. Break-points



Bibliography: Annex

Andersen, O. (1979). "The Development of Danish Mortality 1735-1850", *Scandinavian Population Studies* 5: 9-21.

Anderson, M., C. Ó Gráda, E. A. Wrigley, and R. I. Woods (2001). "Las Islas Británicas", in Bardet, J. P. and J. Dupâquier (Eds.). *Historia de las poblaciones de Europa. II. La revolución demográfica, 1750-1914*, Madrid: Síntesis, pp. 291-308.

Blanes, A. (2007). "La mortalidad en la España del siglo XX. Análisis demográfico y territorial", Ph. D. Thesis, Departamento de Geografía, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.

Blayo, Y. (1975). "La mortalité en France de 1740 à 1829", *Population*, 30(1): 123-142.

Bonneuil, N. (1997). *Transformation of the French demographic landscape 1806 - 1906*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. Data available in the Web: http://table_mortalite_bonneuil.site.ined.fr/en/presentation/

Brunborg, H. (1976). *The Inverse Projection Method Applied To Norway, 1735-1974*, Unpublished typescript.

Carrilho, M. J. (1980). *Tábuas abreviadas de mortalidade, 1941-1975*, Lisbon: Impr. nacional-Casa da moeda.

Centro de Estudos Demográficos (1976). *Tábuas abreviadas de mortalidade distritais e regionais, 1959-1962 e 1969-1972*, Lisbon: Instituto Nacional de Estatística, Portugal.

Coale, A. and P. Demeny (1983). *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations*, New York: Academic Press.

Coale, A. and S. Watkins (eds.) (1986). *The decline of fertility in Europe*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, Data available in the Web: <http://opr.princeton.edu/archive/pefp/>

Cónin, C., A. Marques, and J. Pinto (1988). *Tábuas abreviadas de mortalidade, distritos e regiões autónomas: 1979-1982*, Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Demográficos, Instituto Nacional de Estatística.

Dopico, F. (1987). "Regional mortality tables for Spain in the 1860s", *Historical Methods*, 20(4): 173-179.

Dopico, F. and D. Reher (1998). *El declive de la mortalidad en España, 1860-1930*, Huesca: Asociación de Demografía Histórica, monografía. Data available in the Web: <http://www.geps.es/bases-de-datos/mortalidad/>

- Galloway, P. (1994). "A Reconstruction of the Population of North Italy from 1650 to 1881 using Annual Inverse Projection with Comparison to England, France and Sweden", *European Journal of Population*, 10: 223-74.
- Hacker, D. (2003). "Rethinking the 'early' decline of marital fertility in the United States", *Demography*, 40(4). 605-20.
- Hacker, J. (2010). "Decennial Life Tables for the White Population of the United States, 1790-1900", *Historical Methods*, 43(2). 45-79.
- Hofsten, E. and H. Lundström (1976). *Swedish population history: Main trends from 1750 to 1970*, Stockholm: LiberFörlag
- Imhof, A. (1990). *Lebenserwartungen in Deutschland vom 17. bis 19. Jahrhundert = Life expectancies in Germany from the 17th to the 19th Century*, Weinheim: VCH, Acta Humaniora.
- Imhof, A. (1994). *Lebenserwartungen in Deutschland, Norwegen und Schweden im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin.
- Johansen, H. (2002). *Danish Population History 1600-1939*, Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Johansen, H. and J. Oeppen (2001). *Danish Population Estimates, 1665-1840*, Research Report, 21, Danish Center for Demographic Research.
- Livi-Bacci, M. (1968). "Fertility and nuptiality changes in Spain from the late 18th to the early 20th Century", *Population Studies*, 22: 83-102 y 211-234.
- Lütkepohl, H. (1991). *Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis*, New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Maddison, A. (2009). *Historical Statistics of the World Economy: 1-2008 AD* (available at: www.ggdc.net/maddison/Historical_Statistics/horizontal-file_02-2010.xls, accessed May, 2015).
- Matthiessen, P. (1985). *The limitation of family size in Denmark I-II*, Kobenhavn: Kgl. Danske videnskabernes selskab.
- Nazareth, M. (1977). *Tábuas abreviadas de mortalidade globais e regionais: 1929-1932, 1939-1942 e 1949-1952*, Centro de Estudos Demográficos, Instituto Nacional de Estatística.
- Pool, I. (1982). "Is New Zealand a Healthy Country?: The Centenary of Dr. Alfred Newman's Affirmation 'that it is yet the healthiest on the face of the globe'," *New Zealand Population Review* 8: 2-27.
- Pool, I. (1985). "Mortality Trends and Differentials", in *Population of New Zealand*. 2 vols. New York, I, 209-42.

- Pool, I. (1993). "New Zealand's Two Health Transitions: A Comparative Analysis", in International Population Conference Montreal 1993. 4 vols. Liège, I, 419-27.
- Pool, I. and J. Cheung (2003). "A Cohort History of Mortality in New Zealand", *New Zealand Population Review* 29: 107-38.
- Pool, I. and J. Cheung (2005). "Why were New Zealand Levels of Life Expectancy So High at the Dawn of the Twentieth Century?", *Genus* 61: 9-33.
- Quetelet, A. (1851). "Nouvelles tables de mortalité pour la Belgique", *Bulletin de la Commission Centrale de Statistique*, 4: 1-22
- Rodrigues Veiga, T., M. Guardado Moreira, and A. Fernandes (2004). "Social Changes and Better Health Conditions of the Portuguese Population 1974–2000", *Hygiea Internationalis* 4:1, 255–276.
- Rothenbacher, F. (2002). *The European Population, 1850-1945*, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Turpeinen, O. and V. Kannisto (1997). *Abridged Life Tables for Finland 1751-1880*, Statistics Finland, Population 1997: 5. Helsinki.
- Vallin, J. (1991). "Mortality in Europe from 1720 to 1914. Long-term trends and changes in patterns by age and sex", in Schofield, R. *et al* (Ed.). *The decline of mortality in Europe*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 38-67.
- Van Poppel F. and E. Beekink (2003). "De 'gezondheid' van Nederland. Sterftetrends en sterfteverschillen in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw", in Erik Beekink, O., Th. Boonstra, and H. Knippenberg (Ed.). *Nederland in verandering. Maatschappelijke ontwikkelingen in kaart gebracht 1800-2000*, Amsterdam: Aksant, pp. 71-94
- Weir, D. (1994). "New estimates of nuptiality and marital fertility in France, 1740-1911", *Population Studies*, 48: 307-331.
- Woods, R. (1997). *Causes of Death in England and Wales, 1851-60 to 1891-1900: The Decennial Supplements* [computer file]. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor]. SN: 3552.
- Wrigley, E. and R. Schofield (1981). *The population history of England, 1541-1871. A reconstruction*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wrigley, E.; R. Davies, J. Oeppen, y R. Schofield (1997). *English population history from family reconstitution, 1580-1837*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.