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Abstract. The presented discussion of some demographic processes is the first step in a more broad overview of the development and differentials between subpopulations originating from different sides of the Hajnal line, but co-residing in one country. If to take into account that the immigrant population is comparable in size with the native-born population, the study of the differentials between these populations becomes especially important from the viewpoint of elaborating adequate social and population-related policy. The already outlined trends in family formation and abortive behaviour indicate a need to take into account the advanced processes in the spread of the new family forms and relevant type of living among the Estonian population, while the spread of new family forms, usage of contraceptive methods and the attitude towards abortion demand completely different methods concerning the immigrant population. The article relies on the event history data collected in the Estonian Family and Fertility Survey (1994) and the National Minority Survey (1997), covering female birth cohorts 1924–1973.

The demographic, social and economic development of European nations since WW II has been increasingly shaped by the growing volumes of international migration. As a cumulative effect of the past flows, migration processes have left the countries with bigger and more diverse immigrant or foreign-origin populations than ever (for recent overviews, see (Salt 1996; Coleman 1999)). As the expectations of a large-scale repatriation and return on the part of immigrants have faded, the questions of future development of these new populations have arisen. What to do with these populations, who often have different needs, behaviours, capacities and values from the host population? These issues have become the focus of the governments on all-European scale (UN 1994; UN 1998).

The challenges faced by the host societies have provided a significant impetus for the advancement of research into the conditions and characteristics of
immigrant populations. Apart from numerous national studies, in 1988 the Committee for International Cooperation in National Research in Demography (CICRED) and the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) launched a comparative research project on the impact of international migration on receiving countries. The project addressed the demographic, socio-economic and cultural dimensions of immigrant populations and covered twelve countries (Kosinski 1989). Regarding the 1990s, relevant activities under the coordination of UN ECE and OECD should be mentioned (Freijka 1996; OECD 1998). Most recently, the Population Committee of the Council of Europe has commissioned a comparative study on the situation of immigrant populations in member states (PO-S-MIG). In the framework of that project, case studies for ten countries are to be prepared in 1999–2001. Together with the development of studies on immigrant population, attention has also been drawn to the long-established national minorities residing in host countries, whose demographic trends over the last century have been addressed in the framework of the study of Population Committee of the Council of Europe (PO-S-MIN) (Haug, Courbage, Compton 1998). Understanding of the behaviour patterns of established national minorities is a way to work out substantive integration policies for immigrant populations.

In Estonia, demographic research on the population of foreign origin dates largely back to the early 1990s. In earlier decades, even the absolute volume of migration flows were closed for publication, and additionally, the immediate postwar years of particularly large organised migration, suffered from substantial incompleteness of statistics. Taking advantage of the cessation of restrictions on data availability and publication, the postwar trends of international migration, and respectively, the formation of population of foreign origin were summarised for Estonia (Sakkeus 1991) and Baltic countries (Sakkeus 1994). The basic demographic characteristics of the foreign-born population have been outlined relying on the 1989 census which for the first time since WW II collected information on the birthplace of population (Katus, Sakkeus 1993). Adding a new source of information, the population of foreign origin has been systematically covered by a series of national surveys, launched during the 1990s (EKDK 1995a; 1995b; 1999; Noorkõiv and Puur 1996; Leinsalu et al 1998). Over a range of demographic and social processes, the patterns of native and foreign-origin population of Estonia have been distinguished in national projects of the European Family and Fertility Survey and Dynamics of Population Ageing in the ECE region (UN 2000a; UN 2000b). Additionally, to reconstruct the data on main demographic processes of national minorities in Estonia, a special survey based on event history methodology was launched in 1997 (EKDK 20009).

The aim of the paper is to highlight the behaviour patterns of different demographic processes (family formation and different types of partnerships, fertility and fertility regulation) of two population subgroups in Estonia: Russian historical national minority and Russian immigrants after WW II. The paper is based on the event history data collected in the Estonian Family and Fertility

1. Background

The results presented in the article are derived from the study carried out in the framework of the recent project of the Council of Europe on national minorities. The latter was built around the application of a consistent set of five population characteristics: country of origin/place of birth, individual self-identification, usual language, religious affiliation and citizenship (Haug, Courbage, Compton 1998). This framework proved particularly appropriate in the case of Estonia as a means of identifying the national minorities and distinguishing them from the majority population as well as from the immigrant community. The discontinuity of societal development in the country was accompanied by the breakdown of the national statistical system, which, in turn, has created specific difficulties in following the development of national minorities. For the last fifty years there have been no consistent data about the national minorities available, and in addition to the regular analysis of existing sources, a special effort was therefore required to bridge the information gap. It was for this purpose that the National Minority Survey was launched and in the framework of the mentioned project the main trends of national minorities were established. Among others the population size was reconstructed, based on event history data collected through the survey. Additionally, figures on the precise size of the older minority cohorts and younger cohorts of all non-Estonians are available from census information and were used to control the reconstruction from both ends. Applying this methodology to the Russian national minority suggests that it amounted to some 37,500 persons at the time of the last census (Katus, Puur, Sakkeus 2000). Since the corresponding figure in 1945 was 23,000, it would appear that the number of Russians has undergone substantial increase during the postwar period. The postwar fertility levels among Russians, discussed elsewhere, only partly explain the increase. Evidently, the increase in the population number stems mainly from the postwar repatriation of Russians to Estonia from Petserimaa and Trans-Narva. In addition, the population momentum derived from the comparatively young age structure of the Russians has also favoured growth. Taking into account these factors, the increase of the Russians has been the highest in the immediate postwar decade. In summary, in the period up to 1989 as a whole, the Russian minority grew by 63.1 per cent and exceeded the 15.9 per cent growth in the number of ethnic Estonians by a factor of four. Nonetheless, despite these trends the Russian national minority is still less than half its prewar size.

In the postwar period, Estonia, like other European countries at the same stage of demographic development, turned from an emigration to an immigration country. However, because of the principal geopolitical change related to the
incorporation of Estonia into the Soviet Union, immigration processes to Estonia started a decade earlier. Immigration originated from the European part of Russia which at the time had entered the stage of mobility transition and featured high migration potential.

Regarding postwar Estonia, the international migration comprised overwhelmingly the migration exchange between Estonia and the Soviet Union, although it was regarded as an internal migration at that time. The trend of Estonia's external migration includes two major migration waves. The first of them covers the immediate postwar decade and the volume of migration flows proved to be the highest ever recorded (Sakkeus 1991). By the mid-1950s the migration exchange between Estonia and the Soviet Union had somewhat decreased. The intensity of migration, however, remained rather high. The new increase of immigration was introduced in the late 1960s, the volume of migration flows accounted for about 80 per cent compared to the immediate postwar decade. Throughout the first half of the 1970s, measured by gross migration rate, the intensity of migration remained at the level of 1.6–1.7 moves. In the middle of the 1970s there was a decrease by more than one fifth, after which the gross migration rate stabilised around 1.2–1.3 moves until the very last years of 1980s. Apart from migration flows, special attention should be paid to the extent of turnover. Upon the available data only approximately one out of five immigrants have remained in Estonia, the other four have left at one time or another. For instance, over the period of 1946–1991, the turnover comprised 2,900 thousand persons whereas the number of net migrants was only 337 thousand (Sakkeus 1999). Such a high turnover of migration is related to an extensive military component as well as to a small family component of migration and great unadaptiveness of migrants.

Extensive flows of international migration have resulted in the formation of foreign-born population in Estonia. In the total population of Estonia, the proportion of population with immigrant origin accounts for more than one third, comprising of foreign-borns and their second generation. The data reveal that the second generation has followed their parental behaviour patterns, having had their first socialisation in an environment supported by high migration influx, divergent regional origin and distinct spatial distribution all supporting the integration into another environment than the local one. Thus, the 30 per cent of the second generation has in general had a very low adaptivity and belongs by their behavioural patterns among the foreign-born population of Estonia. Altogether this subpopulation forms one of the highest proportions of foreign-born populations in Europe. Due to this remarkable share, but even more importantly because of the divergent timing of demographic transition, foreign-borns require particular attention whatever demographic or social process in Estonia is concerned. Among the immigrant population in Estonia one could find more than 120 ethnicities, of whom 80 per cent are of Slavic origin (Sakkeus 1994). In the current paper the immigrant population of Russian ethnic background has been addressed.
In any discussion of demographic development of the Estonian population, its native-born population, including national minorities, and immigrant population, the timing of demographic transition and the spread of European marriage pattern are key factors when it comes to understanding the trends that emerged during the first half of the 20th century. Compared with the European average, timing aspects acquired a greater significance in Estonia because of its location in an area where the demographic contrasts between neighbouring nations were particularly marked. The Estonians themselves belonged to the pioneering countries of demographic transition (see Katus 1990). Some minorities in Estonia, however, seemed to follow other patterns, in line with developments in their titular countries. The timing difference has been reflected in the course of demographic processes and, in turn, has been expressed in the age structure variability of the populations under discussion.

Estonia formed an eastern boundary for the European marriage pattern, which had been established by the 18th century (Palli 1988; 1996). The onset of demographic transition in the country, which involved the almost simultaneous decline of fertility and mortality, can be traced back to the middle of the 19th century (Katus 1990). Because of this early transition, life expectancy in Estonia was one of the highest in Eastern Europe and it was close to the levels associated with those countries that were pioneers in the mortality transition (Katus, Puur 1992). The country's fertility transition stands out for an even earlier completion compared to several West European countries, with the birth rate dropping below the replacement level already in the 1920s (Katus 1994). The concomitant changes in age structure began in the 1860s–1870s, and the ageing process was quite advanced by the time of WW II. By comparison, the nations bordering Estonia displayed considerable variability in the timing and patterns of demographic transition. The closest similarity was with Sweden and Northern Latvia (Hofsten, Lundström 1976; Zvidrinsh 1986). Finland, on the other hand, lagged behind Estonia by around 20 years (Strömmer 1969). Russia and Estonia were demonstrating one of the largest, if not the very largest difference in the timing of demographic development among the neighbouring nations in Europe, accounting for almost half a century (Vishnevski, Volkov 1983).

2. Family formation patterns and new family forms

As already mentioned, Estonia belonged historically to the area where the European marriage pattern was prevalent (Hajnal 1965). This pattern of relatively late marriage and a high proportion of population never marrying had become established in Estonia by the 18th century, distinguishing the country from its eastern neighbour (Palli 1997; Vishnevski, Volkov 1983). However, after WW II, the situation changed radically as the European marriage pattern disappeared and the population moved towards earlier family formation and higher marriage rates.
During the 1960s, the total first marriage rate approached a value of 1.0, and exposing sharp juvenation of marriage, even exceeded that level in the second half of the decade. By the 1980s, the rate had more or less stabilised and the decline in the mean age at first marriage came to a halt, bottoming out at around 24–25 years of age for males and at 22–23 years for females (Vikat 1994). The 1990s have witnessed a sharp decline in annually registered marriages. The total first marriage rate, taking into account only legal marriages, had fallen to 0.35 by 1996, when it was among the lowest in Europe alongside Iceland, Latvia, Norway and Sweden (1998). A sharp drop of marriage rate to such low levels has been associated with the postponement of marriage as well as an increase in cohabitation.

3. Timing of first partnership

Against this general background, significant differences in marriage intensity may be observed. The referred project on national minorities aimed to reconstruct the time series for demographic events over the postwar period. According to that it was found that the total first marriage rate has been consistently higher in the Russian minority than in the majority population, stemming from the more traditional matrimonial behaviour of earlier periods. Moreover, the 1990s downturn in marriage rates seems to have been less sharp among the Russian national minority. Since the decline in the first marriage rate has more to do with the postponement of marriage rather than in cohabitation, this suggests that consensual unions are less prevalent in the national minority population. As concerns the period marriage rates of the immigrant population, the same procedure has not been carried out. The postwar population data permits to demonstrate the marriage behaviour of two different subpopulations, natives and immigrants only for the two last census points (1979 and 1989). According to Vikat, the total first marriage rate showed opposite development for the two subpopulations: in the 1980s, TMR for native population showed a slight downward trend, whereas the opposite was observed for foreign-born population. The gap in mean ages between these two subgroups of population formed almost a year (Vikat 1994).

From the cohort perspective, based on the data on comparable female cohorts from the two above-mentioned surveys, the timing of first partnership reveals a much more homogeneous pattern in all the subpopulations under investigation. The separation of the second generation of immigrant population enables to concentrate on the cohorts born between 1949 and 1973. In this cohort range the second generation immigrants display the biggest timing difference accounting for over one year with the lowest mean age at first partnership with 19.8 years. Figure 1 presents the age pattern of the first partnership for all mentioned subpopulations. As concerns the part of population that remains outside the partnership formation, it has undergone a significant reduction in these countries which
were initially characterised by European marriage pattern and is characterised by similar proportion with those nations which lay east to the Hajnal line. In Estonia, almost all subpopulations under consideration are displaying an almost 90 per cent coverage with partnership ties. However, the highest level has been reached by the first generation of immigrant population, followed by Russian national minority, second generation of immigrant population and the lowest coverage with these ties displays the Estonian population.

The development of marriage and family in recent decades has undergone a gradual transformation in these social institutions and the modification of existing forms of families, particularly concerning the first union. The most widespread new type of family is consensual union, but there are also other emerging forms like living apart together and others. Although practised already in earlier decades, there has been a steady rise in the number of consensual unions among Estonians whose marital behaviour has traditionally followed the Baltoscandian pattern. For example, young people now enter consensual unions at a rate comparable with Sweden and Denmark, countries usually considered to be at the forefront of new matrimonial behaviour. Marriage follows later, and is usually related to childbirth. The way how the first partnerships are started is the element of family formation where the difference between native- and foreign-born population is the largest: the native-born population is essentially more prone to start the first partnership as a consensual union which has clearly become the mainstream route to family building. On the other hand, timing aspects between direct marriage and consensual unions also deserve attention.

One would expect consensual unions to start earlier than direct marriages. Still, it is interesting to note that while among Russian immigrant and minority population the difference in mean ages at one or another event are not so important, in the Estonian population the difference in timing accounts for almost a year. The second generation of immigrant population displays an even bigger difference. At the same time, all three subpopulations, except the majority population have quite similar age pattern of the first direct marriage: by age 25, two fifths of the population have been married (Figure 2). Significantly different is the age pattern of Estonian population where the prevalence of direct marriage by the same age remains twice lower. Among the first-mentioned subpopulations,
the first generation immigrants display higher prevalence of direct marriage in the cohorts 1949–1973: almost half of them still marry directly.

The timing pattern of consensual unions is characterised by a quite opposite trend to the above-described one. By age 25 three fifths of the Estonian population have entered into their first consensual union, while among the second generation immigrants and the Russian national minority, around 45 per cent have experienced the first consensual union by that age, thus leaving the first generation immigrants with the lowest prevalence of the new family formation types (Figure 3).

The diversity of family formation patterns is even more clearly exhibited between the subpopulations when analysing the composition of all partnerships by five-year cohorts (Figure 4). It can be measured by two indicators: the proportions of direct marriage and consensual unions (not converted into marriage). The Estonian population is characterised by one-directional development by both these indicators: with every cohort, the proportion of direct marriages falls to almost nil in the youngest cohort, at the same time the proportion of consensual unions gradually increases among all partnerships. While taking together the number of consensual unions and cohabitations later converted into marriages, the prevalence of consensual union in all partnerships has reached already 95 per cent in the youngest cohort. It is also noteworthy that consensual unions already outnumber the converted marriages.

As for the composition of partnerships in the population of Russian ethnic background, the structure of partnerships appears most similar to that of Estonian population among the Russian national minority. It becomes particularly evident, if to measure it by the dynamics of the proportion of consensual unions. However, it has to be borne in mind that while addressing the youngest cohort, high selectivity might be typical of their behaviour of whom more than 40 per cent
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of partnerships</th>
<th>1st generation immigrants</th>
<th>2nd generation immigrants</th>
<th>National minority</th>
<th>Estonians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Direct marriage | Consensual union | Converted marriage |

have not yet entered into their first partnership at all. Among the immigrant population, the dynamics of direct marriage and consensual union by cohorts is not outlined into a very clear trend. Neither the first nor the second generation immigrant population has a clearly increasing trend of consensual unions; also the proportion of direct marriage, which demonstrates lower prevalence in the two youngest cohorts, has not yet formed a visibly decreasing trend.

Thus, the emergence of new family forms might be the most sensitive indicator of the divergent behaviour patterns between these subpopulations, clearly originating from the time-lag in their demographic transitions. The knowledge of this diversity bears significance also from the aspect of development of social policy in Estonia. Until now, the differences among subpopulations have not been acknowledged, neither has the elaborated population-related policy taken into consideration the emerging new family forms, not to mention their prevalence. This is even more important if to consider the policies towards children, as becomes further evident from the discussion of fertility patterns of these subpopulations.

4. Fertility patterns

The early beginning as well as relative regional homogeneity of the fertility transition in Estonia provides the general context where the individual trends for the other subpopulations should be assessed (see Katus 1994). Also, the absence of a postwar baby-boom in Estonia, unusual to pioneering European nations in fertility transition phenomenon, is an additional factor that should be taken into account. For the majority population, period fertility remained below replacement level throughout the forty years period, 1928 to 1968, but the level was never more than 10–15 per cent lower, even during the war and the period of repressions. However, the pattern changed in the late 1960s when Estonian fertility climbed to replacement level where it remained with slight fluctuations until the end of the 1980s.

The fertility transition in the Russian minority lagged behind that of the Estonians, but exposed large timing difference with neighbouring regions of the Russian Federation. Accordingly, the fertility decline in the Russian minority associated with the final stages of transition during the 1940s and 1950s was not
mirrored in the Estonian population who had completed the process earlier. For a short period, the Russian fertility actually dropped below that of the Estonians, but then recovered. Like Estonians, the Russian fertility remained at, or slightly above replacement level for a long period up to the 1990s. It is interesting to note that the fertility of the postwar immigrants of Russian origin experienced a rather different trend: continuously declining and dropping below replacement level in the 1960s (UN 2000b). In this regard, the Russian minority is very clearly characterised by the fertility development closer to the Estonians than the postwar Russian immigrants.

In fact, the fertility transition in the Russian minority was significantly more advanced than in Russia proper (Figure 5). Although their fertility transition was somewhat later than that of the Estonians as mentioned earlier, it was still several decades ahead of the Russian Federation. It is particularly noteworthy, considering that even the bordering oblasts of Pskov and Novgorod exhibited the same fertility trends as for Russia as a whole and lagged behind the Estonians by about half a century (Katus 1997a; Barkalov, Dörbritz, Kirmeyer 1999). These disparities between the trends of the Russian minority compared with those of the Russian Federation (as well as of the immigrant population originating from that country) were still apparent through the 1960s and into the 1980s. During those decades the fertility of the Russian minority was consistently higher. Only the sharp fertility decline of the 1990s has typified all subpopulations under investigation.

Regarding these processes from the cohort perspective, the difference in median age at first birth for women born between 1929 and 1939 of the Russian national minority compared to the majority population was about one year, in the consequent birth cohorts the trend is no longer so clearly reflected. Among the immigrant population the second generation immigrants have maintained younger median age at first birth over all postwar birth cohorts (1949–1973). Among Estonian population the shift towards younger ages evidently took place because of the disappearance of the European marriage pattern, which had been characteristic of them. The immigrant population of the country was rather different in so far as it originated from the eastern side of the Hajnal line, as referred above, and the second generation demonstrates behaviour patterns characteristic of these populations even to a greater extent.
The total cohort fertility rate provides the basis for assessing the perspectives of the development of one or another subpopulation under investigation. The Estonian population, reflecting the distinctions in the fertility development outlined above for this century, displays outstanding stability in the fertility rates over the birth cohorts 1924–1973 (Figure 6). It is also interesting to note that in the presented comparison the cohort fertility rate of the Estonian population is the highest, demonstrating in the cohorts 1949–1954 the replacement level fertility. Quite a similar pattern in cohort fertility is demonstrated by Russian national minority, but it remains constantly lower than that of the majority population by around 5 per cent. As concerns the two youngest cohorts, the drop in fertility rate has not been so sharp for the Russian minority population. From the two above-mentioned subpopulations, quite distinct fertility pattern is displayed by the immigrant population, demonstrating constantly lower fertility rates, in particular among the second-generation immigrants.

The differences between the investigated subpopulations can partly be explained by the differentiation in the parity distribution (Figure 7). While among the Estonian and national minority population parity distribution has shown concentration into the second order of births, the third ones comprising in the first-mentioned subpopulation still form almost one fourth in the cohort range 1949–1973 and the first order births less than one third. Among immigrant population the third order births form barely 8 per cent, although it is known that this parity plays a decisive role in securing the replacement level fertility. The youngest cohorts among immigrant population display a very sharp shift towards first order births, reflecting quite similar trends observed in the population of Russian neighbouring regions (Barkalov, Dörbritz, Kirmeyer 1999).
It has been brought out that the trend towards younger age at first birth is connected with the earlier beginning of sexual life (Katus 1997b). More interesting in the present comparisons is the interval between the first sexual intercourse and first birth. It seems that in connection with the birth outcome of the first pregnancy, the interval has remained practically the same over the cohorts, if to exclude a sharp shift towards earlier beginning in sexual life in the youngest cohort, which can be explained by selectivity (Figure 8). It is interesting to note that although in each subpopulation the interval between the two events has remained approximately the same, the difference between the subpopulations in the length of this interval has also been maintained. Immigrant population is displaying the shortest interval between these two events with the difference being between 1.5–2 years over the cohort range 1949–1973. Russian national minority is presenting the interval from 2 to 2.5 years, while the Estonian population has had the stable interval of 3 years. As it has been pointed out in the youngest cohort, the difference in the timing of these two events has widened which might have more implications on the development of other demographic processes.

5. Induced abortion

The fertility transition in Estonia was accomplished by the use of traditional methods of fertility control. Among the Estonians born during the 1920s, characterised by the below-replacement fertility, the total abortion rate was relatively low, but it increased rapidly with each successive generation and peaked in the birth cohorts of the 1940s and early 1950s when it reached a level of 1.4–1.5 lifetime abortions per woman (Figure 9). The increase in the number of abortions, however, had no effect on the fertility level, which suggests that abortions did not replace live births, but rather reflected limited access to and deteriorating knowledge of contraceptives during the Soviet period (UN 2000b). The shortage of modern contraceptives continued up to the end of the 1980s. Nevertheless, starting with the cohorts born during the 1950s, the total abortion rate has been constantly declining.
A similar trend in the number of abortions can be followed for the Russian national minority, although with somewhat higher levels in earlier birth cohorts with the maximum of 2.1 lifetime abortions per woman in the birth cohort 1949–1953. From that cohort onwards, the total cohort abortion rate demonstrates gradual decrease. It has to be mentioned that the usage of contraceptive methods has been the lowest among this subpopulation. Much higher abortion rates, however, are displayed by their counterparts of foreign origin. For the first generation immigrant population, the trend in the number of abortions can be followed from the 1924 birth cohort, where almost three times higher rate can be found compared to the Estonian population. Even in the youngest cohorts which have showed a considerable decrease in the abortion rate, the difference is maintained almost twofold. It is quite remarkable that the second generation immigrants who are more prone to use contraception display similarly high rates reaching the maximum with 2.4 lifetime abortions as late as in the 1954–1958 birth cohort.

The divergent behaviour pattern between the four subpopulations in connection with abortion becomes even more evident if to compare the cohorts by the proportion of those who have never had abortion (Figure 10). In the birth cohorts of 1920s, the Estonian population and the Russian national minority clearly diverge from immigrant cohorts with the majority of the cohort – two thirds – having not experienced an abortion. However, in the subsequent cohorts the proportion of those without abortions decreases to one third in postwar cohorts. Starting from the birth cohort of 1954, the share of those not having abortions increases quickly and in the youngest cohort three fourths of the cohort have not (yet) had abortion. In Russian national minority in birth cohorts of 1949–1973, more than two fifths have never experienced abortion, in the same birth cohorts of the first
and second generation immigrants the share of those not having had abortions is between 30–37 per cent.

It has been said that abortion was imported into Estonia with the country’s incorporation into the Soviet Union, but the abortion ratio per live births demonstrates that the main contribution to the high abortion rate in Estonia has been made by immigrant cohorts with their totally different behaviour pattern.

Thus, in Estonian population and to a lesser extent in the Russian minority population abortions have never overweighed live births, the opposite is true for all birth cohorts of immigrant population. While the use of traditional methods is quite similar across populations, the largest difference is to be found in the proportion of women who reportedly had never used contraception. The decline in the proportion of non-users has proceeded more slowly in the other three subpopulations and has not dropped to the low levels seen among Estonians (Figure 11).

6. Conclusion

Estonia offers a good site for the comparison of demographic behaviour patterns of immigrant population, distinguishing its second generation, long-established national minority, all originating from the same ethnic background (Russian) and demographically from the east side of the Hajnal line, and that of the native population – Estonians, demographically belonging to the nations of early demographic transition and advanced stage of demographic development. Event history data collected for comparable female birth cohorts enable to outline the relevance of difference in timing of demographic transition to behaviour patterns, reflected in the subpopulations to the present day. On the one hand, the discussed processes of family formation, fertility and abortion indicate that there is a certain impact of belonging to a population originating from the demographically different stage of development. On the other hand, immigrant or native origin bear a greater distinction for demographic processes than ethnic background. In this context, the second generation of immigrant population displays quite divergent behaviour patterns, however, considerably more reflecting those which are characteristic of their parent's country of origin.
In the processes of family formation, the man indicator for carrying patterns of new behaviour has become the type of entry into the first partnership. It has been argued that the first postwar generations were the carriers of patterns of new family behaviour in the West (Kaa, van de 1987). From the presented overview, Estonian population displays behaviour patterns very common to Scandinavian populations with the prevalence of consensual unions having become the mainstream development already since cohorts born in 1939, and sharp decreasing trend of direct marriages, almost non-existent in the youngest cohort born in 1969–1973. In this context all subpopulations of Russian ethnic background do not present a very clear trend, although the national minority population displays a steady increase in the proportion of first partnerships started as consensual unions, while the second generation remains with the highest proportion of those who have started their partnership as direct marriage in the youngest cohort.

The difference between the investigated subpopulations becomes also evident in the number of live-births. Estonian population has had a very stable cohort fertility, reaching in some cohorts the replacement level. No subpopulation of Russian ethnic background, obviously reflecting the post-transitional developments of fertility in Russia proper, has reached replacement level in any cohort. In this context, Russian national minority has had the highest numbers of live-births over the cohorts, whereas the second generation of immigrant population displays the lowest levels of fertility. Another interesting development in the behaviour patterns is observed in the intervals between the first sexual intercourse and first birth. Estonian population, having the youngest median age at the first sexual intercourse, is also characterised by the longest time interval between these two events. The difference between the Estonian population and Russian national minority by this indicator is only half a year, whereas the difference with the first generation of immigrant population is almost one and a half years. With the somewhat earlier entry into the first partnership and first childbearing of the population of Russian ethnic background, this difference in the beginning of sexual life bears one of the significant behaviour distinctions.

However, the biggest difference in the behaviour patterns, studied in the current paper are found in connection with the fertility regulation and abortion as the second most important pregnancy outcome. Behaviour patterns related to abortion clearly divide the population into two parts: native-born (Estonians and Russian national minority) and immigrant population. Throughout the cohort range in the first mentioned two subpopulations, the abortion rates are lower than the fertility rate, while the immigrant population demonstrates opposite behaviour with abortions outnumbering live births and the abortion rate being more than 1.5 times higher than among the Estonian population.

The presented discussion of some demographic processes is the first step in a more broad overview of the development and differentials between subpopulations originating from different sides of Hajnal line, but co-residing in one country. If to take into account that the immigrant population is comparable in
size with the native-born population, the study of the differentials between these populations becomes especially important from the viewpoint of elaborating an adequate social and population-related policy. The described trends in family formation and abortion behaviour indicate a need to take into account the advanced processes in the spread of new family forms and relevant type of co-residence among the Estonian population, while the spreading usage of contraceptive methods and attitude towards abortion demand completely divergent methods concerning the immigrant population.
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