



# PSC Research Reports

Report 12-773

September 2012

Caroline Sten Hartnett

White-Hispanic Differences in  
Meeting Lifetime Fertility Intentions  
in the U.S.

# **White-Hispanic Differences in Meeting Lifetime Fertility Intentions in the U.S.**

Caroline Sten Hartnett

University of Michigan  
426 Thompson Street, Room 2030  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

**Population Studies Center Research Report 12-773**  
**September 2012**

## **ABSTRACT**

Hispanics in the U.S. have higher fertility than Whites but it is not clear why this difference exists nor whether fertility levels reflect the preferences of individuals in these groups. This paper examines the correspondence between fertility intentions and outcomes for Hispanic and White women and men in the U.S. Panel data from the U.S. National Longitudinal Survey of Youth reveals that although Hispanic women and men come closer to achieving early-life parity intentions in the aggregate (Hispanic women fall short by a quarter of a birth, compared to more than two-fifths for Whites), at the individual level, they are not more likely to meet their intentions (34% of Hispanic women achieve their desired parity, compared with 38% of Whites). Hispanics have higher fertility than Whites both because they intend more children and because they are more likely to exceed these intentions.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Differences in fertility rates across ethnic groups in the U.S. are well documented, with Hispanic women bearing more children than non-Hispanic White and Black women, but the reasons for these differences remain unclear (Bean & Tienda 1987; Martin et al. 2009). The country's Hispanic population is growing dramatically and most of this growth currently comes from fertility rather than migration (Pew 2011). Understanding racial-ethnic differences in fertility is important for understanding American fertility more broadly, since race-ethnicity is one of the primary axes along which fertility behaviors vary. It was recently announced that births to non-White women now exceed births to White women for the first time (United States Census Bureau 2012). The presence of higher fertility subgroups – particularly Hispanics – is one reason cited for the fact that the U.S. is able to maintain replacement-level fertility while other developed countries fall short (Kohler et al. 2006; Preston & Hartnett 2010). Here, I focus on Whites and Hispanics specifically and explore whether differences in fertility levels across groups reflect the preferences of individuals in those groups. I also show how ethnic differences in fertility levels can be explained by differences in fertility intentions and the likelihood of meeting those intentions.

Higher fertility among Hispanics could be a reflection of higher fertility intentions. It is commonly assumed that Hispanics have a preference for larger families, and this assumption is frequently applied when socioeconomic factors fail to fully explain ethnic differences in family-related behaviors. While some research shows stronger familistic orientation among Hispanics (Oropesa & Gorman 2000; Trent & South 1992; Sabogal et al. 1987), there is a lack of research examining how fertility preferences correspond with outcomes, for Hispanics compared with other groups. On the other hand, there is reason to believe that higher fertility among Hispanics

is driven by unwanted births rather than wanted ones. Prior research has demonstrated that unintended pregnancy is more common among Hispanic women, compared with Whites, which could be responsible for higher overall fertility. Because of social and economic disadvantages, Hispanics may face more obstacles to achieving their childbearing goals. It is an open question whether ethnic differences in fertility levels are the result of differing preferences or whether some groups are systematically disadvantaged in trying to carry out their childbearing intentions.

The ability to meet intentions is important from a well-being perspective. One component of meeting childbearing intentions – unintended pregnancy – is acknowledged as part of Healthy People 2020 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services 2010). This policy document cites the reduction of unintended pregnancy as a U.S. public health goal, due to the fact that unintended pregnancy is associated with poorer health outcomes for children and health risks for the mother (Sable & Wilkinson 2000; Singh et al. 2003; Barber & East 2011; Baydar et al. 1997a; Baydar et al.; 1997b; Brown and Eisenberg 1995). There has been relatively little research on the prevalence and consequences of the converse situation – unmet desire for children – but infertility has been linked with a variety of negative outcomes, including stress and poorer marital quality (Andrews et al. 1991).

In this paper, I focus on “fertility intentions” (or “intended parity”) expressed in early life (meaning the total number of children that young women and men say they eventually want to have) and the likelihood of ultimately meeting these intentions. Fertility intentions are considered the key determinant of fertility in low fertility settings, where the means of controlling fertility are accessible (Barber 2001; Bongaarts 2001, 1992; Rindfuss, Morgan, and Swicegood 1988; Schoen et al. 1999; Westoff & Ryder 1977; Remez 2000).

## **BACKGROUND**

### **Fertility Intentions**

The centrality of intentions to fertility behavior is found in several theoretical models of fertility decision-making. Prior fertility studies have applied Ajzen and Fishbein's Theory of Planned Behavior which argues that intentions are the main determinant of behavior, along with behavioral control (2005; Fishbein & Ajzen 1975). The economic approach to fertility behavior also assumes that couples weigh the potential costs and benefits of each additional child and act on this calculation (Becker 1991; Becker and Barro 1988). Intentions are also central to the proximate determinants framework for low-fertility settings developed by Bongaarts (2001) and Morgan (2003). This model treats intentions as the main determinant of achieved fertility and identifies several factors that can cause individuals to either exceed intentions or fall short of them, such as unwanted births or the lack of an acceptable partner.

Prior research on meeting fertility intentions finds very different patterns at the individual level compared with the aggregate level. It is common in low fertility populations for women to fall somewhat short of intentions in the aggregate, as Berrington (2004) found in the U.K., but other studies in various countries have found a high level of correspondence between fertility intentions and achieved fertility at the aggregate level, with intended and achieved fertility both hovering around two children (Monnier, 1989; Van de Giessen, 1992, Quesnel-Vallee & Morgan 2003; O'Connell & Rogers 1983). However, this correspondence at the aggregate level does not generally seem to be due to the overwhelming achievement of fertility intentions at the individual level. On the contrary, it seems that a high frequency of both positive and negative "errors" at the individual level balance one another out. For example, research by Morgan and Rackin (2010) found that a high proportion of Americans (57% of women and 64% of men)

either exceed their long-term fertility goals or fall short of them. Throughout this paper, the term “overshooting” intentions is used to refer to the situation of having more births than one intended in early adulthood and the term “undershooting” intentions refers to having fewer births than one intended in early adulthood.

The fact that a large fraction of individuals either undershoot or overshoot their early life fertility intentions can be linked, in part, to changes in preferences over the life course. Fertility intentions depend on expectations of future circumstances (related to partnership situation, economic resources, and other factors) and intentions change over time, so the measurement and meaning of intentions is complex. Nevertheless, it seems that people do have underlying preferences that persist: intentions are powerful predictors of fertility behavior at the individual level, compared with other variables, and this seems to be the case even when intentions apply to a long time frame (Remez 2000; Rindfuss, Morgan, and Swicegood 1988; Thomson, et al. 1990; Thomson 1997; Trent & Crowder 1997; Schoen et al. 1999; Westoff & Ryder 1977; Wilson & Bumpass 1973).

### **Race-Ethnicity and Gender**

Very little of the existing research on the achievement of fertility intentions includes analyses by race or ethnicity. There has been some research that addresses White-Black differences in meeting intentions the U.S. (see Morgan and Rackin 2010), but almost no research in this area has focused on Hispanics. However, prior research does point to White-Hispanic differences in unintended pregnancies and births, which can lead to overshooting intentions. A higher proportion of pregnancies to Hispanic women are unintended, compared with White women (54% and 40%, respectively in 2001), and for both groups, about half of these

pregnancies are carried to term (Finer & Henshaw 2006, Martin et al. 2009). In addition, Hayford (2009) found that Hispanic women were more likely than non-Hispanic White women to reduce their fertility intentions over the life course. To my knowledge, there is no existing research on the correspondence between fertility intentions and completed fertility for Hispanics in the U.S.

It is important to bear in mind that Hispanics are a heterogeneous group, both in terms of country-of-origin and immigrant generation, and these differing characteristics have implications for behavior (Glick 2010). The childbearing preferences and expectations of immigrants may be influenced by the prevailing norms in home countries (Alba & Nee 2003). Moreover, the migration event itself can also be disruptive to childbearing trajectories, either directly or indirectly by affecting partnerships or labor market engagement (Stephen & Bean 1992; Parrado 2011). The dataset used in this analysis minimizes immigration effects on fertility since the sample only includes those who are in the U.S. before peak childbearing ages.

In addition to addressing ethnic differences in fertility intentions and outcomes, this paper also contributes to existing literature by examining men as well as women. Most studies of fertility intentions are limited to women and prior research shows that female partners' intentions have a larger impact on fertility outcomes (Beckman et al. 1983). However, men's intentions also impact a couple's achieved parity (Thomson 1997; Schoen et al. 1999; Thomson et al. 1990). The intentions of male partners could play a particularly important role among Hispanics since men in this group might have more control over fertility decision-making than their White counterparts (Sable et al, 2009; Hirsch 2003).

## **Mediating Factors**

I explore two sets of factors that might explain differences between Whites and Hispanics in terms of their fertility intentions and their likelihood of meeting intentions. While no clear theoretical framework exists for selecting potential explanatory factors, prior research has identified factors that are likely to influence intentions and the likelihood of meeting intentions, and differ between Whites and Hispanics.

First, socioeconomic status is likely to affect individuals' fertility intentions and whether they overshoot or undershoot intentions. Much of the existing research on socioeconomic status and fertility has focused on the role of opportunity costs in childbearing decisions, arguing that women who have more children simply have less to lose by having each additional child (Becker 1991). White women might choose to have fewer children because they have higher earning potential on average, and therefore bear a greater cost from shifting time from market work to childcare work. And, although couples with greater economic resources might theoretically be able to afford more children, wealthier couples spend substantially more money raising each child compared with couples with fewer means (Lino 2007).

Second, differences between Whites and Hispanics in fertility intentions and the likelihood of achieving intentions might also be explained by the presence of less acculturated individuals in the Hispanic group. A large body of literature has demonstrated differences in family behaviors between foreign-born and U.S.-born Hispanics. Much of this literature finds foreign-born Hispanics more distinct from Whites than their U.S.-born peers and these patterns could be due, at least in part, to cultural differences (Landale & Oropesa 2007; Wilson 2009). Cultural explanations for ethnic differences in behavior have tended to stress the importance of

familism as a core element of the Hispanic culture, by which family roles and obligations are highly valued (Bean & Tienda 1987; Landale & Oropesa 2007; Vega 1995). Usually the assumption is that these cultural norms are brought from immigrants' sending countries and then are maintained to some extent within Hispanic families and communities in the U.S. According to the classic assimilation perspective, these norms disappear gradually as immigrants and their descendants become socially and economically integrated (Gordon 1964; Bean & Swicegood 1985; Alba & Nee 2003; Berry 1997). There is some empirical support for the assertion that Hispanics have stronger familistic orientations than U.S. Whites, as expressed through both attitudes and behaviors (Oropesa & Gorman 2000; Trent & South 1992; Sabogal et al. 1987; Koropecj-Cox & Pendel 2007; Molina & Aguirre-Molina 1994; Ford 1990; Minnis & Padian 2001; Sorenson 1985).

### **Goals of the Study**

This study addresses three research aims:

- 1) To describe racial-ethnic differences in fertility intentions and the correspondence between intentions and outcomes
- 2) To decompose racial-ethnic differences in fertility levels into three components: fertility intentions, likelihood of overshooting intentions, and likelihood of undershooting intentions
- 3) To explore possible explanations for racial-ethnic differences in fertility intentions and the likelihood of meeting intentions, including differences in mothers' education, and immigration and acculturation.

## **DATA AND METHODS**

The data for this paper came from the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY79), a large, nationally representative sample of the 1957-64 U.S. birth cohort. This cohort was interviewed starting in 1979 when they were ages 15-21, and re-interviewed every year or two through their childbearing years and beyond (Zagorsky & White 1999). The NLSY is particularly useful for looking at the correspondence between intentions and outcomes since the same respondents were followed through time and were asked for their fertility intentions 16 different times between 1979 and 2008. No other nationally representative survey contains as detailed information about fertility intentions and births throughout the reproductive life course.

Women and men from the 1979 cohort were divided into two ethnic groups: Hispanics and non-Hispanic Whites (hereafter “Whites”). In order to simplify the analysis, the sample was limited to these two groups. Almost one-quarter of Hispanic respondents (and 2% of White respondents) were foreign-born. Since respondents were in the U.S. before most childbearing occurred (most respondents were in their late teens at the first survey), and to maintain sample size, Hispanic immigrants were not separated from non-immigrants in the main analysis. The relevance of immigrant status was examined using regressions, however. Analyses were not conducted by country-of-origin, since data on national origin was only available for those who were foreign born (a minority of the Hispanic sample). Most foreign-born Hispanic respondents were from Mexico (61%).

Several subsamples were dropped from the NLSY after the initial waves, which reduced the original sample by 26%. Of the remaining 6,922 respondents, another 1,674 (24%) were dropped for the analysis due to missing data on key variables (either early life fertility intentions, completed parity above age 42, or independent variables). In other words, of the respondents who could have been followed through to 2008, 76% were included in the analytic sample, with

retention rates varying from 72% for Hispanic men to 80% for White women. Despite attrition and the loss of subsamples, the analytic sample appeared quite similar to the original sample based on a comparison of background characteristics and intended parity (data available from the author).

### **Key Variables**

Early life parity intentions were based on the question, “Altogether, how many (more) children do you expect to have?” This number was added to any existing children to equal the total lifetime intended parity, for a respondent at a given age. The variable for early life intentions was equal to intentions expressed at age 22, or as close as possible to age 22, within the range of 19 to 25 (for 98% of respondents, this information was collected between ages 21 and 23). Following Morgan and co-authors, I chose an age that was old enough that respondents could offer an intended parity that was realistic and based on personal preferences (rather than societal norms) but was young enough that most respondents had not yet completed childbearing (Quesnel-Vallee & Morgan 2003; Morgan & Rackin 2010).

Completed parity was based on the fertility history taken at the last wave the respondent participated in. The variable for completed parity was equal to the number of children ever born to the respondent, as long as the data were available at age 42 or older. For most respondents (64% of women and 62% of men), completed parity was collected above age 45. As a result, the “completed parity” variable missed a small number of births. According to vital registration data, women over 40 contribute only a small fraction of the Total Fertility Rate (1-2%) and the percentage would be substantially lower above age 42 (Quesnel-Vallee & Morgan 2003). Actual completed parity for men is likely to have been only slightly higher than what is reported here, based on the convergence between intended and achieved parity observed among respondents.

The respondent's mother's education was used as indicator of childhood socioeconomic status. Mother's education consisted of four categories: less than high school, high school or equivalent, some college, and bachelor's degree or higher.

Basic descriptive statistics for these independent variables appear in Table 1. Compared with White respondents, Hispanics were less likely to have highly educated mothers, and were more likely to have been foreign-born and to have grown up in a non-English-speaking household.

**Table 1.** Women's and Men's Characteristics: Descriptive Statistics, U.S. NLSY79 (Weighted)

	Women		Men	
	White	Hispanic	White	Hispanic
Mother's Education (%)				
Less than High School	11.5	51.3 *	10.8	49.0 *
High school or equivalent	15.2	13.9	12.2	9.6
Some college	49.2	24.3 *	53.2	26.9 *
Bachelor's degree or higher	24.1	10.6 *	23.9	14.5 *
Born outside the U.S. (%)	2.2	19.7 *	1.9	24.9 *
Grew up in non-English-speaking household (%)	7.8	75.6 *	9.3	77.0 *
<i>N</i> = 5,248	1,923	767	1,849	709

\*White-Hispanic differences significant at  $p < 0.05$

## Analytic Approach

Throughout the analysis, I compared White women to Hispanic women, and White men to Hispanic men. All Hispanics are grouped together to maintain a large sample size. Sampling weights were applied to adjust for differential nonresponse, the oversampling of certain subgroups, and the use of data from multiple waves (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2005).

The first part of the analysis examined group-level differences in fertility intentions and the likelihood of meeting intentions. I present average intended parity around age 22 and average completed parity at age 42 and above for the four groups. I also examined ethnic differences in the likelihood of individuals to meet intentions, that is, what proportion of White

and Hispanic women and men met intentions, exceeded intentions, and fell short of intentions, and by how much. In addition, I present descriptive statistics for two factors that contribute to overshooting intentions: having an unwanted birth and revising intentions upwards.

In the second part of the analysis, decomposition was used to examine how differences in completed parity between Whites and Hispanics were explained by three factors: differences in intended parity, differences in undershooting intentions, and differences in overshooting intentions.

In the third part of the analysis, I explored why two important components of completed parity – intended parity and overshooting intentions– differed by ethnicity using regression analyses. For each dependent variable, I estimated regression models in two steps. The first step included only the ethnicity variables, separated by immigration and language status, in order to examine how intended parity and overshooting intentions differed based on these characteristics. Specifically, the Hispanic group was sub-divided into three categories: those who were born in the U.S. and grew up in English-speaking households, those who were born in the U.S. and grew up in non-English speaking households, and those who were born outside the U.S. (the reference group was non-Hispanic Whites). The second step of the model included the same set of ethnicity variables plus mother's education in order to see whether differences in mother's education mediated the relationship between ethnicity and the dependent variables. The first dependent variable – intended parity – was treated as a continuous variable and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions were used for these models<sup>1</sup>.

Logistic regressions were used for models where the dependent variable was whether the respondent overshot parity intentions. The variable for overshooting intentions was a dummy variable coded 1 if the respondent's completed parity was higher than his or her intended parity as expressed at age 22 (0 if not). Models were estimated separately for women and men. All models controlled for age at the baseline survey.

---

<sup>1</sup> These models were also estimated using Poisson regression and the pattern of results was the same.


## **RESULTS**

### **Racial-Ethnic Differences in Fertility Intentions and Correspondence between Intentions and Outcomes**

Mean intended parity (around age 22) and achieved parity (at age 42 or above) are presented in Table 2. In the aggregate, Hispanic women came very close to meeting intentions: they intended 2.46 children and had 2.21, on average, meaning that they fell short by 0.25 births. In contrast, White women fell short by 0.42 births (intending 2.29 and having 1.87) on average. Men fell short by a wider margin. White men intended 2.24 births around age 22 and have had 1.71 at the last wave (a difference of half a birth). Hispanic men intended 2.45 births and had 2.10 (a difference of 0.35 births). All four groups fell short of intentions, on average, but for both men and women, the gap between intended and completed parity was smaller for Hispanics.

Figure 1 shows how average intended parity and achieved parity evolved with age, for White and Hispanic women and men. With age, intended parity converged with achieved parity, since individuals ultimately adjusted their expectations to fit reality. Although average intended parity at the youngest ages was similar for White and Hispanic women, White women fell further and further behind their Hispanic peers in achieved births. As a result, the White-Hispanic gaps in both achieved parity and intended parity widened with age for women. Among men, Hispanics had higher parity intentions than their White counterparts in early life, and the Hispanic-White gap in intentions continued to grow, as White men fell behind in achieved parity.

**Figure 1.** Intended and achieved parity by age, race-ethnicity, and gender, U.S. NLSY79



Note: Data points are 5-year moving averages. "CEB" = Children Ever Born. "Intended" = Intended Parity

**Table 2.** Mean intended and achieved parity, by race-ethnicity and gender, U.S. NLSY79 (Weighted)

	Women			Men		
	White	Hispanic		White	Hispanic	
Intended parity around age 22 (mean)	2.29	2.46 *		2.24	2.45 *	
Last recorded achieved parity (age 43+) (mean)	1.87	2.21 *		1.71	2.10 *	
Difference (achieved - intended)	-0.42	-0.25		-0.53	-0.35	
<i>N</i> = 5,248	1,923	767		1,849	709	

\* White-Hispanic difference significant at  $p < 0.05$

**Table 3.** Proportion of individuals who met early life parity intentions, by race-ethnicity and gender, U.S. NLSY79 (Weighted)

	Women			Men		
	White	Hispanic		White	Hispanic	
Undershot intentions (%)	41.9	38.6		46.7	42.8	
Achieved intentions (%)	37.5	33.6		31.8	30.8	
Overshot intentions (%)	20.6	27.8 *		21.6	26.5 *	
	100.0	100.0		100.0	100.0	
Average number of births undershot <sup>1</sup>	0.72	0.70		0.86	0.83	
Average number of births overshot <sup>1</sup>	0.29	0.46 *		0.33	0.47 *	
<i>N</i> = 5,248	1,923	767		1,849	709	

\*White-Hispanic differences significant at  $p < 0.05$

<sup>1</sup> Respondents who did not undershoot (or overshoot) are given values of zero

Now turning the question of whether individuals in these groups met their personal childbearing intentions, Table 3 paints a much different picture. In contrast to what is suggested in the aggregate results in Table 2 and Figure 1, Hispanics were not more likely to meet personal childbearing intentions. Rather, Hispanic women and men were significantly more likely to overshoot intentions, compared to their White counterparts (28% versus 21% for women; 27% versus 22% for men). Within the NLSY sample, they were also less likely to meet intentions and were less likely to undershoot intentions, though these differences were not statistically significant.

Were Hispanic women and men more likely to overshoot intentions because they were more likely to change their minds (i.e. revising intention upwards after age 22) or because they were more likely to have an unwanted birth? Table 4 shows that Hispanic women and men were more likely to experience both of these conditions. 44% of Hispanic women and 51% of Hispanic men revised their intended parity upwards between two waves at least once, compared with 37% of White women and 42% of White men. The NLSY data provide two methods of estimating unwanted births. According to self-reports of unwanted births (meaning the woman reported she did not want the pregnancy at any time in the future), nearly 10% of Hispanic women and only 5% of White women experienced an unwanted birth by the end of their reproductive lives. These estimates are low, compared with those found in the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). Men in the NLSY were not asked whether they considered pregnancies wanted or unwanted.

**Table 4.** Reasons for overshooting intentions, by race-ethnicity and gender, U.S. NLSY79 (Weighted)

	Women			Men		
	White	Hispanic		White	Hispanic	
Indicator of changing one's mind:						
% who ever revised intentions upward between two waves	37.2	43.7 *		42.1	50.5 *	
Indicators of unwanted births:						
% classifying at least one birth as unwanted (reported retrospectively)	4.5	9.5 *		N/A	N/A	
% whose achieved parity in any survey year is higher than intended parity at the previous survey (2 years earlier)	17.4	25.2 *		18.5	26.9 *	
<i>N</i> = 5,248	1,923	767		1,849	709	
*White-Hispanic difference significant at $p < 0.05$						

A second method of estimating unwanted births is to infer them, based on whether achieved parity in a given wave was higher than intended parity reported by the respondent in the previous wave, 2 years earlier. Some of these births might have been intended – i.e. the respondent decided to have an additional birth, conceived a pregnancy, and had a birth, all within a 2-year span – but it is likely that many of these births were the result of unexpected pregnancies. These estimates of unwanted births are therefore considered upper bounds. Hispanics were more likely than Whites to be in this situation: 25% of Hispanic women and 27% of Hispanic men had an increase in achieved parity between two waves that was not predicted by intended parity at the prior wave, compared with 17% of White women and 19% of White men.

### Decomposition of Racial-Ethnic Differences in Fertility Levels

How do these factors balance out to explain why completed parity was higher for Hispanics compared with Whites? The importance of intended parity differences can be weighed against differences in overshooting intentions and undershooting intentions by applying the following decomposition formula to the data in Tables 2 and 3 (“H” stands for Hispanic and “W” stands for White):

$$H-W_{\text{mean completed fertility}} = H-W_{\text{mean intended parity}} - H-W_{\text{mean births undershot}} + H-W_{\text{mean births overshot}}$$

Women: (2.21 – 1.87)	=	(2.46-2.29)	-	(0.70-0.72)	+	(0.46-0.29)
0.35	=	0.17	-	-0.02	+	0.26
100%	=	48%	+	5%	+	47%
Men: (2.10-1.71)	=	(2.45-2.24)	-	(0.83-0.86)	+	(0.47-0.33)
0.39	=	0.21	-	-0.03	+	0.14
100%	=	55%	+	9%	+	36%

Differences in completed parity between Whites and Hispanics seemed to be largely explained by differences in two factors -- intended parity and the likelihood of overshooting intentions. 48% of the difference in completed parity between White and Hispanic women was due to higher intentions among Hispanic women, 47% was due to the fact that Hispanic women are more likely to overshoot intentions, and only 5% was due to the fact that Hispanic women are less likely to undershoot intentions. Among men, a larger fraction of the difference in completed parity between Whites and Hispanics was due to higher intentions (55%), while 36% was due to the fact that Hispanic men were more likely to overshoot intentions, and 9% was due to the fact that Hispanic men were less likely to undershoot intentions. In the next section, I focus on these two important factors – intended parity and likelihood of overshooting – and explore reasons for racial-ethnic differences in these factors.

### **Explaining White-Hispanic Differences in Intended Parity**

Table 5 presents coefficients from OLS regression models predicting women's and men's intended parity. The results presented in Table 5 indicate that for both women and men, higher early-life intentions were limited to those Hispanics who were foreign-born or grew up in non-English-speaking homes. Model 1 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in intended parity between Whites and Hispanics born in English-speaking households. However, U.S.-born Hispanics born in non-English speaking households and foreign-born Hispanics have higher intended parity compared with Whites, and the largest differences were among foreign-born Hispanics. Controlling for mother's education in Model 2 did little to change the coefficients for the three Hispanic groups, suggesting that differences in mother's education did not drive the relationships revealed in Model 1. Results were consistent across gender.

**Table 5.** Coefficients from OLS regressions predicting intended parity at age 22, by gender, U.S. NLSY79

	Women (N=2,690)				Men (N=2,558)			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2	
	Baseline	Mother's education	Baseline	Mother's education	Baseline	Mother's education	Baseline	Mother's education
Hispanic, US-born, raised in English-speaking household (Ref = NH White)	-0.004		-0.001		-0.064		-0.064	
Hispanic, US-born, raised in non-English-speaking household	0.137 *		0.149 *		0.184 **		0.214 *	
Hispanic, foreign-born	0.461 **		0.455 **		0.519 **		0.549 **	
Mother's education (Ref = High school)								
Less than high school			0.149 ^				0.030	
Some college			0.118 ^				0.101	
Bachelor's or higher			0.268 **				0.084	

^ p<0.10, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01

Note: All models control for age at the baseline (1979) survey.

### Explaining White-Hispanic Differences in Overshooting Intended Parity

Reasons for White-Hispanic differences in overshooting intentions were also explored. Table 6 presents coefficients from logistic regression models predicting whether women and men overshoot their early life intentions. Model 1 for women shows that there is no statistically significant difference in the likelihood of overshooting intentions between Whites and Hispanics born in English-speaking households. However, U.S.-born Hispanic women raised in non-English-speaking households were more likely to overshoot intentions than their White counterparts, and the difference between foreign-born Hispanic women and White women was even larger. The pattern among men was similar, with the exception that foreign-born Hispanic men were not more likely than White men to exceed intended parity. This may be related to the fact that foreign-born Hispanic men had the highest fertility intentions.

**Table 6.** Coefficients from logistic regressions predicting whether respondent overshoot intended parity, by gender, U.S. NLSY79

	Women ( <i>N</i> =2,690)				Men ( <i>N</i> =2,558)			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2	
	Baseline		Mother's education		Baseline		Mother's education	
Hispanic, US-born, raised in English-speaking household (Ref = NH White)	-0.378		-0.399		0.253		0.263	
Hispanic, US-born, raised in non-English-speaking household	0.541 **		0.465 **		0.362 **		0.226	
Hispanic, foreign-born	0.708 **		0.693 **		0.065		-0.056	
Mother's education (Ref = High school)								
Less than high school			-0.437 *				-0.345 ^	
Some college			-0.474 **				-0.699 **	
Bachelor's or higher			-0.853 **				-0.577 **	

^ p<0.10, \* p<0.05, \*\* p<0.01

Note: All models control for age at the baseline (1979) survey.

Model 2 included mother's education as an independent variable. For women, controlling for mother's education slightly reduced the magnitude of the coefficients for the two less acculturated Hispanic subgroups (U.S.-born Hispanics raised in non-English-speaking households and foreign-born Hispanics). Among men, controlling for mother's education attenuated the only coefficient that was significant in Model 1 – that of U.S.-born Hispanic men raised in non-English-speaking households. In Model 2, this coefficient was smaller and no longer significant. Overall, the higher likelihood of some Hispanic subgroups to overshoot is partially mediated by differences in mother's education.

## DISCUSSION

Hispanics have higher fertility than Whites but prior research had not explored whether this difference reflects the preferences of individuals, nor how differences in fertility levels are related to the process of exceeding or falling short of intentions over the life course. Although Hispanics came closer to achieving early-life parity intentions in the aggregate, at the individual

level, they were not more likely to have the number of children they said they wanted in early life. Decomposition revealed that Hispanics had higher completed fertility than Whites mainly because their desired parity was slightly higher and they were more likely to overshoot desired parity. Overall, Hispanic-White differences in intended parity and the likelihood of overshooting intentions seemed to result mainly from the presence of less assimilated women and men in the Hispanic group.

The regression analysis suggested that differences between Whites and Hispanics were due, in part, to a subgroup of Hispanics – those who are immigrants or raised in non-English-speaking households. However, it is not clear what the mechanism or mechanisms are that link immigration and language characteristics to fertility measures. Cultural differences are one possibility. Alternatively (or in addition), immigration and language variables could be acting as proxies for socioeconomic status, though if socioeconomic status were a key indicator, we would expect that controlling for mother's education would have done more to reduce the Hispanic coefficients. Finally, immigration status could be capturing the effect of the migration itself on fertility outcomes. The migration experience can affect fertility by separating partners from one another, separating parents from children who remain in this home country, or changing participation in the labor market, for example. Disruption is unlikely to be a central mechanism in this case, however, because respondents were in the United States by the time they entered the survey in their late teen years. The findings presented here are, therefore, suggestive of cultural differences, which fits with other research showing that acculturation is associated with a desire for fewer children (Molina & Aguirre-Molina 1994, Ford 1990, Minnis & Padian 2001, Sorenson 1985). Prior research has also found differences in other family-related attitudes between Hispanics (particularly those who are less acculturated) and other groups. Hispanics have been shown to be more supportive of marriage, less supportive of divorce and remaining single, and

had less favorable attitudes towards childlessness (Oropesa & Gorman 2000; Trent & South 1992; Koropecj-Cox & Pendel 2007).

The socioeconomic variables included in the regression models (mother's education) were mostly associated with the fertility variables in the expected direction, but generally did not explain much or any of the difference between Whites and Hispanics in the outcome variables (either fertility intentions or overshooting). The finding that socioeconomic status was not the most salient factor in explaining White-Hispanic differences in fertility behaviors fits with recent work by Musick et al. (2009), which found that variation in opportunity costs was not related to variation in births.

Several other variables were tested in the regression analyses predicting whether respondents overshoot intentions but were not found to be useful for explaining White-Hispanic differences and these results were not presented. Respondents who spent more of their reproductive years married were more likely to overshoot intentions, but Hispanic respondents spent less time married than their White counterparts, so marriage was not useful for explaining White-Hispanic differences in overshooting. Respondents who experienced the death of a child were also more likely to overshoot original intentions (suggestive of a "replacement effect") but this factor did not explain White-Hispanic differences in the likelihood of overshooting. Likewise, respondents with Rotter scores indicating a high "locus of control" were more likely to report an unwanted birth, but controlling for this factor did not explain White-Hispanic differences in the likelihood of overshooting intentions.

Falling short of intentions was a surprisingly common outcome among Hispanic women and men. This is counter-intuitive, considering the emphasis in the literature on Hispanics' higher fertility and higher rates of unintended pregnancies and births. We might assume that it is only groups with low fertility that have fewer children than they would like, but this had not been

examined empirically (Bongaarts 2001; McDonald 2002). In fact, I found that Hispanic women and men were very likely to undershoot intentions – 39% of women and 43% of men fell short of intentions expressed around age 22 – and they were more likely to undershoot intentions than to either meet intentions or exceed them. Hispanic women and men were only a slightly less likely to undershoot intentions than were Whites, and the differences were not statistically significant.

The observed patterns were similar for women and men. Of the four groups, Hispanic women came the closest to meeting intentions in the aggregate (falling short by only one-quarter of a birth, on average), but this seemed to be related to the fact that they were also the group most likely to overshoot intentions, and these women balanced out those who fell short.

A central limitation of this study was the inability to identify country-of-origin for the three-quarters of Hispanic respondents who were born in the U.S. Prior research has established that the Hispanic category is heterogeneous, and these differences have implications for behavior (Oropesa & Landale 2004). However, other studies with more complete information on national origin lack the longitudinal measures of intentions and births available in the NLSY that were necessary for this analysis.

A second limitation of this study is that it followed an older cohort – those who were 18-21 in 1979 – and the Hispanic population in the U.S. has changed in the intervening decades. Hispanics now comprise a larger fraction of the population and are more likely to be foreign born compared with the 1980s (U.S. Census Bureau 1993; Pew 2012). As a result, Hispanic women and men who are currently in their peak childbearing years might fare differently in meeting their intentions. This is an inherent drawback to analyzing fertility at the cohort level as opposed to the period level: cohort fertility levels can only be assessed once couples have finished (or nearly finished) childbearing, which occurs at least fifteen years after the peak childbearing years. Nevertheless, a cohort approach is necessary to evaluate whether individuals meet their

childbearing intentions. It is reassuring that separate analyses of repeated cross-sectional data from the National Survey of Family Growth demonstrated that fertility intentions of both Whites and Hispanics have been fairly stable over time (Author's tabulations; see also Hagewen & Morgan 2005). Despite the drawbacks of examining fertility from a cohort perspective, cohort measures (those that rely on "children ever born") are likely more reliable for estimating fertility among Hispanics compared with period measures (those that rely on vital statistics and census counts), for various reasons, including the fact that Hispanics may be undercounted in population estimates (Parrado 2011; Preston & Hartnett 2010).

Future research might focus on identifying turning points in the life course that set individuals on a path towards overshooting or undershooting their fertility intentions. Adopting a life course approach will be particularly important for understanding the evolution of intentions and births among the high proportion of immigrants who arrive in the U.S. in the middle of their childbearing years. Future research should also take care to monitor changes in sending countries. The fertility levels in Latin American countries continue to converge with that of the U.S., so while the cultural assimilation of immigrants may have been important for understanding fertility patterns among past and current generations of immigrants, the salience of this factor is likely to decline among future cohorts.

## REFERENCES

- Abrahamse, A., Morrison, P. & Waite, L. 1988. "Beyond stereotypes: Who becomes a single teenage mother?" RAND, Santa Monica, CA.
- Ajzen, I. & Fishbein, M. 2005. The Influence of Attitudes on Behavior. The handbook of attitudes. Pp 173-221 in *The Handbook of Attitudes*, edited by Albarracín, D., Johnson, B. T., Zanna, M. P. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Alba R. D., & Nee V. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press
- Andrews, F. M., Abbey, A., & Halman, L. J. 1991. "Stress from infertility, marriage factors, and subjective well-being of wives and husbands." *Journal of health and social behavior* 32(3):238–253.
- Barber, J. S. & East, P. L. 2011. "Children's Experiences After the Unintended Birth of a Sibling." *Demography* 1–25.
- Barber, J. S. 2001. "Ideational Influences on the Transition to Parenthood: Attitudes Toward Childbearing and Competing Alternatives." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 64:101–27.
- Baydar, N., Greek, A., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1997a). A longitudinal study of the effects of birth of a sibling during the first 6 years of life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 939–956.
- Baydar, N., Hyle, P., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1997b). A longitudinal study of the effects of the birth of a sibling during preschool and early grade school years. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 957–965.
- Bean, F. D. & Swicegood, G. 1985. *Mexican American Fertility Patterns*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bean, F. D. & Tienda, M. 1987. *The Hispanic population of the United States*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Becker, G. S. & Barro, R. J. 1988. "A reformulation of the economic theory of fertility." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 103(1), 1–25.
- Becker, G. S. 1991. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Beckman, L. J., Aizenberg, R. et al. 1983. "A Theoretical Analysis of Antecedents of Young Couples' Fertility Decision and Outcomes." *Demography* 20:519-533.
- Berrington, A. 2004. "Perpetual postponers? Women's, men's and couples' fertility intentions and subsequent fertility behaviour." *Population Trends* 117:9-19.
- Berry, J. W. 1997. "Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation." *Applied psychology* 46(1):5–34.
- Bongaarts, J. 2001. "Fertility and Reproductive Preferences in Post-Transitional Societies." *Population and Development Review*, 27: 260-281.
- Brown, S. S., & Eisenberg, L. (1995). Demography of unintended childbearing. In *The best intentions: Unintended childbearing and the well-being of children and families* (pp. 21–49). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Chatters, L. M., Taylor. R. J., Jackson, J. S. Lincoln, & K. D. 2008. "Religious Coping Among African Americans, Caribbean Blacks and Non-Hispanic Whites." *Journal of Community Psychology* 36(3):371-386.
- Finer, L. B., and Henshaw, S. K.. 2006. "Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001." *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* 38:90-96.

- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. 1975. *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Ford, K. 1990. "Duration of Residence in the United States and the Fertility of US Immigrants." *International Migration Review* 24(1):34-68.
- Glick, J. E. 2010. "Connecting complex processes: A decade of research on immigrant families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 72(3):498-515.
- Goldscheider, C., & Goldscheider, F. K.. 1988. "Ethnicity, religiosity and leaving home: the structural and cultural bases of traditional family values." *Sociological Forum* 3.
- Gordon, M. M. 1964. *Assimilation in American life: The role of race, religion, and national origins*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Hagewen, K. J, and Morgan, S. P. 2005. "Intended and ideal family size in the United States, 1970-2002." *Population and Development Review* 31(3):507-527.
- Hayford, S. R. 2009. "The Evolution of Fertility Expectations Over the Life Course." *Demography* 46(4):765-783.
- Hirsch, J. S. 2003. *A courtship after marriage: Sexuality and love in Mexican transnational families*. Berkely: Univeristy of California Press.
- Kohler, H. P., Billari, F. C., & Ortega, J. A.. 2006. "Low Fertility in Europe: Causes, Implications, and Policy Options." Pp 48-109 in *The Baby Bust: Who Will Do the Work? Who Will Pay the Taxes?*, edited by F.R. Harris. Lanham, MD: Rowman.
- Koropecykj-Cox, T., & Pendell, G.. 2007. "The Gender Gap in Attitudes About Childlessness in the United States." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 69:899-915
- Landale, N. S. & Oropesa, R. S.. 2007. "Hispanic families: Stability and change." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33: 381-405.
- Lino, M. 2007. "Expenditures on children by families, 2006." US Department of Agriculture, Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion, Washington, DC.
- Martin J. A., Hamilton, B. E., Sutton, P. D., Ventura, S. J., Menacker, F., Kirmeyer, S., & Mathews, T. J.. 2009. "Births: Final data for 2006." National Vital Statistics Reports; vol 57 no 7. National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, MD.
- McDonald, P. 2002. Low fertility: unifying the theory and the demography, presented at the Population Association of American Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA, May 9-12, 2002.
- Minnis, A. M, & Padian, N. S. 2001. "Reproductive health differences among Latin American-and US-born young women." *Journal of Urban Health* 78(4):627-637.
- Molina, C. W, & Aguirre-Molina, M. 1994. *Latino health in the US: A growing challenge*. American Public Health Association.
- Monnier, A. 1989. "Fertility Intentions and Actual Behaviour. A Longitudinal Study: 1974, 1976, 1979." *Population: An English Selection* 44: 237-259.
- Morgan, S. P. & Rackin, H. 2010. The Correspondence of Fertility Intentions and Behavior in the U.S. *Population and Development Review*, 36(1): 91-118.
- Morgan, S. P. 2003. "Is low fertility a twenty-first-century demographic crisis?" *Demography* 40(4):589-603.
- Musick, K., England, P., Edgington, S., & Kangas, N.. 2009. "Education differences in intended and unintended fertility." *Social Forces* 88:543-572.

- O'Connell, M., & Rogers, C. C. 1983. "Assessing Cohort Birth Expectations Data from the Current Population Survey, 1971–1981." *Demography* 20(3):369–384.
- Oropesa R. S. & Gorman, B. K. 2000. "Ethnicity, immigration, and beliefs about marriage as a 'tie that binds'." Pp. 188–211 in *The Ties That Bind: Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation*, edited by L. J. Waite. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Oropesa, R. S. & Landale, N. S.. (2004). "The Future of Marriage and Hispanics." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:901-920.
- Parrado, E. A. 2011. "How High is Hispanic/Mexican Fertility in the United States? Immigration and Tempo Considerations." *Demography* 1–22.
- Pew Hispanic Center. 2011. *The Mexican-American Boom: Births Overtake Immigration*. Washington, D.C.
- Pew Hispanic Center. 2012. *Statistical Portrait of Hispanics in the United States*. Washington, D.C.
- Preston, S. & Hartnett, C.S. "The Future of American Fertility." 2010. In *Demography and the Economy*, John Shoven, ed. Chicago University Press for National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Quesnel-Vallée, A., & Morgan, S. P.. 2003. "Missing the target? Correspondence of fertility intentions and behavior in the US." *Population Research and Policy Review* 22(5):497–525.
- Remez, L. 2000. "Degree of certainty about plans to have children strongly predicts whether individuals will do so." *Family Planning Perspectives* 32: 46-7.
- Rindfuss, R. R., Morgan, S. P & Swicegood, G.. 1988. *First births in America: Changes in the timing of parenthood*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Rosen, C. E. 1982. "Ethnic differences among impoverished rural elderly in use of religion as a coping mechanism." *Rural Community Psychology* 3(2):27.
- Sable, M. R, Havig, K., Schwartz, L. R., & Shaw, A. 2009. "Hispanic immigrant women talk about family planning." *Affilia* 24(2):137.
- Sable, M. R. & Wilkinson, D. S. 2000. Impact of perceived stress, major life events and pregnancy attitudes on low birth weight. *Family Planning Perspectives* 32(6): 288–294.
- Sabogal, F., Marín, G. Otero-Sabogal, R. Marín, B. V. & Perez-Stable, E. J. 1987. "Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't?." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 9:397.
- Schoen, R., Astone, N. M., Kim, Y. J., Nathanson, C. A., & Fields, J. 1999. Do Fertility Intentions Affect Fertility Behavior? *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61:790–99.
- Singh, S., Darroch, J. E., Vlassof, M., & Nadeau, J. 2003. *Adding it up: the benefits of investing in sexual and reproductive health care*. New York: The Alan Guttmacher Institute.
- Sorenson, A. M. 1985. "Fertility expectations and ethnic identity among Mexican-American adolescents: an expression of cultural ideals." *Sociological Perspectives* 28:339–360.
- Stephen, E. H., and Bean, F. D. 1992. "Assimilation, Disruption and the Fertility of Mexican-Origin Women in the United States." *International Migration Review* 26(1):67–88.
- Thomson, E. 1997. "Couple Childbearing Desires, Intentions, and Births." *Demography* 34: 343-354.
- Thomson, E., McDonald, E., & Bumpass, L. 1990. "Fertility Desires and Fertility: Hers, His, and Theirs." *Demography* 27: 579-588.
- Thornton, A. 1985. "Reciprocal influences of family and religion in a changing world." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 47(2):381–394.

- Thornton, A. & Camburn, D. 1989. "Religious participation and adolescent sexual behavior and attitudes." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 51(3):641–653.
- Trent K. & South, S. J.. 1992. "Sociodemographic Status, Parental Background, Childhood Family Structure, and Attitudes toward Family Formation." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 54(2):427-439
- Trent, K. & Crowder, K. 1997. "Adolescent birth intentions, social disadvantage, and behavioral outcomes." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59:523-535.
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2005. "The NLSY79." in The NLS Handbook. <http://www.bls.gov/nls/handbook/2005/nlshc3.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 1993. *We the American-Hispanics*. Washington, D.C.: GPO.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2012. *Most Children Younger Than Age 1 are Minorities*, Census Bureau Reports. <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-90.html>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2010. *Healthy People 2020*. Washington, D.C.
- Van de Giessen, H. 1992. "Using birth expectation information in national population forecasts." Chapter 12 in *National Population Forecasting in Industrialized Countries*. N. Keilman. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- Vega W. A. 1995. "The study of Latino families. In *Understanding Latino Families: Scholarship*." Pp. 3-17 in *Policy and Practice*, edited by. R Zambrana. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Westoff, C. F. & Ryder, N. B. 1977. "The Predictive Validity of Reproductive Intentions." *Demography* 14:431–53.
- Wilson, E. K. 2009. "Differences in contraceptive use across generations of migration among women of Mexican origin." *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 13(5):641–651.
- Wilson, F. D. & Bumpass, L. 1973. "The Prediction of Fertility Among Catholics: A Longitudinal Analysis." *Demography* 10: 591-597.
- Zagorsky, J. L., & White, L. 1999. "NLSY79 User's Guide 1999." U.S. Department of Labor and Center for Human Resource Research, Ohio.



# PSC Research Reports

The **Population Studies Center** (PSC) at the University of Michigan is one of the oldest population centers in the United States. Established in 1961 with a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Center has a rich history as the main workplace for an interdisciplinary community of scholars in the field of population studies.

Currently PSC is one of five centers within the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. The Center receives core funding from both the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24) and the National Institute on Aging (P30).

PSC Research Reports are **prepublication working papers** that report on current demographic research conducted by PSC-affiliated researchers. These papers are written for timely dissemination and are often later submitted for publication in scholarly journals.

The **PSC Research Report Series** was initiated in 1981.

**Copyrights for all Reports are held by the authors.** Readers may quote from this work (except as limited by authors) if they properly acknowledge the authors and the PSC Series and do not alter the original work.

Population Studies Center  
University of Michigan  
Institute for Social Research  
PO Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248 USA  
[www.psc.isr.umich.edu](http://www.psc.isr.umich.edu)