

Human Fertility and Family Planning
Sociology 7280
FALL 2019
Monday 2:30-5:15
Business Administration Annex 1000

Karen Guzzo
212 Williams Hall
Ext. 2-3312
kguzzo@bgsu.edu
Office Hours: Tuesdays 9:00-11:00 (and by appointment), email anytime!

Course Description and Organization:

This course will focus on human fertility from a sociological and demographic perspective. We will apply and review theories and conceptual frameworks used to understand aspects of fertility change in industrialized countries, challenges in studying and providing family planning services, fertility trends and topics in the United States, and current population policy concerns. Of course, we will not be able to cover every aspect of fertility, but we will focus on some key debates and topics.

The readings are available online; you should be able to access them all on-campus or by logging into the library if you are off-campus. There are a few readings that are not available online, and these readings are indicated below and are available on Canvas, under 'files.' Canvas will be used in this class to present the weekly essay questions and for course announcements. You are expected to complete readings before the class, with optional readings indicated as such.

Course Requirements:

Your grade will be determined by weekly participation (10%), research proposal (30%), weekly essays based on the readings (30%), leading class discussion (15%), presentation of research proposal (10%), and peer research proposal review (5%).

All assignments and material must be turned in on the dates assigned. Please plan accordingly!

1) Participation:

a) It is essential that everyone come to class prepared. Your participation should be ongoing and active. If you do not attend, you cannot participate. Personal vacation and travel should be planned around the class schedule.

2) Reading Essays:

After each class, I will post questions for the following week's readings on Canvas as an announcement; these questions are designed to help you think about the readings in a general way and guide you as read the papers. Each student will prepare a 2-3 page response (double-

spaced) to these questions to be turned in 9:00 am via email prior to that week's class.

3) Lead Discussion:

For each topic, there will be two student leaders. The leaders will present the major points of the assigned readings, facilitate discussion of how the readings are interrelated (coming up with discussion questions), present controversial features of the readings, and critically evaluate the readings. You must turn in a copy of your notes/questions to me at the beginning of class. Leading class discussion is NOT just summarizing the readings. Each student will co-lead class discussion 3 times (5% each time, total=15%). Discussion assignments will occur on the first day of class.

4) Research Proposal:

Your research proposal will give you the opportunity to examine a topic related to the social scientific study of fertility. You should define the research question, provide a rationale for the study, review the relevant research literature, and describe the data, methods and analyses that would be used to address the research question, followed by a discussion of the expected findings, their contributions, and the limitations of the proposed project. Model your proposals on the journal articles we read this semester; copies of prior years' fertility proposals will also be available to serve as examples. I expect proposals to be around 15 pages (20 pages max) not including references or tables. You do NOT have to do any data analysis, but you are welcome and encouraged to do so if you have access to data. I recommend Add Health, TARS, or the NSFG if you'd like to incorporate some basic analysis; the NSFG is the go-to for studying reproductive behavior, and the CFDR is offering an introduction to the NSFG on October 21st. You will have two opportunities to revise your proposal – once based on my comments and then again after your classmate's comments – before you turn in the final version. The idea is that you will write a proposal that can be used to develop a dissertation or thesis proposal, conference paper, and possibly a journal article.

5) Proposal Review

Each student will also serve as a reviewer of the proposal for one other student in the seminar. You will read through a classmate's research proposal draft and produce a 1-2 page written document with suggestions, critiques, and questions for your classmate. We are going to follow the pattern of "single blind" reviews – I will assign each proposal to a student, and the student will submit their review to me, and I will then pass along the anonymized review to the author. In this fashion, you will know whose paper you are reading, but they will not know who write their review. Your goal is to provide constructive criticism so your classmates can improve their proposal, both the theoretical and methodological aspects.

6) Proposal Presentation

Each student will make a 10-12 minute in-class oral presentation of their research proposal.

Research Proposal Deadlines:

- a. Each student will submit a brief (2-3 page) research proposal that describes your research question and rationale no later than **noon on SEPT 30th** via email. You must meet with me beforehand to discuss your topic.
- b. A first draft of your proposal is due **by noon on OCT 28th** via email. I will read through and comment on your proposal and return it to you within 10 days.
- c. **By noon on NOV 18th** you must email your revised research proposal to me, and I will pass it along to a peer reviewer.
- d. **By noon on DEC 2nd** the reviewer will provide written comments on the proposal via email, and I will pass those along to the author.
- e. Students must revise their research proposal in light of the comments of the instructor and reviewer. The final version is due **by noon on DEC 9th** via email.
- f. On **DEC 12th** each student will make a 10-12 minute in-class oral presentation of their research proposal during the final exam period (3:00-5:30). The presentations need to be **emailed to me by 2:00 pm.**

ACADEMIC HONESTY:

Academic honesty is the central value of an academic community. It is expected that graduate students will neither engage in nor facilitate cheating (using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids), fabrication (falsification or invention of any information or citation), or plagiarism (representing the words or ideas of others as one's own) in their academic work. The Academic Honesty Policy can be found at the following web address:

<http://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/catalog/academic-honesty/official-policy.pdf>

The Academic Honesty Policy contains strict sanctions, including expulsion, for all forms of academic dishonesty. Students found guilty of violating other University regulations, such as engaging in moral and ethical misconduct, or in actions that are injurious to others or threaten the orderliness and wellbeing of the campus, are subject to equally strict sanctions in accordance with the provisions set forth in those regulations.

TOPIC SCHEDULE & ASSIGNED READINGS

8/26 Introduction, Overview, and Measurement

World Population:

Population Reference Bureau Data Sheet and Summary 2018 https://www.prb.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/2018_WPDS.pdf

Measurement of Fertility:

McFalls, J (2007). Population: A lively introduction, 5th Edition.” *Population Bulletin* 62(1), Washington DC: Population Reference Bureau.
<http://www.prb.org/pdf07/62.1LivelyIntroduction.pdf> - pages 5-8

Fertility Trends & Differentials:

Guzzo, K. B. & Hayford, S. R. (In press). Pathways to parenthood in social and family context: Decade in review, 2020. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. --- available on Canvas under 'files'---

Determinants of Fertility

Bongaarts, J. (1978). A framework for analyzing the proximate determinants of fertility. *Population and Development Review*. 4:105-132.
<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/27f8/2c7d2600f97014a116a8cada9a84c3867e69.pdf>

9/5 The (First) Demographic Transition (make up for 9/2 Labor Day – 9-12 in CFDR conference room)

Coale, A. (1973). The demographic transition. In Proceedings: International Population Conference, Liege, 1973. 1:53-72. Liege: International Union for the Scientific Study of Population. --- available on Canvas under 'files'---

Montgomery, M. R., & Casterline, J. B. (1996). Social learning, social influence, and new models of fertility. *Population and Development Review*, 22, 151-175.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2808010>

Caldwell, J. C. (2005). On net intergenerational wealth flows: an update. *Population and development review*, 31(4), 721-740. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2005.00095.x>

Bongaarts, J., & Casterline, J. (2013). Fertility transition: Is sub-Saharan Africa different? *Population and Development Review*, 38, 153-168.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00557.x>

Johnson-Hanks, J. (2007). Natural intentions: fertility decline in the African Demographic and Health Surveys. *American Journal of Sociology*, 112(4), 1008-1043.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/508791>

Mason, K. O. (2001). Gender and family systems in the fertility transition. *Population and Development Review*, 27, 160-176. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3115254>

9/9 Post-Transition Theories

Morgan, S. P., & King, R. B. (2001). Why have children in the 21st century? Biological predisposition, social coercion, rational choice. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne de démographie*, 17(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010784028474>

Rindfuss, R. R., Choe, M. K., & Brauner-Otto, S. R. (2016). The emergence of two distinct fertility regimes in economically advanced countries. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 35(3), 287-304. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-016-9387-z>

Zaidi, B., & Morgan, S. P. (2017). The second demographic transition theory: A review and appraisal.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 43: 473-492. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053442>

Goldscheider, F., Bernhardt, E., & Lappegård, T. (2015). The gender revolution: A framework for understanding changing family and demographic behavior. *Population and Development Review* 41: 207-239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2015.00045.x>

Ajzen, I., & Klobas, J. (2013). Fertility intentions: An approach based on the theory of planned behavior. *Demographic Research*, 29, 203-232. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.8>

Bachrach, C. A., & Morgan, S. P. (2013). A cognitive–social model of fertility intentions. *Population and Development Review*, 39(3), 459-485. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2013.00612.x>

Optional

Lesthaeghe, R. (2010). The unfolding story of the second demographic transition. *Population and Development Review* 36: 211-251. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2010.00328.x>

Perelli-Harris, B., & Gerber, T. P. (2011). Nonmarital childbearing in Russia: second demographic transition or pattern of disadvantage? *Demography*, 48(1), 317-342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-010-0001-4>

Anderson, T., & Kohler, H. P. (2015). Low fertility, socioeconomic development, and gender equity. *Population and Development Review*, 41(3), 381-407. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2015.00065.x>

9/16 Defining the Scope and “Problems” for Fertility Research

Almeling, R. (2015). Reproduction. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 423-442. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-073014-112258>

Johnson, K. M., Greil, A. L., Shreffler, K. M., & McQuillan, J. (2018). Fertility and infertility: Toward an integrative research agenda. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 37(5): 641-666. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-018-9476-2>

Reproductive Justice

Luna, Z., & Luker, K. (2013). Reproductive justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 9, 329-352. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102612-134037>

Measuring Key Concepts

Aiken, A. R., Borrero, S., Callegari, L. S., & Dehlendorf, C. (2016). Rethinking the pregnancy planning paradigm: unintended conceptions or unrepresentative concepts. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 48(3), 147. <https://doi.org/10.1363/48e10316>

Potter, J. E., Stevenson, A. J., Coleman-Minahan, K., Hopkins, K., White, K., Baum, S. E., & Grossman, D. (2019). Challenging unintended pregnancy as an indicator of reproductive autonomy. *Contraception*, 100(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2019.02.005>

Kost, K., & Zolna, M. (2019). Challenging unintended pregnancy as an indicator of reproductive autonomy: a response. *Contraception*, 100(1), 5-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2019.04.010>

Optional

Gubrium, A. C., Mann, E. S., Borrero, S., Dehlendorf, C., Fields, J., Geronimus, A. T., ... & Luker, K. (2016). Realizing reproductive health equity needs more than long-acting reversible contraception (LARC). *American Journal of Public Health, 106*(1), 18. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2105%2FAJPH.2015.302900>

Gomez, A. M., Fuentes, L., & Allina, A. (2014). Women or LARC first? Reproductive autonomy and the promotion of long-acting reversible contraceptive methods. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 46*(3), 171-175. <https://doi.org/10.1363/46e1614>

9/23 Contraception and Abortion

Contraception

Guttmacher Fact Sheet: [Contraceptive Use in the United States, 2018](#)

Sundaram, A., Vaughan, B., Kost, K., Bankole, A., Finer, L., Singh, S., & Trussell, J. (2017). Contraceptive failure in the United States: estimates from the 2006–2010 National Survey of Family Growth. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health, 49*(1), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12017>

Bailey, M. J. (2010). “Momma’s got the pill”: how Anthony Comstock and *Griswold v. Connecticut* shaped US childbearing. *American Economic Review, 100*(1), 98-129. <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/aer.100.1.98>

Jones, R. K., Frohwirth, L. F., & Blades, N. M. (2016). “If I know I am on the pill and I get pregnant, it's an act of God”: women's views on fatalism, agency and pregnancy. *Contraception, 93*(6), 551-555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2016.02.005>

Abortion

Guttmacher Fact Sheet: [Induced abortion in the United States, 2018](#)

Guttmacher Fact Sheet: [Induced abortion worldwide, 2018](#)

Lindberg, L., Kost, K., Maddow-Zimet, I., Desai, S., & Zolna, M. (Working paper). Completeness of abortion reporting in three national surveys in the United States. --- available on Canvas under 'files'---

Upadhyay, U. D., Weitz, T. A., Jones, R. K., Barar, R. E., & Foster, D. G. (2014). Denial of abortion because of provider gestational age limits in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 104*(9), 1687-1694. <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/full/10.2105/AJPH.2013.301378>

Foster, D. G., Steinberg, J. R., Roberts, S. C., Neuhaus, J., & Biggs, M. A. (2015). A comparison of depression and anxiety symptom trajectories between women who had an abortion and women denied one. *Psychological Medicine, 45*(10), 2073-2082. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714003213>

Foster, D. G., Biggs, M. A., Ralph, L., Gerdt, C., Roberts, S., & Glymour, M. M. (2018). Socioeconomic outcomes of women who receive and women who are denied wanted abortions in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 108*(3), 407-413. <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/full/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304247>

Optional

Hasstedt, K. (2017). Why we cannot afford to undercut the Title X national family planning program. *Guttmacher Policy Review* 20: 20-23.

<https://www.guttmacher.org/gpr/2017/01/why-we-cannot-afford-undercut-title-x-national-family-planning-program>

Jones, R. K., & Jerman, J. (2017). Population group abortion rates and lifetime incidence of abortion: United States, 2008–2014. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(12), 1904-1909. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2017.304042>

Jones, R. K., Ingerick, M., & Jerman, J. (2018). Differences in abortion service delivery in hostile, middle-ground, and supportive states in 2014. *Women's Health Issues*, 28(3), 212-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2017.12.003>

9/30 Childbearing Intentions, Desires, and Behaviors

PROPOSAL IDEAS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL

Beaujouan, E., & Berghammer, C. (2019). The gap between lifetime fertility intentions and completed fertility in Europe and the United States: A cohort approach. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-019-09516-3>

Hayford, S. R. (2009). The evolution of fertility expectations over the life course. *Demography*, 46(4), 765-783. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.0.0073>

Rackin, H. M., & Morgan, S. P. (2018). Prospective versus retrospective measurement of unwanted fertility: Strengths, weaknesses, and inconsistencies assessed for a cohort of US women. *Demographic Research*, 39, 61-94. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2018.39.3>

Rajan, S., Morgan, S. P., Harris, K. M., Guilkey, D., Hayford, S. R., & Guzzo, K. B. (2017). Trajectories of unintended fertility. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 36(6), 903-928. [10.1007/s11113-017-9443-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-017-9443-3)

Arteaga, S., Caton, L., & Gomez, A. M. (2019). Planned, unplanned and in-between: the meaning and context of pregnancy planning for young people. *Contraception*, 99(1), 16-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2018.08.012>

Gómez, A. M., Arteaga, S., Villaseñor, E., Arcara, J., & Freihart, B. (2019). The misclassification of ambivalence in pregnancy intentions: A mixed-methods analysis. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12088>

Optional

Aiken, A. R., Westhoff, C. L., Trussell, J., & Castaño, P. M. (2016). Comparison of a Timing-Based Measure of Unintended Pregnancy and the London Measure of Unplanned Pregnancy. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 48(3), 139-146.

Finer, L. B., Lindberg, L. D., & Desai, S. (2018). A prospective measure of unintended pregnancy in the United States. *Contraception*, 98(6), 522-527.

Kavanaugh, M. L., Kost, K., Frohwirth, L., Maddow-Zimet, I., & Gor, V. (2017). Parents' experience of unintended childbearing: A qualitative study of factors that mitigate or

exacerbate effects. *Social Science & Medicine*, 174, 133-141.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.12.024>

10/7 Socioeconomic Differences in Reproductive Attitudes and Behavior

James-Hawkins, L., & Sennott, C. (2015). Low-income women's navigation of childbearing norms throughout the reproductive life course. *Qualitative Health Research*, 25(1), 62-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732314548690>

England, P., Caudillo, M. L., Littlejohn, K., Bass, B. C., & Reed, J. (2016). Why do young, unmarried women who do not want to get pregnant contracept inconsistently? Mixed-method evidence for the role of efficacy. *Socius*, 2, 2378023116629464.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023116629464>

Berrington, A., & Pattaro, S. (2014). Educational differences in fertility desires, intentions and behaviour: A life course perspective. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 21, 10-27.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2013.12.003>

Brand, J. E., & Davis, D. (2011). The impact of college education on fertility: Evidence for heterogeneous effects. *Demography*, 48(3), 863-887. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-011-0034-3>

Raley, R. K., Kim, Y., & Daniels, K. (2012). Young adults' fertility expectations and events: Associations with college enrollment and persistence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(4), 866-879. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00990.x>

Musick, K., England, P., Edgington, S., & Kangas, N. (2009). Education differences in intended and unintended fertility. *Social Forces*, 88(2), 543-572.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1353%2Fsof.0.0278>

Optional

Nitsche, N., Matysiak, A., Van Bavel, J., & Vignoli, D. (2018). Partners' educational pairings and fertility across Europe. *Demography*, 55(4), 1195-1232.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0681-8>

Hayford, S. R., & Guzzo, K. B. (2016). Fifty years of unintended births: Education gradients in unintended fertility in the US, 1960–2013. *Population and Development Review*, 42(2), 313-341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2016.00126.x>

Tichenor, V., McQuillan, J., Greil, A. L., Bedrous, A. V., Clark, A., & Shreffler, K. M. (2017). Variation in attitudes toward being a mother by race/ethnicity and education among women in the United States. *Sociological Perspectives*, 60(3), 600-619.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121416662452>

10/14 Gender, Work, and Fertility

Brinton, M. C., & Oh, E. (2019). Babies, work, or both? Highly educated women's employment and fertility in east Asia. *American Journal of Sociology*, 125(1), 105-140.
<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/704369>

Rindfuss, R. R., Guilkey, D. K., Morgan, S. P., & Kravdal, Ø. (2010). Child-care availability and fertility in Norway. *Population and Development Review*, 36(4), 725-748.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2010.00355.x>

- Arpino, B., Esping-Andersen, G., & Pessin, L. (2015). How do changes in gender role attitudes towards female employment influence fertility? A macro-level analysis. *European Sociological Review*, 31(3), 370-382. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcv002>
- Shreffler, K. M., Pirretti, A. E., & Drago, R. (2010). Work–family conflict and fertility intentions: Does gender matter? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 31(2), 228-240. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-010-9187-2>
- Shreffler, K. M., & Johnson, D. R. (2013). Fertility intentions, career considerations and subsequent births: The moderating effects of women’s work hours. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 34(3), 285-295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-012-9331-2>
- Shreffler, K. M. (2017). Contextual understanding of lower fertility among US women in professional occupations. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38(2), 204-224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X16634765>

Optional

- Raymo, J. M., Musick, K., & Iwasawa, M. (2015). Gender equity, opportunity costs of parenthood, and educational differences in unintended first births: Insights from Japan. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 34(2), 179-199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-014-9348-3>
- Nagase, N., & Brinton, M. C. (2017). The gender division of labor and second births: Labor market institutions and fertility in Japan. *Demographic Research*, 36, 339-370. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2017.36.11>
- Hanappi, D., & Buber-Ennsner, I. (2017). When paid work matters for fertility intentions and subsequent behavior: Evidence from two waves of the Austrian gender and generation survey. *Comparative Population Studies-Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, 42, 245-279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2017-15en>

10/21 Macro and Microeconomic Influences

Macroeconomic Conditions

- Cherlin, A., Cumberworth, E., Morgan, S. P., & Wimer, C. (2013). The effects of the Great Recession on family structure and fertility. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 650(1), 214-231. **** only read pages 214-223 (the fertility part) **** <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002716213500643>
- Schneider, D. (2017). Non-marital and teen fertility and contraception during the Great Recession. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 3(3), 126-144. <https://doi.org/10.7758/RSF.2017.3.3.06>
- Seltzer, N. (2019). Beyond the Great Recession: Labor market polarization and ongoing fertility decline in the United States. *Demography*, 56(4), 1463-1493. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00790-6>

Microeconomic Conditions

- Nau, M., Dwyer, R. E., & Hodson, R. (2015). Can’t afford a baby? Debt and young Americans. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 42, 114-122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2015.05.003>

Mansour, F. (2018). Economic insecurity and fertility: Does income volatility impact the decision to remain a one-child family? *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 39(2), 243-257. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-017-9559-y>

Brauner-Otto, S. R., & Geist, C. (2018). Uncertainty, doubts, and delays: Economic circumstances and childbearing expectations among emerging adults. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 39(1), 88-102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10834-017-9548-1>

Optional

Cherlin, A. J., Ribar, D. C., & Yasutake, S. (2016). Nonmarital first births, marriage, and income inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 81(4), 749-770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312241665311>

Testa, M. R., & Basten, S. (2014). Certainty of meeting fertility intentions declines in Europe during the Great Recession'. *Demographic Research*, 31(23), 687-734. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2014.31.23>

Hanappi, D., & Buber-Ennsner, I. (2017). When paid work matters for fertility intentions and subsequent behavior: Evidence from two waves of the Austrian gender and generation survey. *Comparative Population Studies-Zeitschrift für Bevölkerungswissenschaft*, 42, 245-279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2017-15en>

10/28 Timing and Relationship Contexts

PROPOSAL 1ST DRAFTS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL

Santelli, J. S., Kantor, L. M., Grilo, S. A., Speizer, I. S., Lindberg, L. D., Heitel, J., ... & Heck, C. J. (2017). Abstinence-only-until-marriage: An updated review of US policies and programs and their impact. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 61(3), 273-280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.05.031>

Early Childbearing

Kearney, M. S., & Levine, P. B. (2012). Why is the teen birth rate in the United States so high and why does it matter? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(2), 141-63. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles/pdf/doi/10.1257/jep.26.2.141>

Edin, K., & Tach, L. (2012). Becoming a parent: The social context of fertility during young adulthood. Ch. 12 in Booth, A. et al. *Early Adulthood in Family Context* New York: Springer. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-1-4614-1436-0_12

Cohabitation and Marriage

Rackin, H. M., & Gibson-Davis, C. M. (2017). Low-income childless young adults' marriage and fertility frameworks. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 79(4), 1096-1110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12405>

Lichter, D. T., Sassler, S., & Turner, R. N. (2014). Cohabitation, post-conception unions, and the rise in nonmarital fertility. *Social Science Research*, 47, 134-147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.04.002>

Fertility in Higher-Order Unions

Thomson, E., Lappegård, T., Carlson, M., Evans, A., & Gray, E. (2014). Childbearing across partnerships in Australia, the United States, Norway, and Sweden. *Demography*, 51(2),

485-508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-013-0273-6>

Guzzo, K. B. (2017). Is stepfamily status associated with cohabiting and married women's fertility behaviors? *Demography*, 54(1), 45-70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-016-0534-2>

Optional

Sassler, S., & Miller, A. J. (2014). "We're very careful...": The fertility desires and contraceptive behaviors of cohabiting couples. *Family Relations*, 63(4), 538-553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fare.12079>

Gibson-Davis, C., & Rackin, H. (2014). Marriage or carriage? Trends in union context and birth type by education. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(3), 506-519. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12109>

Guzzo, K. B. (2014). New partners, more kids: Multiple-partner fertility in the United States. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 654(1), 66-86. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1177%2F0002716214525571>

11/4 Reproductive Behaviors among Marginalized Groups

Race-Ethnicity

Sweeney, M. M., & Raley, R. K. (2014). Race, ethnicity, and the changing context of childbearing in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 539-558. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043342>

Geronimus, A. T. (2003). Damned if you do: Culture, identity, privilege, and teenage childbearing in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57(5), 881-893. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(02\)00456-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00456-2)

Hartnett, C. S., & Parrado, E. A. (2012). Hispanic familism reconsidered: Ethnic differences in the perceived value of children and fertility intentions. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 53(4), 636-653. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2012.01252.x>

Parrado, E. A. (2011). How high is Hispanic/Mexican fertility in the United States? Immigration and tempo considerations. *Demography*, 48(3), 1059-1080. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-011-0045-0>

Sexual Orientation & Identity

Everett, B. G., McCabe, K. F., & Hughes, T. L. (2017). Sexual orientation disparities in mistimed and unwanted pregnancy among adult women. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 49(3), 157-165. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12032>

Hartnett, C. S., Lindley, L., Walsemann, K. M., & Negraia, D. V. (2017). Sexual orientation concordance and (un) happiness about births. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 49(4), 213-221. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12043>

Optional

Bell, M. C., Edin, K., Wood, H. M., & Monde, G. C. (2018). Relationship repertoires, the price of parenthood, and the costs of contraception. *Social Service Review*, 92(3), 313-348. <https://doi.org/10.1086/699159> --- available on Canvas under 'files'---

Barber, J. S., Yarger, J. E., & Gatny, H. H. (2015). Black-white differences in attitudes related to pregnancy among young women. *Demography*, 52(3), 751-786. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-015-0391-4>

Hartnett, C. S. (2012). Are Hispanic women happier about unintended births? *Population research and policy review*, 31(5), 683-701. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11113-012-9252-7>

11/14 Religiosity and Cultural Shifts across Generations and Time (make up for 11/11 Veterans' Day – 9-12 in CFDR conference room)

Wilde, M. J., & Danielsen, S. (2014). Fewer and better children: Race, class, religion, and birth control reform in America. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(6), 1710-1760. <https://doi.org/10.1086/674007>

Hayford, S. R., & Morgan, S. P. (2008). Religiosity and fertility in the United States: The role of fertility intentions. *Social Forces*, 86(3), 1163-1188. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.0.0000>

Perry, S. L., & Schleifer, C. (2019). Are the faithful becoming less fruitful? The decline of conservative protestant fertility and the growing importance of religious practice and belief in childbearing in the US. *Social Science Research*, 78, 137-155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2018.12.013>

Marshall, E. A., & Shepherd, H. (2018). Fertility preferences and cognition: Religiosity and experimental effects of Decision Context on College Women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(2), 521-536. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jomf.12449>

Westoff, C. F., & Marshall, E. A. (2010). Hispanic fertility, religion and religiousness in the US. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 29(4), 441-452. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1007%2Fs11113-009-9156-3>

Kulu, H., Milewski, N., Hannemann, T., & Mikolaj, J. (2019). A decade of life-course research on fertility of immigrants and their descendants in Europe. *Demographic Research*, 40, 1345-1374. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2019.40.46>

Optional

Herzer, D. (2019). A Note on the Effect of Religiosity on Fertility. *Demography*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00774-6>

Chabé-Ferret, B. (2019). Adherence to cultural norms and economic incentives: evidence from fertility timing decisions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 162, 24-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2019.04.003>

Carlsson, E. (2019). Fertility Intentions across Immigrant Generations in Sweden Do Patterns of Adaptation Differ by Gender and Origin? *Comparative Population Studies*, 43, 211-242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2019-02en>

11/18 – NO CLASS (NCFR meeting)

REVISED PROPOSAL DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL

PROPOSALS DISTRIBUTED FOR REVIEW VIA EMAIL

11/25 Men, Couples, and Fertility

Men

Joyner, K., Peters, H. E., Hynes, K., Sikora, A., Taber, J. R., & Rendall, M. S. (2012). The quality of male fertility data in major US surveys. *Demography*, 49(1), 101-124.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-011-0073-9>

Augustine, J. M., Nelson, T., & Edin, K. (2009). Why do poor men have children? Fertility intentions among low-income unmarried US fathers. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 624(1), 99-117.

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002716209334694>

Trimarchi, A., & Van Bavel, J. (2017). Education and the transition to fatherhood: The role of selection into union. *Demography*, 54(1), 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-016-0533-3>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-016-0533-3>

Couples

Testa, M. R., Cavalli, L., & Rosina, A. (2014). The effect of couple disagreement about child-timing intentions: A parity-specific approach. *Population and Development Review*, 40(1), 31-53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2014.00649.x>

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2014.00649.x>

Shreffler, K. M., Tiemeyer, S., McQuillan, J., Greil, A. L., & Spierling, T. (2018). Partner congruence on fertility intentions and values: Implications for birth outcomes. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 0265407518787232.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518787232>

Stykes, J. B. (2018). Methodological considerations in couples' fertility intentions: Missing men and the viability of women's proxy reports. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 22(8), 1164-1171. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-018-2501-6>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-018-2501-6>

Optional

Carlson, M. J., VanOrman, A. G., & Pilkauskas, N. V. (2013). Examining the antecedents of US nonmarital fatherhood. *Demography*, 50(4), 1421-1447. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-013-0201-9>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-013-0201-9>

Daugherty, J. (2016). How young men at high risk of fathering an unintended birth talk about their procreative identities. *Journal of Family Issues*, 37(13), 1817-1842.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X14551176>

Bauer, G., & Kneip, T. (2014). Dyadic fertility decisions in a life course perspective. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 21, 87-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2013.11.003>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2013.11.003>

12/2 Childlessness and Low Fertility

REVIEWS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL

PROPOSAL COMMENTS DISTRIBUTED VIA EMAIL

Childlessness

Gemmell, A. (2019). From Some to None? Fertility Expectation Dynamics of Permanently Childless Women. *Demography*, 56(1), 129-149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0739-7>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0739-7>

Hayford, S. R. (2013). Marriage (still) matters: The contribution of demographic change to trends in childlessness in the United States. *Demography*, 50(5), 1641-1661. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-013-0215-3>

Merz, E. M., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2012). The attitude toward voluntary childlessness in Europe: Cultural and institutional explanations. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 74(3), 587-600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00972.x>

Low Fertility and Policy

Brinton, M. C., & Lee, D. J. (2016). Gender-role ideology, labor market institutions, and post-industrial fertility. *Population and Development Review*, 405-433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.161>

Luci-Greulich, A., & Thévenon, O. (2013). The impact of family policies on fertility trends in developed countries. *European Journal of Population/Revue européenne de Démographie*, 29(4), 387-416. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10680-013-9295-4>

Gauthier, A. H. (2016). Governmental support for families and obstacles to fertility in East Asia and other industrialized regions. Ch. 11 in Rindfuss, R. R., & Choe, M. K. (Eds.) *Low Fertility, Institutions, and Their Policies: Variations across Industrialized Countries* New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32997-0_11

Optional

Sobotka, T., & Beaujouan, É. (2014). Two Is best? The persistence of a two-child family ideal in Europe. *Population and Development Review*, 40(3), 391-419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2014.00691.x>

Billingsley, S., & Ferrarini, T. (2014). Family policy and fertility intentions in 21 European countries. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76(2), 428-445. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12097>

Malak, N., Rahman, M. M., & Yip, T. A. (2019). Baby bonus, anyone? Examining heterogeneous responses to a pro-natalist policy. *Journal of Population Economics*, 1-42. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-019-00731-y>

12/9 FINAL PROPOSALS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL

12/12 FINAL EXAM PERIOD, 3:00-5:30 – Research Presentations

EMAIL PRESENTATIONS BY 2:00