

**Human Fertility and Family Planning**  
**Sociology 7280**  
**FALL 2021**  
**Monday 2:30-5:15**  
**Education 209**

Karen Benjamin 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 twice (for a total of 14%), presentation of research proposal (10%), and peer research proposal review (6%).

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. You do not need to provide a reference list unless you are citing research not assigned in that week's readings, though you should cite that week's readings within the essay.

### 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, come up with discussion questions to guide the discussion, 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 nor is it *just* coming up with questions – you are expected to make sure you identify the key research questions, motivating theoretical framework, and major findings. You should also try to connect the readings to each other. Each student will co-lead class discussion 2 times (7% each time, total=14%). 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 must use the National Survey of Family Growth (R:\CFDR\Public\Data\NSFG\ for Stata files and [https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nsfg/nsfg\\_2017\\_2019\\_puf.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nsfg/nsfg_2017_2019_puf.htm) for general information), which is the go-to for studying reproductive behavior in the U.S. You are expected to produce at least basic descriptives and cross-tabs. 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/or 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 during the final exam period. There is no final exam for the class.

### **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 OCTOBER 4<sup>th</sup>** via email. You must meet with me beforehand to discuss your topic.
- b. A first draft of your proposal is due **by noon on NOVEMBER 1<sup>st</sup>** via email. I will read through and comment on your proposal and return it to you within 10 days.
- c. **By noon on NOVEMBER 22<sup>nd</sup>** you must email your revised research proposal to me, and I will pass it along to a peer reviewer.
- d. **By noon on DECEMBER 6<sup>th</sup>** 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 DECEMBER 13<sup>th</sup>** via email.
- f. On **DECEMBER 15<sup>th</sup>** 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.

### **COVID19:**

Students are expected to follow BGSU COVID-19 protocols at all times, which includes wearing a face covering in all classroom, studio, lab, and office spaces for as long as a University mandate is in place. Failure to comply with these protocols may result in disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. Please refer to the BGSU COVID-19 website for the most current information about expectations and requirements.

## TOPIC SCHEDULE & ASSIGNED READINGS

### 8/30 Introduction, Overview, and Measurement

#### *World Population:*

Population Reference Bureau Data Sheet 2021 <https://interactives.prb.org/2021-wpds/data-sheet-download/>

#### *Measurement of Fertility:*

McFalls, J (2007). Population: A lively introduction, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition.” *Population Bulletin* 62(1), Washington DC: Population Reference Bureau. (only pages 5-8) --- available on Canvas under ‘files’---

#### *U.S. Fertility Trends & Differentials:*

Guzzo, K. B., & Hayford, S. R. (2020). Pathways to parenthood in social and family contexts: Decade in review, 2020. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(1), 117-144. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jomf.12618>

#### *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>

### 9/6 LABOR DAY – NO CLASS

### 9/13 The (First) Demographic Transition

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>

Hayford, S. R., & Agadjanian, V. (2019). Spacing, stopping, or postponing? Fertility desires in a sub-Saharan setting. *Demography*, 56(2), 573-594. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0754-8>

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>

#### *Optional*

Timæus, I. M., & Moultrie, T. A. (2020). Pathways to low fertility: 50 years of limitation,

curtailment, and postponement of childbearing. *Demography*, 57(1), 267-296.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-019-00848-5>

Bongaarts, J., & Casterline, J. B. (2018). From fertility preferences to reproductive outcomes in the developing world. *Population and Development Review*, 44(4), 793-809.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12197>

Gietel-Basten, S., & Scherbov, S. (2020). Exploring the ‘true value’ of replacement rate fertility. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 39(4), 763-772.  
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11113-019-09561-y>

### **9/20 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* 17(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010784028474>

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>

Berrington, A. (2021). Fertility desires, intentions, and behaviour. In Schneider, N.F. and Kreyenfeld, M., *Research Handbook on the Sociology of the Family* (Ch. 15, p. 248-262). Edward Elgar Publishing.  
<https://www.elgaronline.com/downloadpdf/edcoll/9781788975537/9781788975537.00025.pdf>

### *Optional*

Balbo, N., Billari, F. C., & Mills, M. (2013). Fertility in advanced societies: A review of research. *European Journal of Population*, 29(1), 1-38.  
<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s10680-012-9277-y.pdf>

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>

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>

### **9/27 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>

Cai, Y., & Feng, W. (2021). The social and sociological consequences of China's one-child policy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 47. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-090220-032839>

## **10/4 Contraception and Abortion**

### **PROPOSAL IDEA SHORT DRAFT DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL**

#### *Contraception*

Guttmacher Fact Sheet on Contraceptive Use: <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/contraceptive-use-united-states>

Guttmacher Fact Sheet on Contraceptive Method Choice: <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/contraceptive-use-united-states>

Guttmacher Fact Sheet on Contraceptive Effectiveness <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/contraceptive-effectiveness-united-states>

Gemmill, A., Sedlander, E., & Bornstein, M. (2021). Variation in self-perceived fecundity

among young adult U.S. women. *Women's Health Issues*, 31(1), 31-39.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1049386720300670>

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>

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'---

#### *Abortion*

Guttmacher Fact Sheet on Abortion, U.S.: <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/induced-abortion-united-states>

Guttmacher Fact Sheet on Abortion, Worldwide: <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/induced-abortion-worldwide>

Lindberg, L., Kost, K., Maddow-Zimet, I., Desai, S., & Zolna, M. (2020). Abortion reporting in the United States: an assessment of three national fertility surveys. *Demography*, 57(3), 899-925. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-020-00886-4>

Rocca, C. H., Samari, G., Foster, D. G., Gould, H., & Kimport, K. (2020). Emotions and decision rightness over five years following an abortion: An examination of decision difficulty and abortion stigma. *Social Science & Medicine*, 248, 112704.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277953619306999>

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*

Eeckhaut, M. C., Rendall, M. S., & Zvavitch, P. (2021). Women's Use of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception for Birth Timing and Birth Stopping. *Demography*, 58(4), 1327-1346. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-9386084>

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>

Stevenson, A. J., Genadek, K. R., Yeatman, S., Mollborn, S., & Menken, J. A. (2021). The impact of contraceptive access on high school graduation. *Science Advances*, 7(19), <https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/7/19/eabf6732.abstract>

#### **10/11 Childbearing Intentions, Desires, and Behaviors**

Hartnett, C. S., & Gemmill, A. (2020). Recent trends in U.S. childbearing intentions. *Demography*, 57(6), 2035-2045. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-020-00929-w>

Rackin, H. M., & Bachrach, C. A. (2016). Assessing the predictive value of fertility expectations through a cognitive–social model. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 35(4), 527-551. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11113-016-9395-z>

- 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>
- Gemmill, 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>

### Optional

- Finer, L. B., Lindberg, L. D., & Desai, S. (2018). A prospective measure of unintended pregnancy in the United States. *Contraception*, 98(6), 522-527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2018.05.012>
- Sennott, C., & Yeatman, S. (2018). Conceptualizing childbearing ambivalence: A social and dynamic perspective. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(4), 888-901. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12489>
- 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 and Medicine*, 174, 133-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.12.024>

### 10/18 Socioeconomic Differences in Reproductive Attitudes and Behavior

- Adserà, A. (2017). Education and fertility in the context of rising inequality. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 15, 63-92. [https://austriaca.at/Oxc1aa5576\\_0x003905ed.pdf](https://austriaca.at/Oxc1aa5576_0x003905ed.pdf)
- 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>
- 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>
- Gomez, A. M., Arteaga, S., & Freihart, B. (2021). Structural Inequity and Pregnancy Desires in Emerging Adulthood. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 1-12. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-020-01854-0>
- 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>

*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>

Mooyaart, J. E., Liefbroer, A. C., & Billari, F. C. (2021). The changing relationship between socio-economic background and family formation in four European countries. *Population Studies*, 1-17. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00324728.2021.1901969>

Wright, L. (2019). Union transitions and fertility within first premarital cohabitations in Canada: diverging patterns by education?. *Demography*, 56(1), 151-167.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0741-0>

**10/25 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>

Frejka, T., Goldscheider, F., & Lappegård, T. (2018). The Two-Part Gender Revolution, Women's Second Shift and Changing Cohort Fertility. *Comparative Population Studies*, 43, 99-130. <https://doi.org/10.12765/CPoS-2018-09en>

Fanelli, E., & Profeta, P. (In press). Fathers' Involvement in the Family, Fertility, and Maternal Employment: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe. *Demography*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-9411306>

Bueno, X., & Brinton, M. C. (2019). Gender egalitarianism, perceived economic insecurity, and fertility intentions in Spain: A qualitative analysis. *Population Studies*, 73(2), 247-260.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00324728.2019.1604979>

*Optional*

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>

Stanfors, M. (2014). Fertility and the fast-track: Continued childbearing among professionals in Sweden, 1991–2009. *Demographic Research*, 31, 421-458. <https://www.demographic-research.org/volumes/vol31/15/31-15.pdf>

Landivar, L. C. (2020). First-Birth Timing and the Motherhood Wage Gap in 140 Occupations.

*Socius*, 6, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2378023120939424>

## 11/1 Macro and Micro Influences

### PROPOSAL 1<sup>ST</sup> DRAFTS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL

#### *Macrolevel Factors*

Comolli, C. L., Neyer, G., Andersson, G., Dommermuth, L., Fallesen, P., Jalovaara, M., Klænger Jónssen, A., Kolks, M., & Lappegård, T. (2021). Beyond the economic gaze: Childbearing during and after recessions in the Nordic countries. *European Journal of Population*, 37(2), 473-520. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10680-020-09570-0>

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>

Caudillo, M. L., & Villarreal, A. (2021). The Opioid epidemic and nonmarital childbearing in the United States, 2000–2016. *Demography*, 58(1), 345-378. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00703370-8937348>

#### *Microlevel Factors*

Pessin, L., Rutigliano, R., & Potter, M. H. (In Press). Time, money, and entry into parenthood: The role of (grand) parental support. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12782>

Comolli, C. L. (2021). Resources, aspirations and first births during the Great Recession. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 48, 100405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2021.100405>

Lindberg, L. D., VandeVusse, A., Mueller, J., & Kirstein, M. (2020). Early impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic: Findings from the 2020 Guttmacher Survey of Reproductive Health Experiences. [https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report\\_pdf/early-impacts-covid-19-pandemic-findings-2020-guttmacher-survey-reproductive-health.pdf](https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/early-impacts-covid-19-pandemic-findings-2020-guttmacher-survey-reproductive-health.pdf)

#### *Optional*

Min, S., & Taylor, M. G. (2018). Racial and ethnic variation in the relationship between student loan debt and the transition to first birth. *Demography*, 55(1), 165-188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-017-0643-6>

Su, J. H. (2019). Local employment conditions and unintended pregnancy. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 81(2), 380-396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12546>

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>

## 11/8 Timing and Relationship Contexts

#### *Fertility Timing and the Life Course*

Testa, M. R., & Rampazzo, F. (2018). From intentions to births. *Vienna Yearbook of Population Research*, 16, 177-198. <https://www.austriaca.at/0xc1aa5576%200x003a2735.pdf>

Smith, C., Strohschein, L., & Crosnoe, R. (2018). Family histories and teen pregnancy in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(5), 1244-1258. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jomf.12512>

### *Fertility and Unions*

Barber, J. S., Miller, W., Kusunoki, Y., Hayford, S. R., & Guzzo, K. B. (2019). Intimate relationship dynamics and changing desire for pregnancy among young women. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 51(3), 143-152. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12119>

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>

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*

Guzzo, K. B., & Hayford, S. R. (In press). Adolescent reproductive attitudes and knowledge effects on early adult unintended and nonmarital fertility across gender. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 100430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2021.100430>

Offiong, A., Powell, T. W., Gemmill, A., & Marcell, A. V. (2021). "I can try and plan, but still get pregnant": The complexity of pregnancy intentions and reproductive health decision-making for adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 90, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2021.05.007>

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>

## **11/15 Reproductive Behaviors among Marginalized Groups**

### *Race-Ethnicity-Immigration*

Qian, Z., & Lichter, D. T. (In press). Racial pairings and fertility: Do interracial couples have fewer children?. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12758>

Barber, J. S., Guzzo, K. B., Budnick, J., Kusunoki, Y., Hayford, S. R., & Miller, W. (2021). Black-White differences in pregnancy desire during the transition to adulthood. *Demography*, 58(2), 603-630. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.12119>

Aiken, A. R., & Potter, J. E. (2013). Are Latina women ambivalent about pregnancies they are trying to prevent? Evidence from the Border Contraceptive Access Study. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, 45(4), 196-203. <https://doi.org/10.1363/4519613>

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*

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>

Everett, B. G., Mollborn, S., Jenkins, V., Limburg, A., & Diamond, L. M. (2020). Racial/ethnic differences in unwanted births: Moderation by sexual orientation. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 82(4), 1234-1249. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jomf.12656>

### *Optional*

Wilson, B. (2020). Understanding how immigrant fertility differentials vary over the reproductive life course. *European Journal of Population*, 36(3), 465-498.  
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10680-019-09536-x>

Geronimus, A. T. (2003). Damned if you do: Culture, identity, privilege, and teenage childbearing in the United States. *Social Science and 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)

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>

### **11/22 Religion and Religiosity**

#### **PROPOSAL 2<sup>ND</sup> DRAFTS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL (*I will distribute to peer reviewers*)**

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>

Buber-Ennsner, I., & Berghammer, C. (2021). Religiosity and the realisation of fertility intentions: A comparative study of eight European countries. *Population, Space and Place*, 27(6) 24-33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.2433>

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>

DeRose, L. F. (2021). Gender equity, religion, and fertility in Europe and North America.

*Population and Development Review*, 47(1), 41-55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/padr.12373>

### Optional

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>

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>

Bein, C., Mynarska, M., & Gauthier, A. H. (2021). Do costs and benefits of children matter for religious people? Perceived consequences of parenthood and fertility intentions in Poland. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 53(3), 419-435. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-biosocial-science/article/do-costs-and-benefits-of-children-matter-for-religious-people-perceived-consequences-of-parenthood-and-fertility-intentions-in-poland/3E75F0B32A2B9661BA82551A2E40AE2F>

## 11/29 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>

### Couples

Novelli, M., Cazzola, A., Angeli, A., & Pasquini, L. (2021). Fertility intentions in times of rising economic uncertainty: Evidence from Italy from a gender perspective. *Social Indicators Research*, 154(1), 257-284. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-020-02554-x>

Duvander, A. Z., Fahlén, S., Brandén, M., & Ohlsson-Wijk, S. (2020). Who makes the decision to have children? Couples' childbearing intentions and actual childbearing. *Advances in Life Course Research*, 43, 100286. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2019.04.016>

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>

### Optional

Dudel, C., & Klüsener, S. (2021). Male–female fertility differentials across 17 high-income countries: Insights from a new data resource. *European Journal of Population*, 37(2),

417-441. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10680-020-09575-9>

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>

## 12/6 Childlessness and Low Fertility

### PEER REVIEWS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL (*I will distribute peer reviews by 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>

#### *Childlessness & Delayed Fertility*

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>

Sobotka, T., & Beaujouan, É. (2018). Late motherhood in low-fertility countries: Reproductive intentions, trends and consequences. In *Preventing Age Related Fertility Loss* (pp. 11-29). Springer, Cham. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-14857-1\\_2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-14857-1_2)

#### *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*, 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](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-32997-0_11)

#### *Optional*

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>

Gietel-Basten, S., Han, X., & Cheng, Y. (2019). Assessing the impact of the “one-child policy” in China: a synthetic control approach. *PloS ONE*, 14(11), e0220170. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0220170>

Goodkind, D. (2019). Formal comment on “assessing the impact of the ‘one-child policy’ in China: a synthetic control approach”. *PloS ONE* 14(11), e0222705. <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0222705>

**12/13 FINAL PROPOSALS DUE BY NOON VIA EMAIL**

**12/15 FINAL EXAM PERIOD, 3:00-5:30 – Research Presentations**

**EMAIL PRESENTATIONS BY 2:00**