Hispanic Familism Reconsidered: Ethnic Differences in Perceived Value of Children and Fertility Intentions

Caroline Sten Hartnett & Emilio A. Parrado

ABSTRACT

Familism has often been described as a cultural trait that might explain why the fertility of immigrant and native Hispanic women remains higher than among non-Hispanic Whites. Still few studies have directly analyzed attitudes towards childbearing among Hispanics and how they vary from Whites or between immigrants and natives. Our paper contributes to the discussion of the role of familism in explaining Hispanic family patterns by focusing on two dimensions of childbearing orientation: the social value of children and fertility intentions. Using data from the 2002 and 2006-08 NSFG we find little support for the idea that familism undergirds ethnic differentials in fertility for native Hispanics. The findings are consistent irrespective of whether we focus on men or women suggesting that gender dimensions do not drive differences in fertility between native born Hispanics and Whites. However, there are some differences in the perceived value of children between foreign born Hispanics and Whites, particularly among men, and these differences could contribute to fertility differentials between the two groups. Overall, findings support perspectives that stress the role of socioeconomic characteristics and migration experiences over cultural orientations in explaining ethnic fertility differentials.

Despite evidence that the fertility of U.S. born and immigrant Hispanic women has been declining over time and across generations (Parrado and Morgan, 2008) it has remained higher than among non-Hispanic (NH) Whites for many decades. Pooled data for 2000-2008 from the June fertility supplements of the Current Population Survey show the average number of children ever born to women 40-44 to be 1.8 among native Whites compared to 2.1 and 2.5 among native and immigrant Hispanic, respectively. This implies that compared to NH Whites, fertility is 17 and 39% higher among native and immigrant Hispanic women, respectively. Period fertility estimates also indicate higher fertility rates for Hispanics than Whites (Martin et al 2009). These differences, together with immigration, have raised concerns about Hispanic impact on the social and economic fabric of the U.S. as well as prospects for new immigrants' incorporation.

A central question surrounding discussions about Hispanic fertility and family more generally is the extent to which observed behavioral differences from Whites and within group differences between immigrants and natives reflect the particular social position of the group or specific cultural orientations emanating from socialization processes. The relative weight of structure versus culture in explaining Hispanic behaviors has been the focus of considerable debate. An organizing notion in studies emphasizing culture is the idea that Hispanics possess a more familistic orientation than Anglos which translates into higher fertility and more rigid family arrangements. Alternatively, those emphasizing structure have argued that these differences stem from disparities in social position or life-course experiences and should disappear once variation in opportunities are taken into consideration. While disparities in social position are well-established, few studies have directly investigated differences in cultural orientations between Hispanics and other groups (Fuligni, Tseng, and Lam, 1999).

Our paper contributes to the discussion on the role of familism in structuring ethnic differences in fertility in several ways. We provide a more precise notion of familism directly connected with childbearing that builds on the idea of the "social value of children" and assess its variation by ethnicity and nativity. In addition, we investigate differences in childbearing intentions to assess the extent to which they can account for subsequent fertility differentials. The empirical analysis formulates a more comprehensive model of attitudes towards children that considers both indicators of social position as well as past life-course experiences to account

for variation across groups. In addition, we focus on both men and women to assess the extent to which gender differences in attitudes towards children could translate into differential fertility behavior.

Hispanic familism and childbearing: social value of children and fertility intentions

A long tradition of demographic research has highlighted the importance of culture and values for understanding fertility behavior. The European Fertility Project revealed that fertility change tended to spread quickly within areas sharing language and other cultural characteristics rather than being closely tied to economic conditions (Watkins 1990). Lesthaege (1983) and Caldwell (1981) also concluded that fertility decline in developed regions can be traced to cultural change, specifically the rise of secular individualism. Westoff (1978), Ryder (1979) and others have extended the list of cultural changes that discouraged high fertility to include changes in women's status and cultural norms surrounding marriage and fertility.

Other research has focused on the relationship between attitudes and fertility outcomes at the individual level, rather than the macro level. The "social value of children" studies of the 1970s sought to explain how women's perceptions of the emotional and economic costs and benefits of children predicted their intended family size (Arnold et al 1975; Bulatao 1979; Bulatao 1981). Variation in the perceived social value of children was useful for predicting fertility intentions, though preferences were generally less predictive than socioeconomic characteristics (Ibid). Subsequent research has continued to investigate the relationship between culture and individual fertility behavior and has found that the behaviors modeled by reference groups (i.e. friends and acquaintances) are important in shaping women's fertility goals and outcomes (Bongaarts and Watkins 1996 ; Clay and Zuiches 1980; Hackett 2009). Further, findings by Schoen et al (1997) suggest that women's childbearing intentions are influenced by the social value of children within the woman's community. These authors found a strong correlation between anticipating that a child will improve social relationships and the intention to have a child. More recently, Hakim (2003) has proposed a preference theory of childbearing decision-making that highlights the salience of the value attached to children and family life for explaining fertility differentials in low-fertility countries.

Culture and attitudes could also be instrumental in explaining ethno-racial differences in fertility behavior. As applied to the case of Hispanics, cultural explanations have tended to stress

the importance of familism as a core element of the Hispanic culture to account for particular family and fertility behaviors that cannot be explained by the social and economic position of the group (Bean and Tienda 1987). Familism refers to a collective orientation, a property of the group, by which family roles and obligations are highly valued (Landale and Oropesa 2007; Vega 1995). Usually the assumption is that these cultural traits are brought from Mexico and other sending countries and then maintained in the U.S. While there is considerable debate as to the extent to which these orientations are maintained among U.S. born Hispanics, the underlying expectation is that Hispanics' commitment to family life is stronger and qualitatively distinct from NH Whites and that these preferences translate into differential family decisions.

Indeed, there is some empirical support for this assertion. Attitudinal surveys have shown that compared with NH Whites, Hispanics are more supportive of marriage, less supportive of divorce and remaining single, and less supportive of individual autonomy within marriage (Oropesa & Gorman 2000; Trent & South 1992). A factor analysis by Sabogal et. al. (1987) which used 14 items (such as familial obligations, perceived support from family, and family as referents) demonstrated that responses by Hispanic were significantly more familistic than non-Hispanics. Likewise, in the 1994 General Social Survey, Hispanics reported having less favorable attitudes towards childlessness than did non-Hispanics (Koropeckyj-Cox & Pendel 2007) and several authors have observed a relationship between indicators of acculturation and a desire for fewer children (Molina 1994, Ford 1994, Minnis 2001, Sorensen 1985).

Hispanics' more familistic orientation has been argued to influence actual family behavior and contribute to differences from NH Whites. According to Blea (1992), "the major life objective for women is marriage… Chicanas have been socialized to believe that marriage, children, and family are most valued aspirations." The relatively early marriage of young Hispanic women have sometimes been highlighted as an example of the role of family orientation and traditional gender roles on demographic outcomes (Bean and Tienda 1987; Flores, et al. 2004).

However, the idea that Hispanics have strong familistic orientations has also been challenged. It is often used as a "catch-all" to explain residual differences in family behaviors between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. Critics complain that an emphasis on cultural differences perpetuates pejorative stereotypes and leads to "blaming the victim" for negative outcomes. In addition, some findings do not fit the typical pattern of Hispanic familism. For example, Trent &

South (1992) found that Hispanics are actually more accepting of nonmarital childbearing compared with Whites and Blacks.

Despite its potential significance for explaining differences in outcomes, studies specifically assessing cultural differences between Hispanics and Whites, especially as they relate to fertility, are rare. It is unclear the extent to which Hispanics childbearing preferences and orientations differ from Whites or how they vary between immigrants and natives. Our study specifically addresses the issue of differences in orientations and preferences as they relate to fertility behavior. We evaluate the salience of Hispanic familism in two different ways. First, building on the notion of the social value of children we investigate the extent to which Hispanic immigrants and their descendants attach different rewards to childbearing relative to Whites. Specifically, we expect a familistic orientation to correspond with a higher perceived social value of children which would imply that Hispanic women will perceive the rewards and benefits of having children to be higher than among Whites. The extent to which this orientation varies between immigrants and natives is unclear; however, since socialization into familism will likely be lower among women born in the U.S., we expect the preference to be particularly strong among immigrants.

Second, we directly investigate differences in fertility intentions by ethnicity and nativity. Whether individuals intend to have additional children is a direct measure of their childbearing preferences and expectations and has been found to be consistently associated with subsequent behavior. In our case, however, intentions to have additional children directly capture preferences for larger families and a more pro-natalist orientation. Specifically, we expect that Hispanics will intend to have additional children at a higher rate than NH Whites and that stronger pro-natalist orientation will be particularly pronounced among immigrants.

In addition to more precisely measuring attitudes towards childbearing decisions we contribute to the discussion of the role of familism in explaining Hispanic family traits by extending the analysis of preferences to men. Most prior studies of fertility behavior and orientations tend to exclusively focus on women. The underlying assumption is that women are the central decision-making unit in childbearing behavior. Prior research, though, has questioned this assumption. Studies have shown that men and women differ in their fertility intentions and their attitudes towards childbearing. (Koropeckyj-Cox & Pendell, 2007) and that men are important to the process of fertility decision-making, whether as collaborative partners or passive

ones. Even when the couple does not engage in explicit decision-making, men's childbearing preferences may translate into eagerness or reluctance to use contraception, and a woman likely takes into account what she perceives as her partner's readiness to be a parent when she makes her own calculations.

The exclusive focus on women might be especially problematic in the context of strong familism or rigid gender roles where lack of power might prevent women from contradicting men in fertility decisions (Sable et al 2009). This could be the case for Hispanics, in particular, since one of the defining elements of familism is a preference for a rigid gender roles. One potential outcome is that Hispanic women might not exhibit a stronger pro-natalist orientation relative to Whites, however, differences in men's attitudes and their relatively higher power position with respect to women might undergird fertility differentials. Accordingly, our analysis examines both women and men's orientations towards the social value of children and future fertility intentions. The extent to which familistic attitudes vary by gender is expected to be an indicator of the role of gender inequality in affecting fertility differentials.

DATA AND METHODS

Data for the analysis come from the 2002 and 2006-08 cycles of the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). We restrict the sample to all Hispanics and native born NH White respondents, both men and women, which results in a total of 8,105 Hispanic and 10,786 NH White respondents, respectively. Following our theoretical discussion, the empirical analysis is separated into two parts. The first part investigates ethnic differences in the social value of children. The second part elaborates on ethnic differentials in fertility intentions. Together, the two dimensions capture constitutive elements of familistic orientations.

Table 1 list the variables included in the analysis together with their definitions. The perceived social value of children is measured using three attitudinal questions in the NSFG that capture the extent to which people believe that children are related to happiness and personal gratification. Question 1 asks respondents whether they agree with the statement: "The rewards of being a parent are worth it, despite the cost and the work it takes." Question 2 inquires about agreement with the statement: "People can't be happy unless they have children."[1] Answers to Questions 1 and 2 include four mutually exclusive categories: strongly agree, agree, disagree, or

[1] This question is only available in the 2006-08 version of the NSFG.

strongly disagree. In a small minority of cases, the respondents insist they can neither agree nor disagree; these cases were discarded. Question 3 asks: "If it turns out that you do not have any children, would that bother you…" Question 3 includes the following mutually exclusive categories: not at all, a little, somewhat, or a great deal, and is asked only of those who do not have biological or adopted children at the time of the survey.

The NSFG data also asks respondents about their intention to have additional children. Specifically, the survey asks "Looking to the future, do you (and [name of current partner]) intend to have (a/nother) baby?"[2] Respondents who are sterile (or whose partners are sterile) are excluded. About 1% do not know what their intentions are and are grouped with those who do not intend to have a child in the future. Using this information, parity-specific fertility intentions (Morgan, 1982) that report respondent's intention to have additional children by number of prior births were constructed.

Model specification

Table 1 also lists the explanatory variables in our analysis. Descriptive statistics by ethnicity and nativity are reported in Appendix 1. The dummy indicators of whether a person is Hispanic - foreign born; Hispanic - native born, or NH White - native born are our main variables of interest since they capture ethnic and nativity differences in childbearing attitudes. In addition, the models control for demographic background characteristics such as age, number of children ever born, marital status, and whether the person was raised in an intact family. Socioeconomic resources are captured by variables measuring years of education, poverty status, whether the woman is a homemaker, and religious upbringing. These variables have been found in prior literature to directly relate to fertility decisions.

In addition to standard background measures our model incorporates prior life-course experiences as predictors. Specifically, we control for whether the respondent had a teenage birth, the number of unintended pregnancies (women) or births (men), and the number of prior children born outside of marriage. Given the considerable ethnic and nativity disparities in life-course trajectories these variables are expected to be instrumental in explaining ethnic and nativity differences in attitudes towards childbearing.

[2] In the 2002 wave, cohabiting women were asked for their own intentions. In the 2006-08 wave, cohabiting women were asked for their joint intentions with their partner. Women who were pregnant at the time of the survey (and men whose partners were pregnant at the time of the survey) were asked for intentions after the current pregnancy

ANALYSIS

Social value of children

Descriptive results

Table 2 reports descriptive results for ethnic and nativity differences in the social value attached to children by gender. Overall, respondents in all groups seem to agree that parenting is a worthwhile endeavor. Only 3-5% of women and men disagree or strongly disagree with the statement "the rewards of being a parent are worth it, despite the cost and work it takes." There are more differences across groups among women compared with men, but these are differences in emphasis (agree versus strongly agree) rather than differences in salient orientations towards children. Where differences exist, they actually contradict the image of strong Hispanic familism. NH White women are more likely to strongly agree with the idea that the rewards of being a parent are worth it (64%) compared to immigrant (56%) or native (53%) Hispanic women.

Results show more variation in answers to the question "people can't really be happy unless they have children." The difference is primarily among the foreign born with consistent patterns across gender. Immigrant Hispanics are much more likely to agree with the statement than native NH Whites. Almost 37 and 40% of immigrant Hispanic women and men agreed with the statement compared to merely 3 and 6% among White women and men, respectively. The proportion agreeing is substantially smaller among native born Hispanics but remains higher than among Whites and results are again applicable to both women and men.

There is also evidence of ethnic and nativity differences in answers to the question "If it turns out that you do not have any children, would that bother you: not at all, a little, somewhat, or a great deal?" with some variation by gender. Among foreign born Hispanic women 21% said it would not bother them at all to remain childless compared to 15% among native born Hispanics and Whites (statistically significant), which again does not support the image of strong Hispanic familism. A higher proportion of foreign born Hispanic men reported being "a great deal" bothered by remaining childless than native Hispanics and Whites. Among men, though, the differences across groups seem to stem more from emphasis since the variation is mainly between being bothered somewhat or a great deal.

Multivariate results

The next set of analyses investigates differences in the perceived social value of children in a multivariate context. Tables 3a and 3b report results from logistic regression models predicting the likelihood that women and men would agree or strongly agree with the statement that the rewards of childrearing are worth the cost. We report results from 3 models; Model 1 includes ethnic and nativity indicators as well as socioeconomic background characteristics as predictors; Model 2 adds controls for life-course experiences; and Model 3 tests for interaction effect between life-course experiences and ethnicity and nativity. The models are estimated separately for men and women.

Consistent with the descriptive results, Model 1 shows relatively minor ethnic and nativity differentials. The consistency across groups is striking – a very high proportion of respondents believe childbearing is worthwhile, regardless of ethnicity or nativity. Native born Hispanics appear to be marginally less likely to value childbearing than native Whites (-.252). However, the effect disappears once we control for other characteristics in Model 2. There is no difference between Whites and foreign born Hispanics. Controlling for socioeconomic and life course variables (holding them constant at their means), the predicted probability of agreeing with the statement is nearly identical across groups -- 0.96 for White and foreign born Hispanic women and 0.95 for native born Hispanic women. Among men, only foreign born Hispanics show a stronger preference for childbearing than Whites. The effect remains statistically significant even after controlling for life course experiences in Models 2 and 3, but is very small: Holding socioeconomic and life course variables constant at their means, the predicted probability of agreeing is 0.96 for White and native born Hispanic men, and 0.98 for foreign born Hispanic men.

Background characteristics affect the social value of children in the expected direction with similar results for women and men. Results show that perceived rewards of children decline with age but are positively associated with prior number of children, being married or divorced, and years of education. Some differences across gender do surface though. While religion background does not have a significant effect on perceived rewards of childbearing for women, among men, being raised without a religion significantly reduces the likelihood of valuing the rewards of children (-.683).

More pronounced gender disparities are found for the effect of prior life-course experiences in Models 2. Specifically, Table 3a shows that among women a prior teenage birth (-

.294), number of children born outside of marriage (-.356), and number of unintended pregnancies (-.130), in all cases significantly reduce the likelihood of valuing the rewards of childbearing at the 0.10 level. On the other hand, Table 3b shows that these effects are not present among men. Prior literature has highlighted that the detrimental consequences of early and unintended childbearing might be higher for women than men (Montgomery 1996; Willis & Haaga 1996). Such differences might explain gender differences in the salience of the effects for understanding perceived social value of children.

Model 3 tests for whether these effects vary by ethnicity and nativity. In general, native and foreign born Hispanics are over represented in the prevalence of detrimental life-course experiences (see Appendix 1). In addition to compositional differences there is some reason to believe that their effects might also be different, due to differences in expectations for childbearing or differences social support (Marin & Marin, 1991 p13; Graham 2009 p77). Among women, interaction effects in Model 3 show that native born Hispanics with children born outside of marriage are marginally less likely to value the rewards of childbearing than comparable White women (-.365). Among men, a stronger negative effect is found for the interaction between native born and teenage birth (-1.388). Overall, the costs of stressful childbearing experiences appear to be higher for native born Hispanics than Whites.

Tables 4a and 4b reports results from similar logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement 'People can't really be happy unless they have children' by gender. Overall, results show evidence that Hispanics associate other people's happiness with childbearing more than Whites. In all cases US-born and foreign born Hispanics men and women are significantly more likely to agree with the idea that children are important for happiness than Whites and the differences remain significant even when controlling for background characteristics and stressful childbearing events. The effect is particularly strong among the foreign born and modest among native born Hispanics. For instance, holding socioeconomic and life course variables at their means, the predicted probability of agreeing with the statement is 0.03 for White women, 0.07 for native born Hispanic women, and 0.24 for foreign born Hispanic women. For men, predicted probabilities are 0.07 for Whites, 0.11 for native born Hispanics, and 0.28 for foreign born Hispanics.

The effect of demographic and socioeconomic background show that the likelihood of associating happiness and childbearing declines with years of education and increase among poor

women and men. Among women, those with no religion are less likely to agree with the statement (the relationship is non-significant for men). Among men, agreement appears to be stronger among married individuals, which is consistent with the evidence suggesting that men tend to value marriage and childbearing as a package rather than separate processes. Introducing past life-course predictors in Model 2 shows that only among women the prior number of unintended pregnancies is associated with lower agreement and Model 3 shows that these effects do not vary by ethnicity and nativity.

Our final attitudinal measure assesses concerns over remaining childless. Table 5 reports coefficients from ordered logistic regression models predicting women and men's answers to the question "If it turns out that you do not have any children, would that bother you: not at all (1), a little (2), somewhat (3), or a great deal (4)." Negative coefficients indicate lower likelihood of being bothered about remaining childless. Among women, results show no statistically significant differences between Whites and either US-born Hispanics or Hispanic immigrants in attitudes towards remaining childless. Based on the model presented in Table 5, the predicted probability of being bothered "a great deal" by childlessness is 0.40 for White women, 0.37 for native born Hispanic women, and 0.36 for foreign born Hispanic women. Only foreign born Hispanic men (0.273) appear to be more bothered by the prospect of remaining childless than Whites but the difference is not present among native born Hispanic men. For men, predicted probabilities of being bothered "a great deal" are 0.27 for Whites, 0.26 for native born Hispanics, and 0.33 for foreign born Hispanics (holding control variables constant at their means).

Again, results do not support the image of a strong familistic orientation among Hispanics. In order to investigate the possibility that the findings might be driven by confining the analysis to respondents with no children, we conducted separate analyses limiting the sample to the youngest women and men (15-19 and 15-24) where the proportion childless is most similar across racial-ethnic groups. Results (not reported) show a similar pattern from the one described for the whole sample. Only foreign born Hispanic men appear to be more inclined to be bothered by the prospect of remaining childless relative to Whites and the magnitude of the difference is small.

The effects of demographic and social background characteristics in Table 5 show that they affect attitudes towards childlessness in the expected direction with consistent results for women and men. Being concerned about remaining childless negatively relates to respondent's

age; having a more secular upbringing; and poverty status. However, it is positively associated with being in a union and, interestingly, in conjunction with higher levels of education. This finding is consistent with recent studies finding a disjunction between intended and completed fertility especially among highly educated women.

Parity-specific fertility intentions

Descriptive results

Table 6 reports the proportion of women and men intending to have additional children by parity. Cross-group comparisons show two consistent patterns applicable to men and women: there is evidence of a more familistic orientation among Hispanic and this orientation could originate in the immigrant population. First, at all parities Hispanics, both immigrants and natives, are more likely to intend to have additional children than Whites. Focusing on the transition to third birth (parity 2) shows that 37 and 25 percent of immigrant and native Hispanic women, respectively, intend to have an additional child compared to 14 percent among Whites. The difference holds for men: Results show that at parity 2, 46 and 34 percent of immigrant and native Hispanic men, respectively intend to have additional children compared to 18 percent among Whites.

There is consistent evidence across parities that the intention to have additional children declines between immigrant and natives. Except for parity 0 the proportion of native Hispanic women and men intending to have additional children is in between the proportions for immigrant Hispanics and native Whites. This corresponds to the notion that familistic orientations decline among native Hispanics, compared to their immigrant counterparts, in association with assimilation.

Most of the discussion about Hispanic cultural traits, though, is not exclusively about whether differences exist but the extent to which they can be accounted for by structural conditions. While descriptive results document higher intended childbearing, it is unclear the extent to which they remain after controlling for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. The next set of results investigates this issue.

Multivariate results

Tables 7a and 7b reports estimates from parity-specific logistic regression models predicting the likelihood of intending to have additional children for women and men. Results

show that even after accounting for demographic, socioeconomic, and life-course characteristics foreign born Hispanic women and men maintain higher fertility intentions at all parities than Whites. This is consistent with the emphasis on familism for explaining Hispanic immigrant fertility patterns. At the same time though, results show that much of the higher fertility intentions among native Hispanics disappear once we control for structural conditions. Only among lower parities (0 and 1) do native Hispanic women maintain higher fertility intentions than Whites. Among men, the pattern is less consistent. Native born Hispanic men do not have higher intentions at parity 1, but higher preferences reemerge at parity 2. Overall, though, results suggest that while intentions might be relevant for understanding immigrant fertility differentials, among native born Hispanics, preferences might explain the lower prevalence of childlessness or one-child families among Hispanics relative to White but they are not consistent with the idea of desire for large families of 3 or more children.

Socioeconomic predictors affect intentions in the expected direction and in a manner that is consistent across women and men. In general, being raised with a non-religious background decreases the intention to have a first birth, while growing up in an intact family works in the opposite direction. Higher levels of education increase birth intentions at lower parities and being poor decreases it. Prior life course experiences are also important determinants of childbearing intentions with detrimental experiences, such as having had a teenage birth and number of unintended pregnancies reducing individuals' willingness to have additional children.

CONCLUSION

For native born Hispanics, we find almost no evidence of differences with Whites in cultural norms related to childbearing. We find a very small positive association between Hispanic ethnicity and two measures of familistic orientation: the belief that children are essential for happiness, and the liklihood of intending a first or second birth. We found no significant relationship between native born Hispanics and Whites for several measures, once structural and life course factors are controlled. These measures include whether the respondent agrees that the rewards of childrearing are worth the costs, whether the respondent would be bothered by remaining childless, and the intention to have a higher-parity birth. We conclude there is little evidence in this data that would suggest stronger pronatalism among native born

Hispanics, compared with Whites. Moreover, for native born Hispanics, the pattern of results is nearly identical for women and men, so the attitudes and fertility intentions of men do not seem to be instrumental in explaining racial-ethnic differences in fertility.

For Hispanics who are foreign born, we find the same pattern of results but often with slightly larger and more significant coefficients than for native born Hispanics. Notably, foreign born Hispanic are much more likely to believe that children are essential for happiness, compared with Whites, and at each parity they are more likely to intend a future child. Again, there are no differences between NH Whites and foreign born Hispanic women on two measures – agreeing that the rewards of being a parent are worth it and being bothered by childlessness. Among men, however, foreign born Hispanics are more likely to agree that the rewards of being a parent are worth it and are more likely to be bothered by childlessness. In sum, fertility differentials between foreign born Hispanics and Whites could be explained, at least in part, by stronger familistic orientations among both women and men, but particularly among men.

The majority of Hispanic respondents are of Mexican origin, so we find essentially the same results when the Hispanic groups are limited to Mexicans, as we would expect. Coefficients for Hispanics of other national origins are similar to the Mexican-origin coefficients, which reaffirms the decision to stratify by immigration status rather than national origin.

Together, we take our results to mean that the case for pro-natalist attitudes among native born Hispanics may have been overstated. Among foreign born Hispanics, there does seem to be some evidence of more favorable attitudes towards childbearing. Presumably, these are attitudes that immigrants bring from their home countries. Despite the rapid fall in fertility in many parts of Latin America, including Mexico (where the Total Fertility Rate is now 2.1), and substantial changes in family behaviors, Latin Americans continue to have families that are more extended and more interdependent compared to White families in the U.S. (Phinney et al 2000, Landale & Oropesa 2007).

Our pattern of results has implications for theoretical perspectives on immigration. The fact that the responses of native born Hispanics fall between those of foreign born Hispanics and Whites supports the traditional assimilation perspective, which predicts that immigrant groups move closer to the (White) mainstream with each passing generation. This is consistent with findings from Fischer & Mattson (2009) and others that Hispanics are successfully assimilating

into the mainstream. Our findings contradict the idea that second and third generation Hispanics have developed group norms favoring high fertility or have integrated into such groups. This possibility was raised by Frank & Heuveline (2005), after noting that women of Mexican origin born in the U.S. had higher fertility than women in Mexico.

Since our findings for native born Hispanics are counterintuitive, we checked other attitudinal questions related to family issues and found that Hispanics in the 2002 and 2006-08 NSFG are more likely to hold conservative opinions on these issues (results not shown). For example, they are more likely to say it is better to get married than to stay single and less likely to say that it is okay for unmarried female to have a child. This is true for all the Hispanic subgroups we examined – foreign born and native born women and men. Our results, therefore, do not necessarily call for a re-examination of Hispanic familism in general, but do call into question whether differences in childbearing between native born Hispanics and Whites can be explained by differences in group norms around childbearing or the personal value of children.

Our results stand in contrast with other studies that sought to explain fertility differentials across subgroups. Hayford & Morgan (2008) find that higher fertility among religious women can be largely explained by the fact that young religious women intend to have more children. Likewise, educational differences in completed childbearing correspond to a similar gradient in fertility intentions. As far as we know, our finding that a group difference in fertility outcomes (in this case between Whites and native born Hispanics) has little corresponding difference in fertility intentions or personal value of children is unique.

An obvious limitation of this study is the fact that group norms and personal attitudes are difficult concepts to measure. We do not know the extent to which questions about attitudes accurately capture the underlying attitudes held by respondents, nor how group norms influence underlying attitudes, nor how underlying attitudes influence behavior. Separate analyses (not shown) reveal that our attitudinal measures regarding childbearing do correspond with differences in behavioral intentions to have a future birth, which is reassuring. Another indication that these variables are meaningful is that variables that we might expect to be good predictors of value-of-children measures are: age is negatively associated with being bothered by childlessness; and being raised with some religion and having children already are both positively associated with saying that the rewards of childrearing are worth the costs. It would be a problem if value-of-children questions were interpreted differently by racial-ethnic group. It

has been shown that Hispanics are particularly prone to giving socially desirable or positive answers and extreme answers (Marin, Gamba, & Marin 1992; Ross & Mirowsky 1984), but it is reassuring that there is a correlation between attitudinal variables and behavioral intentions for all groups.

Our findings highlight two potential problems with previous studies on cultural differences between Whites and Hispanics. First, grouping foreign born together with native born Hispanics may mask similarities between US-born Hispanics and Whites. Second, research sometimes highlights statistically significant difference between Whites and Hispanics even when these differences are small.

The lack of evidence for Hispanic-White differences in group norms related to fertility means we should look elsewhere to explain differences in fertility levels. Structural explanations have substantial explanatory power. Differences in the opportunity costs of raising children, which are higher for women with higher potential earnings, are somewhat useful for explaining fertility variation in general and racial-ethnic differences in fertility in particular. About half of the difference in completed fertility between US-born Hispanics and Whites is "explained" by differences in the distribution of mother's education in the 2002 NSFG (analysis not shown). In order to better understand racial-ethnic fertility patterns, we should also think in terms of timing and biography. At each parity, native born Hispanic women are more likely to intend a future birth, but this difference essentially disappears once other factors are controlled. Starting at parity 2, holding constant parity and age, native born Hispanic and White women are equally likely to intend a future birth, however, Hispanic women start childbearing earlier on average, which gives them more time to meet their fertility goals and also puts them at risk of unwanted pregnancy (pregnancies that occur when the woman wants no more children) for a longer period of time. The reasons for these differences in timing could be structural, cultural, or both. Unwanted and unintended childbearing, which are very common in the U.S., could be useful for explaining differences in fertility outcomes. Migration experiences are also likely to be important for explaining the fertility trajectories of Hispanic immigrant women. For example, foreign born women might be more inclined to desire higher parity births if their older children are living in their home countries.

REFERENCES

Arnold et al. 1975. “The Value of Children: A Cross-National Study.” Honolulu: East-West Population Institute.

Bean, Frank D. and Marta Tienda. 1987. The Hispanic population of the United States. Russell Sage Foundation.

Blea, I. I. (1992). La chicana and the intersection of race, class, and gender. New York: Praeger.

Bongaarts, J. and S. C. Watkins. 1996. "Social interactions and contemporary fertility transitions." Population and Development Review 22:639Bulatao et al 1975

Bulatao, R. A. 1979. On the Nature of the Transition in the Value of Children. East-West Center.

Bulatao, R. A. 1981. “Values and disvalues of children in successive childbearing decisions.” Demography 18:1–25.

Clay, D. C. and J. J. Zuiches. 1980. "Reference Groups and Family-Size Norms." Population and Environment 3:262-279.

Fischer, C. S, and Mattson, G. Is America Fragmenting? Annu. Rev. Sociol. 2009. 35:435–55

Flores E, Tschann JM, Marin B, Pantoja P. 2004. Marital conflict and acculturation among Mexican American husbands and wives. Cult. Divers. Ethn. Minor. Psychol. 10:39–52

Ford AE, Norris KF. Condom beliefs in urban, low income, African American and Hispanic youth. Health Educ Q 1994;21:39–53.

Frank, Reanne, and Patrick Heuveline. 2005. “A cross-over in Mexican and Mexican-American fertility rates.” Demographic Research 12:77-104. (Accessed December 3, 2009).

Fuligni, Andrew J., Vivian Tseng, and May Lam. 1999. “Attitudes toward Family Obligations among American Adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European Backgrounds.” Child Development 70:1030-1044

Graham, C. 2009. “Measuring Quality of Life in Latin America: Some Insights from Happiness Economics and the Latinobarometro.”P. 71–106 in Barometers of Quality of Life Around the Globe, ed Valerie Møller, Denis Huschka, Alex C. Michalos.

Hackett C. Why is congregational participation associated with higher fertility. Presented at the Population Association of America Annual Meeting. April, 2009. Detroit, MI.

Hayford, S. R., and S. P. Morgan. 2008. “Religiosity and fertility in the United States: The role of fertility intentions.” Social forces; a scientific medium of social study and interpretation 86:1163.

Koropeckyj-Cox, Tanya, and Gretchen Pendell. 2007. “The Gender Gap in Attitudes About Childlessness in the United States.” Journal of Marriage and Family 69:899-915

Landale, Nancy S., and R.S. Oropesa. 2007. “Hispanic Families: Stability and Change.” Annual Review of Sociology 33:381–405

Marin, G.,&Marin, B.V. (1991). Research with Hispanic populations (Applied Social Research

Methods Series, Vol. 23). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Marin, G, R. J Gamba, and BV Marin. 1992. “Extreme response style and acquiescence among Hispanics.” Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 23:498.

Martin JA, Hamilton BE, Sutton PD, Ventura SJ, et al. Births: Final data for 2006. National vital statistics reports; vol 57 no 7. Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics. 2009

Minnis AM, Padian NS. Reproductive health differences among Latin American- and US-born young women. J Urban Health 2001;78:627– 37

Molina C, Aguirre-Molina M. Latino health in the U.S.: a growing challenge. Washington (DC): American Public Health Association, 1994Montgomery & Casterline 1996

Montgomery, M. R. 1996. “Comments on men, women, and unintended pregnancy.” Population and Development Review 22:100–106.

Morgan, S. P. 1982. “Parity-specific fertility intentions and uncertainty: The United States, 1970 to 1976.” Demography 19:315–334.

Oropesa RS, Gorman BK. 2000. Ethnicity, immigration, and beliefs about marriage as a ‘tie that binds’. In The Ties That Bind: Perspectives on Marriage and Cohabitation, ed. LJWaite, pp. 188–211. New York: Aldine de Gruyter

Parrado, Ea, and Sp Morgan. 2008. “Intergenerational Fertility Among Hispanic Women: New Evidence of Immigrant Assimilation.” Demography 45:651-671. (Accessed December 4, 2009).

Phinney, J. S, A. Ong, and T. Madden. 2000. “Cultural Values and Intergenerational Value Discrepancies in Immigrant and Non-Immigrant Families.” Child Development 71:528–539.

Ross, C. E, and J. Mirowsky. 1984. “Socially-desirable response and acquiescence in a cross-cultural survey of mental health.” Journal of Health and Social Behavior 25:189–197.

Sable, M. R, K. Havig, L. R Schwartz, and A. Shaw. 2009. “Hispanic immigrant women talk about family planning.” Affilia 24:137.

Sabogal, F., G. Marín, R. Otero-Sabogal, B. V. Marín, and E. J. Perez-Stable. 1987. “Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't?.” Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences 9:397.

Schoen, Robert, Young J. Kim, Constance A. Nathanson, Jason Fields, and Nan Marie Astone. 1997. “Why Do Americans Want Children?.” Population and Development Review 23:333-358

Sorenson, A. M. 1985. “Fertility expectations and ethnic identity among Mexican-American adolescents: an expression of cultural ideals.” Sociological Perspectives 28:339–360.

Trent Katherine and South Scott J. Sociodemographic Status, Parental Background, Childhood Family Structure, and Attitudes toward Family Formation. Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 54, No. 2 (May, 1992), pp. 427-439

Vega WA. 1995. The study of Latino families. In Understanding Latino Families: Scholarship, Policy and Practice, ed. R Zambrana, pp. 3–17. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Watkins, S C. From Provinces into Nations: Demographic Integration in Western Europe, 1870-1960. Population and Development Review, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Jun., 1990), pp. 241-272

Willis, R. J, and J. G Haaga. 1996. “Economic approaches to understanding nonmarital fertility.” Population and Development Review 22:67–86.

Table 1: List of variables included in the analysis

Variable name	Description
Dependent	
Social value of children	
Rewards	Equals 1 if person agrees or strongly agrees with the statement "The rewards of being a parent are worth it, despite the cost and the work it takes", 0 otherwise.
Happiness	Equals 1 if person agrees or strongly agrees with the statement "People can't be happy unless they have children", 0 otherwise.
Bother	Ordinal measure ranking answers to the statment "If it turns out that you do not have any children, would that bother you…" (1) not at all, (2)a little, (3) somewhat, or (4) a great deal.
Parity-Specific fertility intentions	
Intent	Equals 1 if person intents to have more children, 0 otherwise.
Explanatory	
Ethnicity and nativity	
Hispanic, foreign born	Equals 1 if person is Hispanic and born outside the U.S, 0 otherwise.
Hispanic, native born	Equals 1 if person is Hispanic and born in the U.S, 0 otherwise.
NH White, native born	Equals 1 if person is NH White and born in the U.S, 0 otherwise (Ref.).
Demographic background	
Age	Respondents age.
Children ever born	Number of children ever born.
Marital status	Set of dummy variables indexing whether the person is married; cohabiting; divorced/widowed/separated, or never married (Ref.).
Raised in intact family	Equals 1 if the person was raised in an intact family, 0 otherwise.
Religion raised	Set of dummy variables indexing whether the person was raised Catholic, Protestant (Ref.), Other, or No religious.
Socioeconomic position	
Years of Education	Number of completed years of education.
Poor or near-poor	Income below 150% of poverty line.
Homemaker	Works at home (women).
Prior life-course experiences	
Had a teenage birth	Equals 1 if the person had a teenage birth, 0 otherwise.
Number of unintended pregnancies/births	Number of prior unintended pregnacies for women or births for men.
Number of children born outside of marriage	Number of prior children born outside of marriage.

TABLE 2: Ethnic and nativity differences in the social value attached to children by gender

	WOMEN			MEN		
	Foreign-born Hispanics	Native-born Hispanics	Native-born Whites	Foreign-born Hispanics	Native-born Hispanics	Native-born Whites
"The rewards of being a parent are worth it, despite the cost and the work it takes"						
Disagree/Strongly disagree (%)	3.0	5.2	3.5	**2.4**	5.9	5.3
Agree	**40.9**	**41.7**	32.8	43.9	47.3	45.1
Stronly agree	**56.1**	**53.2**	63.8	53.7	46.8	49.6
N	1,499	1,681	7,606	1,167	1,340	5,598
"People can't really be happy unless they have children"						
Strongly disagree (%)	**14.0**	**34.7**	46.1	**11.7**	**20.7**	35.6
Disagree	49.0	56.0	50.6	**48.8**	**67.5**	58.7
Agree/Stronly agree	**36.9**	**9.2**	3.3	**39.5**	**11.8**	5.7
N	463	498	2,128	375	425	1,880
"If it turns out that you do not have any children, would that bother you…"						
Not at all (%)	**21.2**	15.2	14.9	23.5	23.3	20.5
A little	**18.2**	14.2	13.8	16.5	16.7	19.2
Somewhat	**18.5**	31.0	30.8	**24.4**	30.5	33.3
A great deal	42.1	39.6	40.5	**35.7**	29.6	27.0
N	330	748	3,731	460	873	3,787

Bolded percentages indicate difference with native NH Whites statistically significant at p<.05

TABLE 3a: Logistic regression results predicting agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'The rewards of childrearing are worth the cost'

	WOMEN								
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Ethicity and nativity									
Hispanic, foreign-born	-0.016		(0.165)	-0.029		(0.165)	0.244		(0.207)
Hispanic, native-born	-0.252	*	(0.128)	-0.204		(0.128)	-0.038		(0.151)
Demographic background									
Age	-0.035	**	(0.007)	-0.034	**	(0.007)	-0.035	**	(0.007)
Children ever born	0.489	**	(0.060)	0.828	**	(0.093)	0.839	**	(0.093)
Marital status (Reference = Never married)									
Married	0.654	**	(0.138)	0.453	**	(0.141)	0.438	**	(0.141)
Cohabiting	0.021		(0.146)	0.108		(0.147)	0.108		(0.147)
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	0.414	*	(0.186)	0.329	^	(0.188)	0.317	^	(0.189)
Raised in intact family	0.191	*	(0.095)	0.137		(0.095)	0.151		(0.095)
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)									
No religion	-0.222		(0.146)	-0.198		(0.146)	-0.204		(0.146)
Catholic	0.057		(0.110)	0.047		(0.110)	0.052		(0.110)
Other religion	0.159		(0.211)	0.133		(0.211)	0.150		(0.211)
Socioeconomic position									
Years of Education	0.071	**	(0.020)	0.064	**	(0.020)	0.067	**	(0.020)
Poor or near-poor	-0.051		(0.106)	-0.009		(0.107)	-0.026		(0.107)
Homemaker	0.050		(0.137)	0.046		(0.137)	0.050		(0.138)
Prior life-course experiences									
Had a teenage birth	--			-0.294	^	(0.169)	-0.224		(0.244)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			-0.356	**	(0.108)	-0.154		(0.152)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			-0.130	**	(0.050)	-0.117	^	(0.070)
Interactions									
w/ Hispanic native born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			-0.345		(0.392)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			-0.365	^	(0.201)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			0.049		(0.115)
w/ Hispanic foreign born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			0.032		(0.424)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			-0.291		(0.193)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			-0.194		(0.118)
Chi-square									
N	10,786			10,786			10,786		

TABLE 3b: Logistic regression results predicting agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'The rewards of childrearing are worth the cost'

	MEN								
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Ethicity and nativity									
Hispanic, foreign-born	0.512	**	(0.188)	0.525	**	(0.188)	0.472	*	(0.200)
Hispanic, native-born	-0.106		(0.126)	-0.093		(0.126)	-0.030		(0.134)
Demographic background									
Age	-0.036	**	(0.006)	-0.036	**	(0.006)	-0.036	**	(0.006)
Children ever born	0.602	**	(0.087)	0.766	**	(0.130)	0.769	**	(0.131)
Marital status (Reference = Never married)									
Married	0.902	**	(0.173)	0.807	**	(0.177)	0.812	**	(0.178)
Cohabiting	0.192		(0.169)	0.232		(0.170)	0.215		(0.171)
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	0.191		(0.195)	0.143		(0.196)	0.143		(0.196)
Raised in intact family	0.075		(0.095)	0.069		(0.095)	0.070		(0.095)
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)									
No religion	-0.683	**	(0.132)	-0.683	**	(0.132)	-0.680	**	(0.132)
Catholic	0.012		(0.111)	0.009		(0.111)	0.009		(0.111)
Other religion	0.085		(0.204)	0.084		(0.204)	0.084		(0.204)
Socioeconomic position									
Years of Education	0.074	**	(0.020)	0.071	**	(0.020)	0.074	**	(0.020)
Poor or near-poor	-0.116		(0.109)	-0.108		(0.109)	-0.109		(0.109)
Homemaker	--			--			--		
Prior life-course experiences									
Had a teenage birth	--			-0.288		(0.284)	0.478		(0.491)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			-0.259		(0.168)	-0.318		(0.201)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			0.267		(0.497)	0.012		(0.571)
Interactions									
w/ Hispanic native born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			-1.388	*	(0.656)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			-0.036		(0.259)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			--		
w/ Hispanic foreign born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			-1.365		(0.851)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			0.478		(0.365)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			-0.401		(1.086)
Chi-square									
N	8,105			8,105			8,105		

TABLE 4a: Logistic regression predicting agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'People can't really be happy unless they have children'

	WOMEN								
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Ethicity and nativity									
Hispanic, foreign-born	2.230	**	(0.192)	2.220	**	(0.195)	2.261	**	(0.235)
Hispanic, native-born	0.815	**	(0.213)	0.858	**	(0.214)	0.979	**	(0.253)
Demographic background									
Age	0.001		(0.011)	-0.004		(0.012)	-0.004		(0.012)
Children ever born	0.060		(0.062)	0.178	*	(0.083)	0.167	*	(0.084)
Raised in intact family	-0.048		(0.146)	-0.109		(0.148)	-0.098		(0.149)
Marital status (Reference = Never married)									
Married	0.290		(0.209)	0.317		(0.227)	0.330		(0.228)
Cohabiting	0.120		(0.234)	0.146		(0.243)	0.175		(0.245)
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	-0.130		(0.269)	0.072		(0.284)	0.084		(0.285)
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)									
No religion	-0.938	*	(0.416)	-0.884	*	(0.417)	-0.890	*	(0.417)
Catholic	0.164		(0.179)	0.137		(0.182)	0.146		(0.182)
Other religion	0.866	**	(0.264)	0.880	**	(0.264)	0.911	**	(0.266)
Socioeconomic position									
Years of Education	-0.159	**	(0.033)	-0.162	**	(0.033)	-0.161	**	(0.033)
Poor or near-poor	0.363	*	(0.158)	0.373	*	(0.159)	0.367	*	(0.160)
Homemaker	-0.127		(0.173)	-0.154		(0.175)	-0.139		(0.176)
Prior life-course experiences									
Had a teenage birth	--			-0.239		(0.198)	-0.102		(0.417)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			0.079		(0.089)	0.123		(0.166)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			-0.247	**	(0.082)	-0.234		(0.156)
Interactions									
w/ Hispanic native born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			0.031		(0.599)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			0.048		(0.245)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			-0.247		(0.251)
w/ Hispanic foreign born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			-0.237		(0.479)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			-0.060		(0.180)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			0.050		(0.180)
Chi-square									
N	3,108			3,108			3,108		

TABLE 4b: Logistic regression predicting agreeing or strongly agreeing that 'People can't really be happy unless they have children'

	MEN								
	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Ethicity and nativity									
Hispanic, foreign-born	1.730	**	(0.186)	1.732	**	(0.186)	1.721	**	(0.205)
Hispanic, native-born	0.609	**	(0.196)	0.589	**	(0.197)	0.652	**	(0.217)
Demographic background									
Age	-0.003		(0.011)	0.000		(0.011)	-0.001		(0.011)
Children ever born	0.125	^	(0.066)	0.093		(0.083)	0.089		(0.083)
Raised in intact family	0.195		(0.140)	0.201		(0.141)	0.199		(0.141)
Marital status (Reference = Never married)									
Married	0.432	*	(0.211)	0.424	^	(0.218)	0.457	*	(0.219)
Cohabiting	-0.112		(0.241)	-0.142		(0.248)	-0.154		(0.252)
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	0.509	^	(0.291)	0.474		(0.292)	0.491	^	(0.295)
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)									
No religion	-0.399		(0.301)	-0.413		(0.303)	-0.408		(0.303)
Catholic	0.247		(0.171)	0.253		(0.171)	0.247		(0.172)
Other religion	0.017		(0.308)	0.028		(0.308)	0.008		(0.310)
Socioeconomic position									
Years of Education	-0.140	**	(0.032)	-0.138	**	(0.032)	-0.136	**	(0.032)
Poor or near-poor	0.328	*	(0.147)	0.329	*	(0.147)	0.323	*	(0.148)
Homemaker	--			--			--		
Prior life-course experiences									
Had a teenage birth	--			0.317		(0.245)	0.613		(0.408)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			0.000		(0.107)	-0.162		(0.189)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			0.130		(0.268)	0.659	^	(0.388)
Interactions									
w/ Hispanic native born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			0.103		(0.701)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			-0.029		(0.312)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			-1.560		(1.129)
w/ Hispanic foreign born									
Had a teenage birth	--			--			-0.498		(0.547)
# of children born outside of marriage	--			--			0.246		(0.209)
# of unintended pregnancies	--			--			-0.712		(0.536)
Chi-square									
N	2,701			2,701			2,701		

TABLE 5: Ordered logistic regression predicting 'If it turns out that you do not have any children, would that bother you: not at all (1), a little (2), somewhat (3), or a great deal (4)'

	WOMEN			MEN		
Ethicity and nativity						
Hispanic, foreign-born	-0.076		0.115	0.273	**	(0.100)
Hispanic, native-born	-0.124		0.079	-0.023		(0.073)
Demographic background						
Age	-0.088	**	0.005	-0.065	**	(0.004)
Raised in intact family	-0.081		0.057	0.038		(0.054)
Marital status (Reference = Never married)						
Married	0.499	**	0.080	0.287	**	(0.089)
Cohabiting	0.362	**	0.096	-0.036		(0.103)
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	0.362	*	0.142	0.275	^	(0.148)
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)						
No religion	-0.369	**	0.090	-0.303	**	(0.086)
Catholic	0.009		0.063	0.034		(0.060)
Other religion	0.114		0.106	0.229	*	(0.103)
Socioeconomic position						
Years of Education	0.082	**	0.012	0.104	**	(0.011)
Poor or near-poor	-0.200	**	0.064	-0.185	**	(0.063)
Homemaker	0.007		0.101	--		
Chi-square						
N	4,809			5,120		

TABLE 6: Ethnic and nativity differences in percent who intend to have a future birth by parity and gender

	WOMEN						MEN					
	Foreign-born		Native-born		Native-born		Foreign-born		Native-born		Native-born	
Parity	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*	%	*N*
0	**82.5**	*332*	**84.4**	*751*	74.3	*3781*	**81.7**	*469*	**85.2**	*877*	77.9	*3829*
1	**62.4**	*287*	**60.9**	*325*	46.7	*1396*	**67.9**	*218*	**63.2**	*182*	48.6	*741*
2	**36.9**	*409*	**24.8**	*282*	14.4	*1494*	**45.7**	*230*	**34.4**	*154*	18.2	*664*
3+	**19.5**	*471*	12.1	*323*	7.6	*935*	**23.2**	*250*	**18.9**	*127*	11.5	*364*
N		*1,499*		*1,681*		*7,606*		*1,167*		*1,340*		*5,598*

Bolded percentages indicate difference with native NH Whites statistically significant at p<.05

TABLE 7a: Logist models predicting intention to have an additional child by parity: Women

	Parity 0		Parity 1		Parity 2		Parity 3+	
Ethicity and nativity								
Hispanic, foreign-born	0.763	**	0.515	**	0.953	**	1.006	**
	(0.179)		(0.179)		(0.181)		(0.290)	
Hispanic, native-born	0.304	*	0.331	*	0.184		0.194	
	(0.126)		(0.159)		(0.191)		(0.302)	
Demographic background								
Age	-0.166	**	-0.198	**	-0.206	**	-0.204	**
	(0.006)		(0.010)		(0.014)		(0.023)	
Children ever born								
Marital status (Reference = Never married)								
Married	0.193	^	0.265		0.346		0.483	
	(0.108)		(0.195)		(0.256)		(0.441)	
Cohabiting	-0.321	*	0.062		0.274		0.791	^
	(0.127)		(0.189)		(0.252)		(0.422)	
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	-0.176		-0.150		0.417		0.440	
	(0.180)		(0.216)		(0.277)		(0.471)	
Raised in intact family	0.036		0.323	**	0.257	^	-0.484	*
	(0.085)		(0.114)		(0.135)		(0.210)	
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)								
No religion	-0.647	**	-0.170		0.046		0.416	
	(0.120)		(0.190)		(0.246)		(0.476)	
Catholic	0.148		0.048		0.378	*	0.489	^
	(0.096)		(0.129)		(0.156)		(0.258)	
Other religion	0.005		-0.202		1.034	**	1.059	**
	(0.159)		(0.244)		(0.273)		(0.381)	
Socioeconomic position								
Years of Education	0.134	**	0.074	**	0.047		0.072	
	(0.017)		(0.025)		(0.029)		(0.048)	
Poor or near-poor	-0.358	**	-0.233	^	0.241	^	-0.111	
	(0.098)		(0.134)		(0.144)		(0.233)	
Homemaker	-0.137		0.175		-0.027		0.261	
	(0.149)		(0.133)		(0.137)		(0.205)	
Prior life-course experiences								
Had a teenage birth			-0.719	**	-0.460	**	-0.308	
			(0.156)		(0.159)		(0.248)	
# of children born outside of marriage			-0.067		0.232	*	-0.007	
			(0.164)		(0.105)		(0.112)	
# of unintended pregnancies	-0.080		-0.142	*	-0.197	**	-0.219	*
	(0.075)		(0.059)		(0.066)		(0.085)	

TABLE 7b: Logist models predicting intention to have an additional child by parity: Men							
Ethicity and nativity							
Hispanic, foreign-born	0.436	**	0.498	*	1.252	**	1.382	**
	(0.154)		(0.216)		(0.238)		(0.400)	
Hispanic, native-born	0.271	*	0.187		0.526	*	0.392	
	(0.122)		(0.209)		(0.229)		(0.423)	
Demographic background							
Age	-0.141	**	-0.171	**	-0.135	**	-0.129	**
	(0.005)		(0.013)		(0.016)		(0.028)	
Children ever born								
Marital status (Reference = Never married)								
Married	-0.556	**	0.178		-0.940	*	-1.958	*
	(0.114)		(0.253)		(0.368)		(0.761)	
Cohabiting	-1.031	**	-0.222		-0.780	*	-1.889	*
	(0.130)		(0.243)		(0.353)		(0.756)	
Divorced, Widowed, or Separat	0.090		0.138		-0.606		-0.987	
	(0.179)		(0.272)		(0.381)		(0.793)	
Raised in intact family	0.157	^	0.356	*	0.356	*	0.016	
	(0.084)		(0.146)		(0.174)		(0.303)	
Religion raised (Reference = Mainline Protestant)								
No religion	-0.265	*	-0.057		-0.370		-0.594	
	(0.129)		(0.253)		(0.335)		(0.718)	
Catholic	0.028		0.236		0.022		0.210	
	(0.095)		(0.164)		(0.198)		(0.356)	
Other religion	0.190		-0.071		-0.014		1.603	*
	(0.167)		(0.337)		(0.399)		(0.640)	
Socioeconomic position							
Years of Education	0.109	**	0.046		0.043		-0.018	
	(0.017)		(0.030)		(0.035)		(0.062)	
Poor or near-poor	-0.313	**	-0.617	**	-0.091		-0.250	
	(0.101)		(0.180)		(0.188)		(0.305)	
Homemaker	--		--		--		--	
Prior life-course experiences							
Had a teenage birth			-0.413	^	0.017		-0.527	
			(0.237)		(0.240)		(0.364)	
# of children born outside of marriage			-0.024		0.076		0.077	
			(0.196)		(0.135)		(0.154)	
# of unintended pregnancies			-0.859	*	-0.512	^	-1.045	*
			(0.350)		(0.297)		(0.413)	

Appendix 1

Descriptive statistics for National Survey of Family Growth, pooled data from 2002, 2006-08

	WOMEN			MEN		
	Native-born Hispanics	Foreign-born Hispanics	Native-born Whites	Native-born Hispanics	Foreign-born Hispanics	Native-born Whites
	% or mean	% or mean	% or mean	% or mean	% or mean	% or mean
Age	26.7	30.8	29.2	25.8	29.7	28.3
Children ever born	1.2	1.9	1.0	0.7	1.4	0.6
Years of Education	12.7	11.5	13.7	12.5	11.3	13.4
Poor or near-poor (below 150% of poverty level)	43.5	59.8	25.3	33.0	47.4	18.3
Homemaker	19.5	34.6	17.0	--	--	--
Raised in intact family	56.5	68.8	63.4	56.4	69.8	65.9
Marital status						
Married	29.5	49.0	41.6	19.8	42.4	27.2
Cohabiting	12.0	16.5	9.6	11.2	15.9	7.3
Divorced, Widowed, or Separated	10.5	12.1	10.7	6.6	6.3	9.3
Never been married	48.0	22.3	38.1	62.4	35.4	56.2
Religion raised						
No religion	6.9	3.3	11.0	6.0	3.3	11.9
Catholic	69.4	82.4	29.0	68.6	83.4	29.7
Protestant	20.0	11.5	52.7	21.4	10.4	50.9
Other religion	3.8	2.8	7.4	4.0	2.9	7.5
Had a teenage birth	26.6	29.0	12.4	9.8	9.7	3.7
Number of unintended pregnancies*	0.97	0.97	0.65	0.03	0.07	0.02
Number of children born outside of marriage	0.64	0.74	0.3	0.36	0.59	0.17
N	1,681	1,499	7,606	1,340	1,167	5,598

*for men, this is limited to births that occurred during the past 5 years