



Early Life Experiences and Adult Fertility Behavior: Evidence from Indonesia

Dhanushka Thamarapani (Clark University)

Marc Rockmore (Clark University)

Willa Friedman (University of Houston)

UNU-WIDER Conference on Human Capital and Growth
June 6, 2016



What are Early Life Experiences and Why Should We Care?

- Focus on shocks that happen within the family.
 - Death of a sibling (child mortality).
 - Mother having miscarriages or stillbirths (adverse fertility event).

- Why do early life experiences matter?
 - Early life shocks persistently change people's preferences/behavior.
 - Help explain why 'identical' households respond differently to interventions.



What We Do

- If a child grows up in a family that has high child mortality or adverse events, when she is an adult
 - How many kids (pregnancies) will she have?
 - What other changes will she make in her adult behavior?

- Extend the intuition to understand formation of fertility choices and preferences.

- Re-examine demographic transitions.
 - Micro perspective to the macro economic phenomenon.



What We Find: A Preview

- Strong inter-generational persistence of fertility
 - Adult births: magnitude of 15 to 38% of avg. no. of pregnancies
 - Related: Age of first marriage
 - Channels: Some effect of mental health

- Effect varies based on the age of exposure

- Inter-generational transfers: earlier literature on physical and human capital
 - Experience growing up in a family shape adult behavior



Data: Indonesian Family Life Survey (IFLS)

- 4 rounds: 1993, 1997, 2000, 2007 (Tracking individuals across 14 years).
- 7224 households across 13 provinces encompassing 83% of the Indonesian population.
- Link 1st and 2nd generation
 - Family (mother) birth histories.
 - Siblings – education, marriage, employed (adult outcomes).



Sample of Daughters

- Aged 9 – 17 in round 1 (1993).
 - Typically unmarried.
- Appear in round 4 (2007): 23 to 31.
 - Marriageable and child bearing age.
- Why daughters?
 - Fertility outcomes are recorded for married women.
 - Son's wife and mother-in-law must be panel respondents (low likelihood).
- At least two daughters who fulfill the above criteria.
 - Sibling fixed effect.



Empirical Model: Sibling Fixed Effect

$$Outcome_{ik} = \alpha + \beta Adverse_{ik} + \gamma Controls_{ik} + FE_{ik} + \varepsilon_{ik}$$

- For daughter i in municipality k
- *Outcome* (of daughter as adult):
 - Number of pregnancies → β positive
 - Age at first marriage → β negative
- *Adverse* (event of mother):
 - No. of child deaths (sibling)
 - No. of miscarriages or stillbirths
 - Age of daughter at time of event: 0-4, 5-9, 10-14 (5 year interval)
- Identification strategy
 - Variation in timing of exposure to the mother's adverse event.



Empirical Model: Sibling Fixed Effect

$$Outcome_{ik} = \alpha + \beta Adverse_{ik} + \gamma Controls_{ik} + FE_{ik} + \varepsilon_{ik}$$

■ *Controls*: Characteristics of

- daughter (birth order, ability to conceive, education, work, per capita consumption exp. and rural – round 4)
- daughter's husband (age, education, work, lives at HH)
- Community (round 4 – access to contraception, family planning)

■ *FE* (fixed effects):

- Comparing siblings → sibling FE
- Municipality (round 4) → municipality FE
- Age of daughter → birth year FE



Main Results – Fertility Outcomes

| Number of Pregnancies | |
|--|----------------------|
| No. of deaths seen (age 0 to 4) | 0.441*** (0.002) |
| No. of deaths seen (age 5 to 9) | 0.416*** (0.002) |
| No. of deaths seen (age 10 to 14) | 1.061*** (0.004) |
| No. of adverse fertility events (age 0 to 4) | 0.170*** (0.002) |
| No. of adverse fertility events (age 5 to 9) | -0.158*** (0.002) |
| No. of adverse fertility events (age 10 to 14) | 0.401*** (0.003) |
| Observations | 773 |
| Standard errors in parentheses | |
| *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10 | |

[Full table](#)



Main Results – Fertility Behavior

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Age at 1 st marriage | |
| No. of deaths seen (age 0 to 4) | 0.134*** (0.008) |
| No. of deaths seen (age 5 to 9) | -0.287*** (0.011) |
| No. of deaths seen (age 10 to 14) | -0.452*** (0.013) |
| No. of adverse fertility events (age 0 to 4) | -0.396*** (0.010) |
| No. of adverse fertility events (age 5 to 9) | -0.996*** (0.008) |
| No. of adverse fertility events (age 10 to 14) | -1.461*** (0.011) |
| Observations | 773 |
| Standard errors in parentheses | |
| *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10 | |

[Full table](#)



The Results are Robust to

- Categorizing the age groups by 4 year intervals (vs. 5 year) [\[Table\]](#)
 - Age 0 to 3, 4 to 7, 8 to 11, 12 to 15
- Sibling sample
 - Re-run without sibling FE
- Selection into marriage [\[Table\]](#)



Heterogeneity: Do daughters respond differently based on

- The gender of the deceased sibling?
 - Does losing a brother have the same effect as losing a sister?

- The income status of the family when growing up ?
 - Do wealthier families respond differently than poorer families based on the gender of the deceased sibling?

 - Divide the households into two groups and binary variable "*Below*"
 - Below the median income of the municipality → poorer HHs (*Below* = 1)
 - Above the median income of the municipality → wealthier HHs (*Below* = 0)



Heterogeneity Summary : Number of Pregnancies

■ Deceased sister

- Wealthier HHs : 0.573 **more** pregnancies (50% of the avg. no. preg.)
- Poorer HHs : 0.167 less pregnancies (15%)

■ Deceased brother

- Wealthier HHs : 0.172 less pregnancies (15%)
- Poorer HHs : 0.493 **more** pregnancies (43%)
 - Son preference literature: missing women in India, sex-ratio in China
 - Potential reasons: agriculture, property endowment law

[Table]



Mechanisms: what is driving the results?

- Fertility preferences [\[Table\]](#)
 - Desired number of children over lifetime
 - Overall number unchanged → stockpiling of pregnancies

- Mental health (depression) [\[Table\]](#)
 - Measured at the time of survey using CES-D test
 - Categorical variable: 0 – 30 (higher the value higher the depression)
 - Sibling deaths: some evidence on higher depression level when adult

- No clear evidence on
 - Risk preferences: likely to be more risk averse?
 - Measured by standard lottery games
 - Time preference: likely to be more impatient?
 - Measured by standard lottery games



What Does This Mean?

- Early life experiences persist across time (fertility)
 - Effects are large as share of daughter's fertility
 - Need to calculate as share of overall fertility transition

- Policy
 - May explain why 'identical' households respond differently to interventions
 - Underestimating (intergenerational) benefits of health interventions

- Pathways
 - Some evidence of mental health but only for sibling deaths



Thank You