(Somewhat) un-orthodox findings on the family
A Small Family is a happy Family

- Most of international public policy has been predicated on the twin ideas that:
  - (1) large families are bad and
The “unmet demand” for contraception

- (Poor) people are unable to control their fertility

"But I take the pill everytime I become pregnant, and it doesn't help."
Famous and infamous examples

- The sterilization policy during the emergency in India
- The one child policy in China
- Much more benign: the contraception program experiment in ICCDRB in Bangladesh
A very short history of Malthusianism

- Malthus: Resources are finite (e.g. land)
- So when there are more people, there is less for everyone.
- Eventually, high mortality puts population back in check
- E.g. Black death: believed to have killed half of British population between 1348 and 1377 was responsible for high wage growth that followed
After Malthus

As it turns out, the population grew several fold after Malthus, without catastrophic disasters.

What could be going on?
- Technological progress keeps making us more productive with the same resources
- It is even possible that technological progress is faster when populations are more numerous
Population growth, 5 million BC to 1990

This is the annual rate of population growth from \( t \) to \( t + 1 \) plotted against population at rate \( t \).

Source: Kremer (1993)
Malthus all over again

Jeff Sachs Common Wealth: Economics for a Crowded Planet

• “Stabilizing the world’s population is crucial to ensuring peace and prosperity on this already crowded planet.

• If we ignore this issue we risk a massive and unsettling youth bulge, unbearable environmental pressures and unchecked global migration.”
And indeed, countries with high fertility are poorer.
As usual, correlation could go either way....

- Poor country could be poor because they are too crowded
- Or rich country could have lower fertility because they are rich.

It will be difficult to answer this question.... And even harder to predict what population increase would do to the planet...
Are large families worst off?

- Perhaps we can say more about the family
- Note that this is not necessarily the entire answer to what population growth does to countries or the world:
  - Families may not fully take into account the impact of their fertility on others in the community (local, country, world...)
- However, it is still an important question:
  - If true, could give a reason to subsidize/encourage family planning, for the sake of children (who do not decide)
  - We need to understand the cost and benefits of large family to design effective policies
The quality-Quantity Trade off

- Becker and Tommes (1976) describe the “quality quantity” trade-off parents face
  - Siblings compete for resources (parental attention, money etc.) so more children means that each get fewer
  - The paper observed that if “quality” is a normal good, then poor parents will tend to want to have more children.
Is there a quality quantity trade off

- We cannot look at children in large and small families: in Becker’s world, family size is a choice and it is the family who cares less about quality that will go for large family.
- Look at exogenous changes in family size.
  - “Fertility shocks”
  - Exogenous reduction in family size
Fertility shocks

- Twins:
  - 2 kids when you expected just one!
  - Will increase family size but not one for one (why?)
  - However:
    - We cannot look at the twins themselves. Why?
    - Even looking at other kids may be misleading, if kids demand more attention than other kids.
Fertility shocks

- **Gender:**
  - In the US, parents want mixed family: Families that have had one boy and one girl are less likely to have a third child than family who had two boys or two girls.
  - In developing countries: further shock due to gender of the child— if parents have a preference for having a boy. Girls will tend to be born in large families.
    - However, sex may not be random any more due to sex-selective abortion.
Evidence from Israel

- Angrist, Lavy, Schlosser
- The evidence comes from using both twins and gender composition
- It includes Israeli Arabs who are quite poor.
  - Find no effect at all!
Impact of Forced reduction: China One child policy

- Since 1978-79, Chinese government severely restricts the number of children a family can have.
- Each couple can have only one child, or is subjected to heavy fine.
- However, since mid 1980s, relaxation in some areas if the first child is a girl.
- She compares girls, in areas had a relaxation policy, after the policy was put in places.
Girls live in larger families in relaxed areas

Figure 3A: The Effect of Relaxation on Family Size
Coefficients of the Interactions between Born in a Relaxed Area * Birth Regions
...And they are more educated!

Figure 4A: The Effect of Relaxation on School Enrollment
Coefficients of Interactions between
Born in Relaxed Region * Birth Year
Curious findings

- So if anything, Nancy Qian found that having two children is better than one. However:
  - May be the trade off kicks off later?
  - May be it is good for girls to have a sibling (who is all too often a brother...): both kids gets educated
One more “normal” example

- The Matlab program, in Bangladesh, provided women in treatment areas with regular access to contraceptive, a Community Health Worker that visited women at home, etc.

- Initially, there was a fairly large decline in fertility in the treatment areas:
  - By 1996 women in Treatment areas had 1.2 fewer children.

- However, by 1996 no difference in height, weight, school enrollment, years of education of children born in T and C areas...
Is contraception availability the key barrier?

- The other part of the conventional wisdom on population policy is that lack of availability of contraceptive is way to reduce fertility.
- Concept of “unmet demand” for contraceptive.
- But what is the impact of making contraceptive available on reducing family size?
Evidence from Colombia

- A family planning program was introduced in Colombia by a young doctor.
- The program did reduce fertility
Table 4: Estimated Program Effects on Completed Lifetime Fertility Among Women Ever Having Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable:</th>
<th>Int(Births)</th>
<th>Any Birth</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Any Birth (NB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort Only</td>
<td>All Covariates</td>
<td>Cohort Only</td>
<td>All Covariates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 15-19</td>
<td>-0.116***B</td>
<td>-0.132***B</td>
<td>-0.064***B</td>
<td>-0.072***B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 20-24</td>
<td>-0.071***B</td>
<td>-0.089***B</td>
<td>-0.036***B</td>
<td>-0.082***B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 25-29</td>
<td>-0.054***B</td>
<td>-0.062***</td>
<td>-0.028**</td>
<td>-0.038***B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 30-34</td>
<td>-0.030***B</td>
<td>-0.042***B</td>
<td>-0.015*</td>
<td>-0.020**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 35-39</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.023)</td>
<td>(0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 40-44</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Planning Access 40-44 Lead</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort Fixed-Effects</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality Fixed-Effects</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality-Specific Linear Trends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence from Colombia

- A family planning program was introduced in Colombia by a young doctor.
- The program did reduce fertility
- But the effects were low:
  - 5% more kids per woman
  - 1/10 of the total fertility decline in Colombia over the 1960s
What about Matlab?

- Matlab was a successful program to reduce fertility
- However the effects became lower over time as fertility declined in the country overall
- It may have accelerated a trend, by changing preferences, rather than reducing the cost of contraception per se.
- What determine preferences on family size?
What determine preferences on fertility

- **Social norms**
  - What your neighbor do (Matlab)
  - But also, what you see in Television:
    - In Brazil, fertility declined faster in regions where Telenovelas became available first
    - Telenovelas present the image of a “small, happy family”

- **Costs and benefits of both sex and pregnancies.**
HIV prevention and teen pregnancy in Kenya

- Adolescents are the “window of hope” in the prevention of HIV:
  - Still uninfected
  - Their sexual pattern may not be set yet.

- Programs are developed for schools, with help of UNICEF only, but they are a little bit limited by social norms of what can be taught in school

- ABCD strategy. But really, only A and B in schools in Kenya: abstain till marriage.

- Danger: that kids will decide to get married!
A test: Duflo, Dupas, Kremer

- In 2002-2003 376 schools were randomly assigned to one of 4 groups:
  - CONTROL
  - Teacher training for HIV education: official curriculum
  - Free uniform for all children in grade 7 and 8
- Kids were followed several years later (until 2011)
Main Finding: Education, girls

Completed primary school

- Control: 0.81
- Uniforms: 0.87
- Teacher Training: 0.84
- Both: 0.85
Main finding: Pregnancy

Ever pregnant

- Control
- Uniforms
- Teacher Training
- Both
Main Finding: HSV2

HSV2 positive

- Control
- Uniforms
- Teacher Training
- Both
The explanation

- What is the explanation for these curious findings?
- Why is the combined program the most effective at reducing HSV2, but in between for pregnancies?
- What does it tell us about girls’s ability to “say no” (or other form of control...).
Understanding family decisions

• Since it now clear that fertility, like other decision, is a decision, we need to understand why it is the best idea for a poor family to have many children
• Affecting those factors is more likely to affect fertility rates and teenage pregnancies than just distributing contraceptive
• It does not mean that contraceptives is not a good idea! It allows people to control the timing of their fertility and live a happier lives. Also, even if on average fertility is not very much affected by contraception ability, it may make a big difference to an individual’s life.