Teenage childbearing and its life cycle consequences

Hotz, McElroy and Sanders

Teenage pregnancy (1990)

- About 4 million children born in 1990, 1/8 are to teen mothers
- 12% teen women get pregnant/year
- 35-40% of teen women become pregnant before the age of 20
- 25% will be a mother by age 20
- 17% of teens will get pregnant during their 1st non-marital intercourse
- 6% of teen women, aged 15-19 give birth in a given year

- Teen birth rates have changed considerably over time
- Most of these births are out of wedlock
- Rates differ considerably across race

Some trends in words

- Teen age pregnancy (15-19) rate fell dramatically between 1990 and 2002
 - 40% for black teens
 - 34% for whites

3

• Between 1988-2000, teenage pregnancy rates declined in every state and in the District of Columbia.



- By 2002, the teenage abortion rate had dropped by 50% from its peak in 1988.
- From 1986 to 2002, the proportion of teenage pregnancies ending in abortion declined more than one-quarter from 46% to 34% of pregnancies among 15–19-year-olds.

5

In 2000

- States with highest teen birthrate: MS, TX, AZ, AR, NM
- Lowest :NH, VT, VT, MA, ND, and ME
- Teenage abortion rates were highest in the DC, NJ, MD, NV, CA

6

• Lowest in ND, SD, KY and UT













	1991	1993	1995	1997	1999	2001	2003	200
All Students	37.5	37.6	37.9	34.8	36.3	33.4	34.3	33.9
Race/Ethnicity ²								
White, non-Hispanic	33.9	34.0	34.8	32.0	33.0	31.3	30.8	32.0
Black, non-Hispanic	59.3	59.1	54.2	53.6	53.0	45.6	49.0	47.
Hispanic	37.0	39.4	39.3	35.4	36.3	35.9	37.1	35.0
Grade								
9	22.4	24.8	23.6	24.2	26.6	22.7	21.2	21.5
10	33.2	30.1	33.7	29.2	33.0	29.7	30.6	29.
11	43.3	40.0	42.4	37.8	37.5	38.1	41.1	39.
12	50.6	53.0	49.7	46.0	50.6	47.9	48.9	49.4











 Bill Clinton's State of the Union Address, 1995

• "We've got to ask our community leaders and all kinds of organizations to help us stop our most serious social problem: the epidemic of teen pregnancies and births where there is no marriage. "

19

Are poor economic outcomes 'caused' by early childbearing?

- Teen mothers are not a random sample of the population
- Teen mothers are more likely to come from situations that would predict poorer economic outcomes anyway

	% with Disadvantage	% Gave Birth before Age 20	% Gave Bir before Age 1
All		0.24	0.12
Born to mother less than age 20 (n=1,797)	0.14	0.46	0.26
Born to mother less than age 18 (n=1,797)	0.04	0.43	0.24
Born to unmarried mother $(n=1,743)$	0.28	0.45	0.23
Born to mother with less than HS degree $(n=1,266)$	0.28	0.44	0.26
Born into Poverty (n=1.611)	0.13	0.49	0.26
Not living with married parents at age 15 (n=1,412)	0.45	0.39	0.21
Living in poverty at age 15 (n=1,553)	0.04	0.53	0.38

	Dep. Gave Birth		
	(1)	(2)	
Born to Mom < 20 (col. 1&2)	0.250		
or 18 (col. 3&4)	(0.041)		
Born to Mom < 20 (col. 1&2)	0.014	-0.001	
or 18 (col. 3&4)	(0.045)	(0.049)	
Born to Single Mom	0.186	0.092	
Ū.	(0.031)	(0.037)	
Born to Mom < HS grad	0.198	0.191	
	(0.030)	(0.033)	
Born into Poverty	0.075	0.112	
	(0.041)	(0.028)	
Age 15- Not living w/	-	0.112	
married parents		(0.028)	
Age 15 - Living in poverty	-	0.093	
		(0.068)	
constant	0.138	0.112	
	(0.014)	(0.017)	
sample size	1,213	1,022	
Adjusted R ²	0.116	0.117	

- On average, teen mothers are more likely to come from:
 - families with lower income and education - poorer neighborhoods and lower quality
 - schools
 - Families with a teen mother
 - Have Lower test scores
 - Racial and ethnic minorities

 Table 1
 Background Characteristics of Teenage Mothers and Women Who Delayed
 Childbearing until after Age 18
 Ch

	Teenag	e Mothers	Not Teenage Mothers		
Characteristic	Mean	Standard Duration	Mean	Standard Duration	
Black	0.33	0.47	0.12	0.33	
White	0.58	0.49	0.82	0.39	
Hispanic	0.09	0.29	0.06	0.24	
Family on welfare in 1978 ^a	0.19	0.39	0.11	0.31	
Family income in 1978 ^b	\$30,532	\$22,401	\$50,717	\$31,841	
In female-head household at age 14	0.20	0.40	0.12	0.33	
In intact household at age 14	0.69	0.46	0.84	0.37	
Mother's education	9.88	2.86	11.67	2.76	
Father's education	9.94	3.37	11.91	3.56	
AFQT score ^a	25.81	21.39	49.58	27.49	
Number of observations		603	4	4,323	

23



- Women from poorer backgrounds have lower opportunity cost of having children because they have lower economic prospects
- In this example, teen motherhood does not 'cause' poor outcomes, but instead, is a signal of the same problem – poor future prospects

25

Natural experiment

- If this were a clinical setting could determine long run consequences of teen motherhood through an experiment
- Randomly assign babies to teens and follow the families over time
- Problem would not pass human subjects review!!!

26

- Solution natural experiment
- Find something that acts like a random assignment clinical trial randomly assigns higher or lower birth probability to a women

Examples of natural experiments in this case

- Abortion reform
 - Abortion became available in 1970 in CA and NY (and some other states)
 - Compare women who turned 19 before 1970 in CA and NY with women who turned 19 by 1973
 - One was exposed to abortion (and had lower birth rates) the other group was not

27



- High summer temperatures reduce fertility
 - Decrease sexual activity
 - Decrease sperm counts
 - Increase miscarriage rates
- Some teens are more exposed to high summer temperatures
- The ones who are are a treatment lower births

29

This paper

- · Miscarriages as an experiment
- Miscarriages are mostly random -determined by genetic malformation
- Take a sample of teen women who all get pregnant

30

- Some miscarriage (treatment)
- Some do not (control)

 All women in the survey are 'representative' of women who get pregnant during teen years

- If teen motherhood is bad economically, we would expect to find better outcomes for women whose teen pregnancy was halted by a miscarriage
- The test has the ability to reject the null

31

32

	First Pregnancy before 18 ended in Birth (2)		First Pregnancy before 18 ended in Abortion (4)		First Pregnancy before 18 ended in Miscarriage (5)	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	0.30	0.46	0.16	0.36	0.26	0.44
White	0.61	0.49	0.79	0.41	0.63	0.49
Hispanic	0.09	0.29	0.05	0.22	0.11	0.32
Family on welfare	0.19	0.39	0.09	0.28	0.11	0.32
Family income in 1978 ^b	\$32,267	\$23,217	\$52,774	\$34,999	\$27,441	\$16,919
In female-headed family at age 14	0.19	0.39	0.14	0.34	0.23	0.42
In intact household at age 14	0.71	0.45	0.78	0.42	0.64	0.48
Mother's education	10.00	2.84	11.70	2.15	10.15	2.07
Father's education	9.93	3.33	11.89	2.93	10.13	3.23
AFOT score	27.30	21.92	44.38	24.52	31.59	22.30
Number of		778	74.30	192	31.39	72 72
observations Percent of those pregnant before age 18		74.7%		18.4%		6.9%

	OLS		IV (on			
	All Covariates, ^a All Women Sample	All Covariates, ^a Teen Pregnancy Sample	No Covariates	Covariates Correlated with Miscarriages ^b	All Covariates ^{a,b}	Sample Mean fo Teen Moth at Age 2
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Education Outcomes: 1. High school diploma (HSD) by age 28 2. General educational development (GED) by age 28 3. HSD or GED by age 28	-0.46*** (18.66) 0.17*** (7.15) -0.28*** (10.77)	-0.19*** (4.45) 0.09** (2.50) -0.10*** (2.79)	-0.05 (0.51) 0.11 (1.61) 0.05 (0.54)	-0.07 (0.70) 0.12* (1.75) 0.05 (0.47)	-0.11 (1.31) 0.13** (1.99) 0.01 (0.14)	0.31 0.25 0.55

		LS	IV (on	Sample)		
	All Covariates,ª All Women Sample	All Covariates, ^a Teen Pregnancy Sample	No Covariates	Covariates Correlated with Miscarriages ^b	All Covariates ^{a,b}	Sample Mean for Teen Moth at Age 28
work Outcomes:						
8. Annual hours worked at age 28	-170***	-21	405**	420**	317*	1,039
AND THE CONTROL OF MALE	(2.96)	(0.24)	(2.26)	(2.24)	(1.67)	10000
9. Cumulative number of hours	$-2,009^{***}$	-969	2,600**	2,790**	2,031	7,759
worked by age 28	(5.19)	(1.56)	(2.24)	(2.36)	(1.49)	010101
 Hourly wage rate at age 28 (in 1994\$)^c 	-0.88** (2.03)	-0.91 (1.42)	1.82 (1.53)	2.07* (1.65)	2.72** (2.07)	7.90
Earnings-Related outcomes:	(2.05)	(1.42)	(1.55)	(1.0.)	(2.07)	
11. Woman's annual earnings at	-3.780***	-2.599***	4.677***	5.075***	4.218**	\$7,500
age 28 (in 1994\$)	(3.50)	(2.68)	(2.93)	(2.95)	(2.47)	\$1,500
12. Annual earnings of spouse at	-2.213**	115	1,177	1.029	1.668	\$10,742
age 28 (in 1994\$)	(2.07)	(0.06)	(0.31)	(0.28)	(0.45)	0101110
13. Fraction living in poverty at	0.15***	0.06	-0.14	-0.14	-0.13	0.47
age 28	(5.36)	(1.42)	(1.40)	(1.43)	(1.41)	
Public Assistance Outcomes:						
14. On AFDC while age 28	0.11***	0.02	-0.05	-0.06	-0.02	0.27
-	(4.85)	(0.57)	(0.62)	(0.65)	(0.21)	
15. Received food stamps while	0.14^{***}	0.04	-0.07	-0.07	-0.03	0.36
age 28	(5.76)	(1.07)	(0.81)	(0.82)	(0.33)	
16. Annual public assistant benefits		230	-510	-455	53	\$2,787
at age 28 (in 1994\$)	(4.84)	(0.69)	(0.57)	(0.53)	(0.07)	