Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Related Literature
- 3. Institutional Background
- 4. Methodology
- 5. Data
- 6. Results
- 7. Mechanisms and Heterogeneity
- 8. Conclusion

Fertility and Parental Retirement

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

August 31, 2023

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

Motivation

Child care access is central to female labor force participation and fertility

- As a tool to increase female labor force participation by alleviating child care burden on women
- As a tool to increase fertility by reducing both direct and opportunity costs of having children

Grandparental Child Care



Figure 5-3 Percentages of parents who have a child that is looked after by a grandparent, by gender and country

Source: Glaser et al. (2013)

Research Question

Does delaying retirement affect subsequent generation's fertility and labor force participation?

Relevance

- Policy side: Could delaying retirement threaten the stability of pension systems by reducing subsequent generation's fertility or labor force participation?
- Academic side: what is parents' role in their adult daughters fertility and labor force participation?

Related Literature

Eibich & Siedler (2020) early retirement threshold in Germany.

- Parents become eligible for retirement \rightarrow daughters fertility \uparrow

Series of Italian pension reforms \rightarrow parents retire later:

- Bratti et al. (2018): daughters' LFP \downarrow
- Battistin et al. (2014): daughters' fertility \downarrow
- Aparicio-Fenoll & Vidal-Fernandez (2015): daughters' fertility ↑, LFP↓

Frattola (2023) old-age pension thresholds around Europe.

• Parents become eligible for retirement \rightarrow daughters fertility in Mediterranean \uparrow , no impact elsewhere

Three pillars

- Social security (old age pension), $\approx 50\%$ entitlements.
- Sectoral pensions main doorway to retirement, pprox 45% entitlements.
- Individual insurance schemes, pprox 5% entitlements.

2006 pension reform

- Eliminated the tax deductibility of sectoral pension contributions.
- Individuals had to work longer to reach planned benefit level.

2006 pension reform

- Eliminated the tax deductibility of sectoral pension contributions.
- Individuals had to work longer to reach planned benefit level.

The new regulation only applies to those born from January 1, 1950 onward.

• Individuals born just before 1950 remain in the more generous pension regime.

2006 pension reform

- Eliminated the tax deductibility of sectoral pension contributions.
- Individuals had to work longer to reach planned benefit level.

The new regulation only applies to those born from January 1, 1950 onward.

• Individuals born just before 1950 remain in the more generous pension regime.

 \Rightarrow people born just a few days apart face very different retirement opportunities.

Methodology

- Whether a person is born just before January 1, 1950 or just after should be as good as random
- Sharp regression discontinuity design for parents being born after December 1949.

Methodology

- Whether a person is born just before January 1, 1950 or just after should be as good as random
- Sharp regression discontinuity design for parents being born after December 1949.

 $Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T_j + \beta_2 \textit{distance}_j + \beta_3 T_j \textit{distance}_j + X_{ij} \gamma + \varepsilon_{ij},$

- Y_{ij} fertility or labor market outcome for woman *i* with parent *j*
- T_j dummy that takes value 1 if parent j was born from January 1, 1950 onward and 0 otherwise
- *distance_j* distance from the birth month of parent *j* to January 1950 measured in months
- X_{ij} vector of covariates measured before the reform
- β_1 measures the impact of the reform

RDD Details

$Y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 T_j + \beta_2 distance_j + \beta_3 T_j distance_j + X_{ij} \gamma + \varepsilon_{ij},$

- Separate analysis by woman-parent link.
- Bandwidth of 12 months.
- In specifications with controls: quadratic functions of woman's age, income in 2004, and employment status in 2004 and equivalent controls for their partners and parents.

Data

Data

Main sample

- Administrative data from Statistics Netherlands
- Sample includes all cohabiting childless opposite sex couples together on January 1 2005 with at least one parent(-in-law) born within 12 months of January 1950 and alive in 2004.

Effect on Retirement

Effect on Retirement Age



Figure 1: Parent generation's retirement age

Results

Effect on Retirement by Year



Figure 2: Effect on working in parent generation by year

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

Effect on Fertility

Results

Effect on Fertility in Next Generation



Figure 3: Fertility in 2021, in relation to women's parents' birth dates

Standard RDD Robustness Checks

Standard RDD Robustness Checks

- Bandwidth choice Bandwdith
- Polynomial choice Polynomial
- Balance in observables Balance
- Manipulation of running variable Manipulation
- Placebo cutoffs Placebo tests

Fertility Effect Dynamics



Figure 4: Effect on total fertility via mother by year

Is the Fertility Effect Permanent?

Table 1: Heterogeneity analysis for the effectsthrough women's mothers

		RF	Ν
(1)	Baseline sample	-0.056*** (0.021)	35,287
(2)	44 and older	-0.094*** (0.029)	17,698
(3)	Younger than 44	-0.020 (0.029)	17,589

Note: Regression discontinuity effect estimates. *significant at 10%, **significant at 5%, ***significant at 1%.

Effect on Labor Force Participation

Results

Effect on Work hours in Next Generation



Figure 5: Average yearly work hours between 2010 and 2015, in relation to women's parents' birth dates

Is Child Care the Mechanism?

Time transfers versus income transfers?

- Effect limited to families living close by Distance heterogeneity
- Grandparental childcare is prevalent while income transfers are rare Transfers
- Reform had a large effect on retirement age but a limited effect on income

Conclusion

- Pension reform reduced fertility in the next generation
 - Effect runs through women's mothers
 - Grandparental child care seems to be the primary mechanism
- Little effect on female LFP.
 - Likely due to formal childcare subsidies linked to working hours
- Reforms aimed at balancing pension systems may be less effective than though previously because lower fertility could reduce future contributions.

Appendix

Sensitivity to bandwidth and polynomial

Back

 Table A1: Sensitivity analysis for the effect on fertility

 through women's mothers

		RF	FS	IV	Ν	
Band	Bandwidth and polynomial					
(1)	Baseline: linear, 12-month	-0.056*** (0.021)	0.210*** (0.067)	-0.266** (0.131)	35,287	
(2)	Linear, 6-month	-0.086*** (0.030)	0.175* (0.096)	-0.491 (0.319)	17,602	
(3)	Quadratic, 12-month	-0.084*** (0.032)	0.242** (0.102)	-0.347* (0.197)	35,287	
(4)	Linear, 24-month	-0.027* (0.014)	0.087* (0.048)	-0.313 (0.239)	70,108	
(5)	Quadratic, 24-month	-0.062*** (0.022)	0.178** (0.072)	-0.351* (0.188)	70,108	
(6)	Cubic, 24-month	-0.092*** (0.030)	0.293*** (0.096)	-0.313** (0.145)	70,108	
(7)	Optimal bandwdith (Calonico et al., 2020)	-0.075*** (0.025)	0.222*** (0.081)	-0.303* (0.145)	104,629	

Note: Standard errors clustered at the parent level in parentheses. *significant at 10%, **significant at 5%, ***significant at 1%.

Sensitivity to outcome measure and placebo tests

Back

Table A2: Sensitivity analysis for the effect on fertility through women's mothers

		RF	FS	IV	N	
Altern	Alternative outcomes					
(8)	Fertility by mothers' 70th birthday	-0.055*** (0.021)	0.210*** (0.067)	-0.263** (0.130)	35,287	
(9)	Age at first birth	0.240** (0.121)	0.210*** (0.067)	1.145* (0.682)	35,287	
Placebo tests						
(10)	Placebo January 1, 1949	0.014 (0.021)	0.125** (0.064)	0.115 (0.174)	34,762	
(11)	Placebo January 1, 1948	0.018 (0.021)	0.001 (0.060)	0.000 (0.000)	34,438	
(12)	Placebo January 1, 1947	0.008 (0.021)	0.053 (0.060)	0.162 (0.444)	33,396	

Note: Standard errors clustered at the parent level in parentheses. *significant at 10%, **significant at 5%, ***significant at 1%.

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

Pre-reform Characteristics

Back

	Control mean	Treated mean	<i>p</i> -value at threshold
Background characteristics			
Age 2004	27.67	27.07	0.355
Partner's age 2004	30.12	29.63	0.871
Relationship duration	3.26	3.01	0.843
Other unaffected parents	2.219	2.059	0.630
Oldest parent	0.052	0.040	0.975
Distance to parent (km)	25.39	24.53	0.206
Higher education	0.400	0.384	0.646
Labor market outcomes in 2004			
Working	0.944	0.951	0.677
Income (1,000s of euros)	22.53	21.75	0.355
Couple's income (1,000s of euros)	51.02	49.55	0.476
Parent's income (1,000s of euros)	8.27	8.93	0.424
Parent working	0.494	0.528	0.865
Parent working in public sector	0.254	0.271	0.750

Table A3: Balance table for females in relation to their mothers

Note: Comparison of females with mothers born up to 12 months before 1950 (control group) and mothers born up to 12 months after 1950 (treated group). p-values from RDD flexible linear specification. N = 35,449, cluster = 32,215



Figure A1: Distributions of birth dates for women's parents and parents-in-law



Note: Distributions of birth dates for women's parents and parents-in-law in my main sample. *p*-values from a test for manipulation of the running variable following Cattaneo et al. (2020) implemented with default parameters described in Cattaneo et al. (2018).

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

5 / 17

Effect of Reform on Retirement Age: Employed

Back



Figure A2: Parent generation's retirement age, employed on 53rd birthday

Note: Scatter plots for the mean of retirement age censoring at 53 and 67. Point estimates refer to regression discontinuity effect estimates from a flexible quadratic specification.

Fertility by Distance to Woman's Mother

Back

 Table A4:
 Heterogeneity analysis for the effects through women's mothers

		RF	Ν
(1)	Baseline sample	-0.056*** (0.021)	35,287
(4)	Within 15 km of mother	-0.073*** (0.025)	22,935
(5)	More than 15 km away from mother	-0.022 (0.036)	12,352

Note: Regression discontinuity effect estimates. *significant at 10%, **significant at 5%, ***significant at 1%.

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

7 / 17

Gender and Generations Survey: Grandparental Childcare

Back

	Fraction	<i>p</i> -value against subsequent row
With children under 15		
Female's Mother	0.486	0.000
Female's Father	0.316	0.498
Male's Mother	0.306	0.000
Male's Father	0.219	
With children under 3		
Female's Mother	0.659	0.000
Female's Father	0.463	0.737
Male's Mother	0.452	0.014
Male's Father	0.373	

Table A5: Grandparental childcare in GGS

1. Households with children under 15 years of age were asked if their household regularly receive help with childcare from informal sources.

2. With children under 15: N = 1643, With children under 3: N = 451

3. *p*-values from a paired *t*-test for equal means

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

8 / 17

Gender and Generations Survey: Income Transfers

Back

Table A6:	Grandparental	income transfe	ers in GGS
-----------	---------------	----------------	------------

	Fraction	<i>p</i> -value against subsequent row
With children under 15		
Female's Father	0.114	0.201
Female's Mother	0.101	0.031
Male's Father	0.080	0.120
Male's Mother	0.067	
With children under 3		
Female's Father	0.184	0.007
Female's Mother	0.126	0.828
Male's Father	0.122	0.005
Male's Mother	0.073	

1. Household representatives were asked if their household received money, goods, or assets from people outside the household in the last 12 months.

- 2. With children under 15: $\mathsf{N}=1638,$ With children under 3: $\mathsf{N}=451$
- 3. p-values from a paired t-test for equal means

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

Effect of Reform on Parents' Income

Back



Figure A3: Parent generation's retirement age

Note: Scatter plots for the mean of income from 2011-2018 period. Point estimates refer to regression discontinuity effect estimates from a flexible quadratic specification.

Mechanisms

Back

Income transfers?

- Small fraction of household reports receiving income transfers.
- Women's fathers provide more income transfers than mothers.
- We find no effect for women's fathers.
- Result may not be consistent with income transfer channel.

Grandparental childcare?

- Women's mothers provide significantly more grandparental childcare than women's fathers.
- We find an effect for women's mothers.
- Result is consistent with the grandparental childcare channel.

Reconciling Fertility and Labor Market Outcomes

Back

I investigate two possible explanations:

1) Indirect effect via fertility diminished the direct effect on labor market outcomes

- Women who did not reduce fertility might work less.
- Women who reduced fertility might work more than if they were to have children.
- Opposing forces could cancel out.

2) Grandparental childcare is not (very) important for female labor force participation

• May be important for fertility through enabling more leisure or providing psychological support and advice.

Dutch Formal Childcare System

Back

- Five days of kindergarten per week from 7am to 6pm can often cost as much as 1500 euros per month, making childcare prohibitively expensive.
- Government provides subsidies as high as 80% of the formal childcare cost.
- The number of subsidized hours depends on the number of hours both parents spend working

Dutch Formal Childcare System's Implications

Back

- In families where the male partner is working full time, the female partner can access cheap childcare if they wish to work more. However, they face expensive childcare costs if they wish to substitute childcare time with other activities.
- Women who wish to work already have access to childcare. Gaining access to grandparental childcare might not affect them much.
- Grandparental childcare may be particularly important for women with weaker labor market engagement.

GGS: Grandparental Childcare and Work

Back

Weekly working hours With children under 15 With childre			ren under 3	
Then enner				
0.196 0.345 0.3		0.340	0.328	
(0.656)	(0.707)	(1.292)	(1.291)	
17.620***	17.512***	17.714***	17.722***	
(0.456)	(0.474)	(1.047)	(1.046)	
No	Yes	No	Yes	
1622	1615	448	448	
	With childr 0.196 (0.656) 17.620*** (0.456) No 1622	Weekly wo With children under 15 0.196 0.345 (0.656) (0.707) 17.620*** 17.512*** (0.456) (0.474) No Yes 1622 1615	Weekly working hours With children under 15 With child 0.196 0.345 0.340 (0.656) (0.707) (1.292) 17.620*** 17.512*** 17.714*** (0.456) (0.474) (1.047) No Yes No 1622 1615 448	

Table A7: Grandparental childcare and work in GGS

1. Gender and Generations Survey results. Representatives of households with children under 15 years of age were asked if their household regularly receives help with childcare from informal sources. Those answering positively were asked to list up to five informal childcare providers.

2. The table presents point estimates from a regression of female partner's weekly working hours on a dummy taking value one if the household reported receiving regular help with childcare from the female's mother.

3. Coefficient for the constant in the specifications with fixed effects refers to the average fixed effect $% \left({{{\rm{T}}_{{\rm{T}}}} \right)$

University of Amsterdam

GGS: Grandparental Childcare and Work

Back Lack of clear relationship between working and receiving grandparental childcare help suggests two things:

- First, grandparental childcare access may not be pivotal for LFP (only correlation)
- Second, grandparental childcare is just as popular among women with lower labor market engagement
- → grandparental childcare is likely important for reasons other than
 enabling labor force participation, which helps explain the effect on
 fertility and the absence of effects on labor market outcomes

References

- Aparicio-Fenoll, A., & Vidal-Fernandez, M. (2015). Working women and fertility: The role of grandmothers' labor force participation. CESifo Economic Studies, 61(1), 123–147.
- Battistin, E., De Nadai, M., & Padula, M. (2014). Roadblocks on the road to grandma's house: Fertility consequences of delayed retirement. *IZA Discussion Paper No. 8071*.
- Bratti, M., Frattini, T., & Scervini, F. (2018). Grandparental availability for child care and maternal labor force participation: pension reform evidence from Italy. *Journal of Population Economics*, *31*(4), 1239–1277.
- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., & Farrell, M. H. (2020). Optimal bandwidth choice for robust bias-corrected inference in regression discontinuity designs. *The Econometrics Journal*, *23*(2), 192–210.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Jansson, M., & Ma, X. (2018). Manipulation testing based on density discontinuity. *The Stata Journal*, 18(1), 234–261.
 Cattaneo, M. D., Jansson, M., & Ma, X. (2020). Simple local polyno-

mial density estimators. Journal of the American Statistical Association,

Julius Ilciukas

University of Amsterdam

17 / 17