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Abstract

This study investigated the fertility preferences of parents and children in immigrant and Dutch families. I explored the preferred ages for having a first child as well as preferred family size among 1,290 parent-child dyads from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study and the Social Position and Provisions Ethnic Minorities Survey. I examined intergenerational differences in fertility preferences and asked how ethnic origin, socio-demographic position and parents’ values influence intergenerational discrepancies. Results indicated that there are clear absolute differences in preferred timing and family size between the ethnic groups. With respect to preferred family sizes I find intergenerational differences among all ethnic groups: children prefer smaller families than their parents. There is, however, no indication that intergenerational differences are larger among immigrant families. Regarding timing of childbearing I find larger intergenerational discrepancies among Moroccan families only. Furthermore, parent and child characteristics are of limited importance for intergenerational discrepancies.
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Intergenerational transmission of family formation preferences and behavior are widely documented in the literature (Barber 2001; Musick 2002). Strong correlations have been found between parents’ and children’s fertility preferences and behavior. While this research strand shows that intergenerational transmission of fertility preferences is of importance among the native population, the importance of intergenerational transmission in immigrant families is less well understood. It has been brought up that many of immigrant children adapt faster to the host society than
is the case for their parents resulting in larger intergenerational differences 
(Kagitcibasi, 2005; Nauck, 2001). Others have brought up that immigrant parents 
themselves are open to new values in the host society suggesting that immigrant 
parents and children may adapt at a similar pace. This raises the question whether 
intergenerational differences in fertility preferences are larger, smaller or similar to 
those in native families. In addition, what are the factors affecting the likelihood of a 
generational gap? These questions become more significant now growing shares of 
the population in many Western societies are of immigrant origin (Coleman, 2006). 
Births of immigrant women in the Netherlands for example accounted for about a 
quarter of all newborns in 2004. It is thus important to know more about parents’ and 
children’s preferences when it comes to childbearing and to reveal circumstances 
under which one might expect intergenerational tensions.

In this study the focus was on the role of ethnic origin on fertility preferences. 
Specifically my first aim was to determine the extent to which there were 
intergenerational differences in fertility preferences among families from four 
immigrant origins and Dutch. I compared preferred timing of childbearing and family 
size preferences of parent-child dyads using two large surveys in the Netherlands. The 
second aim of my study was to understand the conditions under which discrepancies 
between the generations are larger or smaller. Mechanisms of social exclusion that 
may result in discrepancies are analyzed by including ethnic origin, socio-
demographic characteristics of the family as well as parental values. Including Dutch 
families in the study was to help to ascertain whether intergenerational differences in 
immigrant families are primarily related to their migrant background or a general 
phenomenon that all families undergo.
Socialization and acculturation

Through socialization parents transmit the prevailing norms, values and beliefs on to their children. This transmission process is, however, not perfect and thus results in inconsistencies in parent’s and children’s norms. In addition, children’s attitudes are not exclusively shaped by their parents but are also open to peers, media and the society they live in. Previous studies have documented changes in attitudes towards family formation between cohorts (Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001; Sassler & Miller, 2007). As a result intergenerational discrepancies may exist within families.

Parents themselves acquired norms through their own socialization. Because fertility preferences and behavior differ between regions worldwide, many (first generation) immigrant parents grew up in non-western countries with very different fertility patterns compared to the host society (Coleman, 1994; Lodewijckx et al., 1997).

Especially after migration the norms one learned may no longer be similar to those predominant in the host society. When migrating, however, individuals in general acculturate or adapt to the new society to a certain extent either or because of acculturation or socio-economic conditions (Andersson, 2004; Andersson & Scott, 2005; Berry, 1997; Foner, 1997). Some of the old values will remain important after migration whereas new values are taken over from the host society. Immigrants may thus adjust to the fertility norms in the host country over time (Andersson, 2004; Coleman, 1994; Kahn, 1994). Research suggests that immigrant children generally acculturate faster than their parents (Sam & Virta, 2003). Immigrant children are expected to be more in contact with the host society than their parents because they for example spent a substantial share of their time in the educational system. As a result they will be more oriented towards the norms of the host society. Value discrepancies between immigrant parents and children may thus become larger than is
the case in native families (Phinney et al., 2000). Another strand of literature also argues that immigrant families may experience larger intergenerational differences based on a different argument. It is suggested that especially first generation immigrants will adapt to the host country as they migrated to improve their situation and have clear social mobility ambitions for their children (Kulu, 2005). At the same time the second generation immigrant children are thought to be more likely to fall back on to the norms and prescriptions predominant in their (parents’) country of origin especially when they children feel marginalised in the host society. Though the argument is different also according to this theoretical reasoning intergenerational differences can expected to be larger in immigrant families. Against this background I expected intergenerational differentials to be generally present in both immigrant and native families. I additionally hypothesized that in immigrant families these discrepancies would be larger than in native families.

**Fertility values and socio-demographics**

Fertility preferences are, however, by no means exclusively determined by ethnic origin. The literature shows the importance of parents’ family formation values for their children’s preferences. Parents’ attitudes about the ideal family size, marriage and cohabitation directly influence their children’s views (Axinn, Clarkberg, & Thornton, 1994; De Valk & Liefbroer, 2007). It has been shown that values attached to the importance of having children for a family differs between cultures and generations (Nauck, 1988; Kohlmann, 2002). One can assume that parents who attach more importance to having children will put emphasis in transmitting this on to their children. This leads me to expect that there will be less parent-child differences in
fertility preferences among families with parents who emphasize the importance of children in women’s lives.

Religious affiliation and participation are also shown to strongly affect individual’s attitudes toward family formation (Brooks, 2002). One can assume that children who’s parents are actively adhere to a religion mainly have contacts within this more religious network. This would leave less room for deviant attitudes. According to this line of reasoning I hypothesize that parent-child differences will be smaller in families where parents are more involved in religion.

Research has shown that educational attainment plays a strong role in shaping fertility preferences and behaviour (Esveldt et al., 2001; Liebbroer & Dykstra, 2000; United Nations, 1995). It is generally assumed that more schooling results in more liberalizing values and attitudes (Barber, Thornton & Young-DeMarco, 2001). In addition, higher educated have been the front-runners when it comes to postponement of childbearing. The literature has also covered the importance of parent’s family status for children’s attitudes towards family formation. Children who are growing up in non-traditional families are more likely to be positive about unmarried cohabitation and premarital sex. Given these previous findings one could expect that parents who are higher educated as well as those who are not in a married union are more open to alternative views their children might have regarding childbearing. I therefore hypothesize that intergenerational differences in fertility preferences will be larger in non-traditional and higher educated families.

In my analyses I control for a number of confounding factors. The literature has extensively covered the positive relation between family of origin sizes and a person’s reproductive behavior (Murphy & Knudsen, 2002). Having more siblings overall improves the chances that the next generation has more children. In the analyses I
therefore control for the number of siblings the child in the dyad under study has. In addition, the role of gender specific socialization regarding a range of attitudes and behavior has been debated. The literature is indecisive about the importance of fathers versus mothers as well as about the direction of the effects on daughters and sons (Goldscheider & Goldscheider, 1989). I thus include controls specifying the different parent-child gender dyads. All analyses are also controlling for the age of the child.

**Background on the ethnic groups in the study**

Although I have referred to immigrant families so far, many of the children in these families do not have a migration experience themselves as they were born and raised in the Netherlands. Around 19% of the total 16.3 million inhabitants of the Netherlands is born abroad or has at least one parent who is born abroad. In my study I focus on four ethnic groups beside the Dutch: children with a Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean origin. Together these four immigrant groups compose 67% of the non–Western migrant population in the Netherlands in 2005 (Statistics Netherlands, 2005). All four migrant groups have a younger age structure than the Dutch: 17% of the Dutch population is between 15 and 30 years of age whereas among the four migrant groups this percentage varies between 25 and 30%.

Today, the majority of young Turks and Moroccans in the Netherlands are children of the (predominantly male) migrant workers who were recruited in the 1960s to carry out unskilled labor in the Netherlands. The majority of these migrants originated from rural areas in Turkey and Morocco (e.g., the Rif region). Family members who initially stayed behind joined them later and today, many Turks and Moroccans still find a partner in their countries of origin (De Valk, Liefbroer, Esveldt, & Henkens,
The majority of Turks and Moroccans adhere to Islam (Phalet & Van Praag, 2004).

Migration from Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles to the Netherlands stems from the colonial history between the Netherlands and these countries. Surinamese society includes a wide variety of ethnic groups with Creoles and Hindus being the two major ones. Traditionally, migrants from Surinam and the Antilles came to the Netherlands for educational purposes. Furthermore, a substantial number of Surinamese migrated to the Netherlands around the independence of Surinam in 1975. Until 1980, Surinamese kept Dutch nationality and could thus easily settle in the Netherlands without residence permits. Because The Antilles are still part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, migration is relatively easy. In recent years, limited job opportunities on the Antilles made many young Antilleans decide to migrate to the Netherlands. Among Surinamese, a diversity of religions is found: Islam, Hinduism, and Christianity. Antilleans mainly identify themselves as Christian.

**Data**

Parent and child data from the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study (main sample, 2002) and the Social Position and Provisions Ethnic Minorities Survey are used. The first wave of the Netherlands Kinship Panel Study is a national representative sample of about 8,000 Dutch respondents (Dykstra, Kalmijn, Knijn, Komter, Liefbroer, & Mulder, 2005). The main respondent was interviewed in a personal interview supplemented with self-completion questionnaires. Up to five family members (partner, one parent, one sibling, and two children) of this main respondent both in and outside the household were asked to complete a self-completion questionnaire. The Social Position and Provisions Ethnic Minorities Survey include 4,100 migrants.
with a Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, or Antillean background living in 13 municipalities in the Netherlands (Groeneveld & Weijers-Martens, 2003). These heads of household were approached at home by an interviewer with the same ethnic background. In addition to this main interview with the head of household, the partner and children over the age of 12 who lived in the same household were asked to fill in a short self-completion questionnaire.

Both surveys allow comparison of parents and children living in the same household. The analyses required that information on fertility preferences was available for both parent and child. I selected respondents who had at least one child aged between 15 and 30 years living in the parental home at the time of interview. Information on one of the parents and a randomly chosen child who met the above-mentioned criteria was included in the analyses. After selection, the data included 1293 parent-child dyads of which 661 Dutch, 251 Turkish, 173 Moroccans, 132 Surinamese, and 76 Antilleans.

**Measures**

**Dependent variables**

Two measures of fertility preferences were used in the study. My first dependent variable indicates the preferred family size. This was derived from a question asked of both parents and children: “what is in your opinion the best number of children for a family”. Open answers to this question were coded in absolute numbers. The second dependent variable is the preferred age for a woman to experience a first birth. Respondents were asked: “What do you consider a good age for a woman to have a first child.” Respondents were asked to give the absolute age in full years.
Both these questions were posed to (at least one) parent and (at least) one randomly selected child living in the same household. The preferred absolute ages and family sizes are analyzed for parent-child dyads in each of the ethnic groups and Dutch. The intergenerational difference scores for preferred family size and preferred age at childbearing were derived from the difference between the matched parent-child value score on the two measures. The two obtained difference scores were then used for analyses.

Independent variables

Child measures

Ethnic origin. Based on the persons and their parents country of birth he/she is assigned to one of the five ethnic groups. I distinguish between those who were themselves born or have at least one parent born in Turkey, Morocco, Surinam and the Antilles. Those with a Dutch origin are the reference group in the analyses.

Age. I distinguish between those younger than 20 years, those aged 20 to 25 years and those who are 25 to 30 years of age. The youngest age group are the reference category in the analyses.

Number of siblings. The absolute with a maximum of 7 is included as a continuous variable in the analyses.

Dyad measures

Gender composition of the dyad. I distinguish between mother-son, father-daughter and father-son dyads. The mother-daughter dyads are the reference category.

Parent measures
Parents’ educational level. The highest level of education completed either abroad or in the Netherlands was included in the analyses with a dummy variable. I distinguish between parents who are lower (maximum lower vocational education) or higher educated. The lower educated are the reference category.

Parent’s religious participation. Level of participation was measured by the question “how often do you currently attend church or religious services”. Four categories ranging from low to high participation were distinguished: 1) never, 2) several times a year, 3) several times a month, and 4) once a week or more often.

Parent’s family status. Those whose parents are in a married union (reference group) are compared to those who are unmarried, divorced, or widowed.

Parent’s value of children. The importance of children in a persons live is measured by the question “one can never be happy without kids”. Answering categories of the five point likert scale ranged from 1) strongly agree to 5) strongly disagree.

Parent’s female family orientation. The extent to which the reporting parent feels that women should exclusively focus on family and children is measured by the level of agreement with the statement “a women should stop working when she has her first child”. The five point likert scale ranging from 1) strongly agree to 5) strongly disagree was included in the analyses.

- Table 1 about here -

Methods

In the first step of the descriptive analyses a comparison of preferences of parents and children from different ethnic origins was made. Means and standard deviations are calculated for both independent variables. Furthermore, differences between mean
group preferences are tested using posthoc multigroup (Least Significant Difference) comparison.

The second part of the descriptive analyses focuses on the level of agreement between parents and children in each of the ethnic groups. Agreement was measured in two ways. First, I calculated correlations between parent and child preferences for timing and level of fertility therewith indicating similarities between their perceptions. Second, dyadic difference scores were computed. This method was selected as I am primarily interested in which person (parent or child) prefers older ages for childbirth and larger family sizes. Furthermore, difference scores allow me to assess variation in the level (dis-) agreement among parent and children with different ethnic origins. Paired t tests were computed on each of the difference scores for each of the ethnic groups.

The multivariate analyses examine factors that are related to a certain level of (dis-) agreement. The raw dyadic difference scores for both preferred childbearing ages and preferred number of children are grouped into three levels of agreement. Based on the percentile ranking each parent child dyad is assigned to one of the following three groups: high agreement, parent prefers older ages and larger families, or child prefers older ages and larger families. This triadic categorical variable is the dependent variable in the multinominal logistic regression models in which children’s, parents’ and dyadic characteristics that might differentiate between the three groups are identified. The reference group in the analyses are parent-child dyads with a high level of agreement on the best ages for childbearing and family sizes. The factors related to be in the ‘high agreement’ group are contrasted with the likelihood of a dyad being in the group in which parents prefer older ages and larger families or
being in the group in which the child prefers older childbearing ages and larger family sizes.

Ethnic and intergenerational comparisons

Descriptive findings on the preferences of parent and child for the preferred number of children of a family are presented in Table 2. Findings show that Dutch on average prefer the smallest family sizes ($M = 2.51$ and 2.37 parents and children respectively) and Moroccans the largest ($M = 3.78$ and 2.90 parents and children respectively). The preferences of Turkish, Antillean and Dutch parents do not differ from each other. Regarding the family size preferences of children we find that Moroccans are the exception as they prefer clearly larger sizes than the other four ethnic groups who do not significantly differ from each other.

Beside comparing differences between the ethnic groups I am mainly interested in the intergenerational differences within each of these groups. Therefore the correlation between parents and children’s reports is presented in the last column of Table 2. For all ethnic groups I find that parent’s and children’s preferences correlate significantly. The correlation is lowest among the Moroccans.

Finally, the parent-child difference score is calculated and tested for significant differences within families with $t$-tests. The difference score shows that family size preferences of parents and children differ significantly: parents overall prefer larger families than is the case for their children. Although this finding applies for all groups the difference is not significant for the Antillean parent-child dyads. The intergenerational difference is largest for the Moroccans and smallest for the Dutch dyads. The analyses of variance of difference scores showed that the variance between the ethnic groups was larger than within the groups ($F = 10.67, p < .001$).
To gain further insight in parent-child similarity among each of the ethnic groups separately, parent-child difference scores were standardized (not in Table). For each of the ethnic groups the difference scores were standardized and the percentage of parent-child dyads whose difference score is within the range of 1 standard deviation was compared. The highest agreement is found among Turks and Dutch for which respectively 89 and 81 percent of all dyads fall within the defined range. Although agreement is somewhat lower among Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean parent and children, still the majority (76, 69 and 69 per cent respectively) of all these dyads fall in the defined range of agreement.

- Table 2 about here -

Regarding the preferred age for a woman to have a first child (Table 3) I again find clear ethnic differences: Moroccans prefer the youngest ages ($M = 23.3$ and 24.8 years for parents and children) and Dutch the oldest ($M = 26.9$ and 27.2 years for parents and children). Turkish, Surinamese and Antillean parents and children do not significantly differ in their age preferences.

Beside the differences in fertility preferences between the ethnic groups, I find that the correlation between parent and child within each of the ethnic groups is highly significant (last column Table3). Intergenerational correlation is highest among Moroccans and lowest among the Dutch parent-child dyads.

Parent-child difference scores of preferred age at childbearing are computed and compared within families using $t$-tests. The parent-child difference scores indicate limited differences between the generations. Even though children of all ethnic groups, except the Antilleans, prefer to postpone childbearing compared to their
parents intergenerational differences are not always significant. Intergenerational
dissimilarities are found to be the largest and significant for Turkish and Moroccan
families whereas among the other three ethnic groups no significant differences
between the preferred ages of parents and their children were found. Analyses of
variance for the difference score of preferred age showed that there were significant
differences by ethnicity ($F = 7.11, p < .001$).

Again the difference scores on preferred ages were standardized per ethnic group.
Between 72 to 75 percent of all Dutch, Antilleans, Surinamese and Moroccans parent-
child dyads fall within the range of 1 standard deviation below or above the mean.
Only for Turks I find a lower percentage (65%) of all dyads falling within this range.

- Table 3 about here-

Groups of parent-child agreement
Difference scores were computed for each of the two fertility preference measures by
subtracting the child’s score from the parent’s score. Thus, difference scores of
greater than zero mean that the parent preferred higher fertility levels and older
childbearing ages, differences score lower than zero indicate that the child preferred
higher fertility and childbearing ages and difference scores close to zero indicate high
agreement.

The dyads in the high agreement group have a mean difference score close to zero
and was exactly 0.00 regarding the agreement on preferred number of children. This
was the largest groups with in total 573 of the 1,187 parent-child dyads (48%) belong
to this cluster. The group in which parents preferred larger family sizes comprised of
428 of the 1,187 dyads (36%). The final group included those dyads in which the child preferred larger family sizes, in total 186 dyads (16%).

For the preferred childbearing age the mean difference score for the dyads with high agreement was -0.41. In total 361 of the 1,225 dyads (30%) felt in this group. Again positive scores refer to higher preferred ages among parents which applied to 429 dyads (35%). The dyads for which the children preferred higher ages comprised of 435 dyads (35%) in the total sample of 1,225 parent-child dyads.

Predicting parent-child agreement

What factors influence the likelihood of parent-child dyads to exhibit a certain pattern of agreement or disagreement with respect to fertility preferences? I identified the possible individual and family characteristics that may be related to high agreement, to parent more favorable or to child more favorable of high fertility levels. The multinominal logit model simultaneously contrasts the likelihood of a dyad being in group 1 (child preferred larger family size) versus high agreement (group 2) and the likelihood of being in group 3 (parent preferred larger family size) versus high agreement (group 2). There were relatively few significant predictors of the tendency to fall into the child preferred larger family sizes. Despite my hypothesis that migrant children would be more likely to fall in one of the two less parent-child agreement groups no support is found in the analyses. Only Surinamese dyads are slightly more likely to fall into the group in which the child preferred larger family sizes than in the high agreement group. Dyads in which the child had many siblings were more likely to prefer larger family sizes than did those with fewer siblings. In addition, I find that mother-son dyads were slightly less likely to be in the group in which the child prefers higher fertility levels. Finally, the more parent’s are of the opinion that one
can also be happy without kids the more likely the dyad was to be in the child more favorable of larger families group. None of the other child, dyadic or family characteristics were found to be related to the likelihood of falling in group 1 compared to the high agreement group (2).

Also for the second equation that contrasted the parent prefers larger families to the dyads with high agreement I find no effect of ethnic origin. This indicates that parents and children in migrant families are not more likely to disagree on the best number of children than is the case for the Dutch. The more siblings the child has the higher the more likely the dyad is to be in the group in which parents prefer larger family sizes compared to the high agreement group. Greater parental religious involvement is related to a higher likelihood of being in the group in which parents prefer more children for a family compared to those in the high agreement group.

- Table 4 about here-

The second aspect of fertility I studied relates to the preferred timing of childbearing. Again I start with contrasting the dyads in which the child prefers older ages to the group of high agreement. Parent-child dyads of Moroccan origin are more likely to fall in the child prefers older ages than dyads of the other ethnic origins. So I find some limited support for my hypothesis that migrant families are more likely to have intergenerational disagreement on timing of childbearing. No other characteristics are related to being in this disagreement group compared to those in the agreement group. For the contrast between the group of dyads in which parents prefer older childbearing ages and the high agreement group I find that only dyads with an Antillean origin are more likely to fall in the first category. Dyads in which
the child is in the beginning twenties on the other hand are less likely to be in the
category in which parents prefer older ages. The last predictor of the likelihood to fall
in the group where parents prefer older ages is parents’ value on female labour force
participation. Those dyads in which parents are of the opinion that women should not
quite work when having children are more likely to be in this group in which parents
prefer postponement of childbearing. Again I find that none of the other predictors
was related to be in the group of more disagreement compared to the high agreement
group.

Conclusion and discussion

In this paper I studied intergenerational differences in fertility preferences among
immigrant and Dutch families. I analyzed the preferred timing of childbearing and
family size preferences of parent-child dyads. The conditions under which
discrepancies between the generations are larger or smaller were assessed.

My findings show that the parent and child generation differ in their preferred
family sizes among all groups. Overall children prefer smaller families than their
parents. This intergenerational discrepancy is largest among Moroccan families. This
indicates that children in Moroccan families seem to make a larger step in adjusting
their preferences to the Dutch norm of smaller families than is the case for the other
immigrant groups. This is also due to the fact that Moroccan parents and children
differ significantly from the other groups in that they prefer larger families. A finding
that is in line with the TFR of Moroccan women of the first generation in the
Netherlands which is found to be higher than among Turkish, Surinamese and
Antillean women. This is supported in my multivariate analyses where I find that it’s not so much the effect of Moroccan background but rather the fact that children of Moroccan origin grow up in larger families that is related to larger intergenerational discrepancies in family size preferences. All in all this suggests that when the discrepancy between the fertility norms and behavior in the country of origin and settlement are larger it may take several generations to accustom to the norms predominant in the host society.

For the preferred timing of having a first child I find no intergenerational differences for the Surinamese, Antillean and Dutch families. For Turkish and Moroccan families, however, the findings show that the child generation prefers to postpone childbearing more than their parents. Again intergenerational discrepancies are largest for Moroccan families also after taking other characteristics of parent and child into account. Although I do not find overall support for my hypothesis that intergenerational differences are larger among immigrant families the potential for intergenerational tensions is thus largest for Moroccan families. This finding is line with other research showing that Moroccan youth are open towards Dutch society and at the same time have difficulties in balancing the expectation in their families (REF). This also points out that it is important to include the specific characteristics of an immigrant group as there is no clear dichotomy between immigrant and native families.

Beside the fact that I find only limited support for the ethnic factor in intergenerational discrepancies of fertility preferences, there is not much evidence that these preferences are related to other parent and family characteristics included in my study. Intergenerational disagreement and tensions may not be very well captured by characteristics of parents and children separately. It may rather be the interaction
between parent and child as well their relationship characteristics that may result in
more or less agreement between the generations. It would therefore be worthwhile to
include more dyad information in future studies of intergenerational transmission of
preferences in order to get a better hold on the processes taking place in the family.

Though this paper expanded the scope to intergenerational transmission among
immigrant families there are a number of limitations to the study. First of all, my data
allowed to include only those children living at the parental home. It would be
valuable to have information

Second, my analyses included the preferences of one selected parent and child
only. For future surveys it would be valuable to assess the preferences of both parents
and all their children. This would allow us to see among which parent-child dyads
within one family the intergenerational discrepancies are largest.

Finally, given the growing share of immigrant youth in many western societies it is
crucial to know more on the grounds for intergenerational tensions within these
families. Including persons with different immigrant origins in large surveys is
therefore a prerequisite.
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### Table 1  
**Description of independent variables by ethnic group, mean and (standard deviation)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Turks</th>
<th>Moroccans</th>
<th>Surinamese</th>
<th>Antilleans</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.71 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.44)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.24 (0.42)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.39)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.05 (0.22)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.27)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.25)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of siblings</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>3.33 (1.26)</td>
<td>5.06 (1.64)</td>
<td>2.81 (1.01)</td>
<td>3.11 (1.21)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dyad characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother – daughter (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.25 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother – son</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.20 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.27 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.34 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father - daughter</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.25 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.46)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.16 (0.37)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father – son</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.29 (0.45)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.38)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.33)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental educational level</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.20 (0.40)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.44)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.39)</td>
<td>0.54 (0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s religious participation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.95 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.14 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.13 (0.95)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s family status</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.12 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s value of children</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.71 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.49 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.53 (1.03)</td>
<td>3.79 (0.95)</td>
<td>4.25 (0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s female family orientation</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.94 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.74 (1.17)</td>
<td>3.62 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.65 (1.12)</td>
<td>3.68 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Preferred number of children for a family reported by parents and children per ethnic group, mean and (standard deviation), parent-child difference score and correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Parent M (SD)</th>
<th>Child M (SD)</th>
<th>Parent-child difference (t-test)</th>
<th>Correlation r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>2.65&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (1.22)</td>
<td>2.39&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.83)</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>3.74&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (1.28)</td>
<td>2.90&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; (1.03)</td>
<td>0.84***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>2.82&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt; (0.96)</td>
<td>2.51&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.73)</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilleans</td>
<td>2.59&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.77)</td>
<td>2.53&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.91)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>2.57&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.79)</td>
<td>2.35&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; (0.91)</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means in the same column that do not share subscripts differ at p < .05 in the multiple comparison Least Significant Difference (LSD) test.


**p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 3  Preferred age for a woman to have a first child reported by parents and children per ethnic group, means and (standard deviation), parent-child difference score and correlation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Parent Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Child Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Parent-child difference (t-test)</th>
<th>Correlation r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>24.5\textsubscript{a} (2.26)</td>
<td>25.4\textsubscript{a} (2.57)</td>
<td>-0.92***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccans</td>
<td>23.4\textsubscript{b} (2.56)</td>
<td>24.8\textsubscript{b} (2.49)</td>
<td>-1.47***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>25.3\textsubscript{c} (2.98)</td>
<td>25.5\textsubscript{a,c} (3.11)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antilleans</td>
<td>25.2\textsubscript{a,c} (2.90)</td>
<td>25.1\textsubscript{a,b,c} (3.18)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>27.0\textsubscript{d} (2.56)</td>
<td>27.2\textsubscript{d} (2.97)</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means in the same column that do not share subscripts differ at \( p < .05 \) in the multiple comparison Least Significant Difference (LSD) test.


***\( p < .001 \).
Table 4  Multinominal logit coefficients for predicting level of agreement between parent and child on preferred family sizes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Group 1 child prefers larger family size</th>
<th>Group 3 Parent prefers larger family size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.20***</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic origin (Dutch ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (15-19 ref.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of siblings</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad (mother – daughter ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother – son</td>
<td>-0.41~</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father - daughter</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father – son</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental educational level</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s religious part.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s family status</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s value of children</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s female orientation</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5  
*Multinominal logit coefficients for predicting level of agreement between parent and child on preferred age for having a first child*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Group 1 child prefers older childbearing age</th>
<th>Group 3 parent prefers older childbearing age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Child characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin (Dutch ref.)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>0.63*</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinamese</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (15-19 ref.):</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of siblings</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dyad (mother – daughter ref.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother – son</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father - daughter</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father – son</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parent characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental characteristic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parental educational level</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s religious part.</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s family status</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s value of children</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent’s female orientation</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Nagelkerke                          | 0.07                                        |                                             |