

Delayed Childbearing and Urban Revival (Moreno-Maldonado & Santamaria, 2022)

Allan Hsiao
Princeton University

June 13, 2022

Summary

- Delayed parenthood → urban revival (novel channel)
 - Because downtown neighborhoods are worse for families
- Causal impact of delayed parenthood
 - Exogenous variation in access to assisted reproductive technology
- Spatial equilibrium model with fertility and location choices
 - Taste for children, downtown amenities, and child income penalties

Assisted reproductive technology

- Triple difference: pre/post-1990, treatment/control city, downtown/suburb
 - Not leveraging timing
 - Big cities only; cover + IVF vs. offer + no IVF
 - Why not downtown-suburb difference as outcome?
- 9 treatment cities vs. 8 control over 5 time periods
 - Policy reform by state: 7 treatment states vs. 2 control
 - Only 1 period for checking pre-trend
- LATE for ART instead of delayed parenthood more broadly

Spatial equilibrium model

- Number of locations is fixed
 - More suburbs \rightarrow more suburban Fréchet draws
- Key GE force?
 - Higher downtown amenities \rightarrow more delayed parenthood \rightarrow higher downtown rents
- More focus on decomposition?

Therefore, we have shown in this section that (1) an increase in the risk of postponing childbearing results in an increase in the fraction of households that have children when they are young; (2) this increase is larger for high-skilled households than for less skilled households; and (3) households with children are less likely to locate downtown than those without children.