

Teen Religiosity and Fertility in Adulthood in a Canadian Prairie Province

Frank Trovato¹

Received: 16 April 2015 / Accepted: 27 October 2015 / Published online: 12 November 2015
© Religious Research Association, Inc. 2015

Abstract This study examines the association of self-reported religiosity during one's teens with cumulative fertility in adulthood based on a representative sample of women in Alberta, a province in the prairie region of Canada. A significant association is found between these two variables. The association persists even after relevant controls have been taken into account in Poisson regression analysis. Women reporting a high degree of religiosity during their teen years achieve a larger family size than women who stated they were nonreligious or had a low level of religious engagement in their teens. The findings of this study are consistent with the proposition that early life experiences can have long term effects into adulthood, including in this case, cumulative fertility. Religiosity remains an important factor in the explanation of fertility differentials.

Keywords Sample survey · Cumulative fertility · Teen religiosity · Poisson regression · Alberta, Canada

Introduction

The role of religion in society has received extensive attention by sociologists dating back to the formative years of sociology as a discipline (e.g., Durkheim 1897 [1951]; Weber 1905 [1958]). Within social demography the importance of religion has been shown in relation to a variety of phenomena, including group differences in health and mortality (Berkman and Syme 1979; House et al. 1988; Hummer et al. 1999), variations in family related processes such as, the timing of sexual debut, mate selection, family stability, family planning, as well as the timing and spacing of children (Adsera 2006; Balakrishnan and Chen 1990; Berghammer 2012;

✉ Frank Trovato
ftrovato@ualberta.ca

¹ Department of Sociology, University of Alberta, Edmonton T6G 2H4, Canada

Hayford and Philip Morgan 2008; Heaton and Goodman 1985; Lehrer 2004; McQuillan 2004; Zhang 2008). The present study concerns itself with an important dimension of religion: It looks at the association of teen religiosity—the extent to which one participates in religious rituals during her teens—and cumulative fertility (number of children borne). It is proposed that for women a greater level of religious engagement early in life during the teen years translates into a higher cumulative fertility in adulthood. The setting for this investigation is the province of Alberta in the prairie region of Canada.¹ The data analyzed are retrospective reports by a sample of Alberta women that participated in a survey conducted in 2010.

Religion, Religiosity and Fertility

Early Canadian studies have documented significantly fertility variations among religious groups (Balakrishnan et al. 1975, 1979; Burch 1966; Henripin 1972). After the 1970s however, differentials by religious denominations have virtually disappeared, barring perhaps some small religious isolates such as Hutterites that continue to stand out for their above average fertility as compared to other Canadians.² Certainly, the once prominent Catholic-Protestant fertility differential has vanished into insignificance today (Mosher et al. 1992; Westoff and Jones 1979). In their extensive analysis of the Canadian Fertility Survey data, Balakrishnan et al. (1993: 60–61) reached the conclusion that while fertility differentials by religious denomination have narrowed considerably, those by religiosity have not. In a different study, Balakrishnan and Chen (1990) also noted that among the women surveyed, religiosity explained significant variations in the probability of cohabitation and divorce as well as cumulative fertility. More religious respondents were not only less likely to cohabit before marriage, but were also more likely to stay in their first marriage and also reported a significantly larger family size as compared to less religious women.

Given this tendency toward convergence much of the attention has shifted to examining how religiosity, the extent to which one participates in religious activities and rituals as indicators of religious commitment, may explain family behaviors including fertility. Various explanations in the social demographic literature have been presented regarding the importance of religion as a factor in fertility variations. The particularized ideology thesis attributes group fertility differentials to religious doctrine, as exemplified by the Catholic Church's prohibition of birth control (Day 1968; Kennedy 1973; Van Heek 1956). The minority-group status thesis predicts variations in family size as a function of social psychological insecurities associated with membership in a disadvantaged minority with a history of prejudice and discrimination. For instance, upwardly mobile Blacks in the United States have been shown to have lower fertility than upwardly mobile Whites, presumably as a result of conscious choice by minority couples to limit fertility as a means of advancing

¹ The other two Canadian prairies provinces are Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

² Although today Hutterites maintain above average fertility, this group has experienced significant declines in fertility over the course of the twentieth century (see, Laing 1980; Peters 1987; White 2002).

socioeconomically (Goldscheider and Uhlenberg 1969). A third explanation, the characteristics-assimilation hypothesis, specifies that differential fertility emanates not from the effects of ideology or group insecurities, but rather from group inequalities in demographic composition (e.g., age structure) and socioeconomic status (e.g., education, income). According to this hypothesis, equalization of demographic and social economic characteristics across groups would result in fertility convergence (Goldscheider and Uhlenberg 1969).

The main focus of the present study is not on religion but rather on religiosity early in life as a possible factor explaining cumulative fertility variations. Although useful, these explanations are generally silent on this specific aspect of religion as it pertains to fertility.³ What is it about being religious early in life that helps explain variation in achieved fertility? In a general sense (denominational variations acknowledged) all major world religions share a common pronatalist ideological orientation as well as favoring traditional family values (Tang 1995). Therefore the stronger the commitment to the religious life the more likely one is to develop preferences for early marriage and large families (Uecker and Hill 2014; Hayford and Philip Morgan 2008; Lehrer 2004; Thornton et al. 1992). As explained by Balakrishan et al. (1993: 61), “[w]omen who are very religious are expected to be traditional in their views, and hence have a larger family-size norm and accept the role of motherhood more readily than less religious women.”

Viewed from a life course perspective, for many individuals the process of becoming religious begins early in life during childhood socialization within the family context. According to Bengston et al. (2013) this often involves intergenerational dynamics, whereby parents and grandparents transmit and reinforce religious values to children. Highly religious families would instill in children the importance of religious observance and commitment and also help inculcate in the child traditional orientation toward matters of family and childbearing (Miller 1992). Attendance at sectarian schools may further reinforce a child’s religious socialization in the family (Johnson 1982). And, in adulthood, strong attachment and adherence to religion would imply the evaluation of important life decisions, including family formation and childbearing, from the perspective of what does or does not accord with moral precepts and expectations embodied by a religion (Gupta 2010; Lehrer 2004; Janssen and Hauser 1981; Pearce 2010; McQuillan 2004).

Consistent with these ideas, it is proposed that teen religiosity plays a significant role in women’s fertility decisions. Women who were more religious in their teens would be expected to have more children on average than those who in their teens were either nonreligious or had low levels of religious involvement. This relationship between teen religiosity and fertility is likely mediated by differences in the timing of entry into marriage, as more religious women would tend to marry earlier on average than less religious women. The statistical analysis in this study will control for marriage timing as well as other relevant variables including the

³ However, there may be implied linkages in these explanations with respect to the role of religiosity. For instance, the particularized ideology thesis implies that stronger adherence to church doctrine should induce greater levels of conformity by group members to ideological expectations regarding family planning and childbearing. Similarly, in the minority status thesis, religiosity may interact with group insecurities such that more religious members might place greater emphasis on achieving a larger family than on getting ahead socioeconomically and assimilating to the larger society.

possibility that some who were highly religious in their teens may have become nonreligious later in adulthood. This possible change is captured in the statistical multivariate analysis by an interaction term reflecting levels of teen religiosity with currently religiosity.

Study Setting

A number of features make Alberta an important setting for the study of teen religiosity and fertility. First, to the author's knowledge, no other Canadian fertility survey includes retrospective questions on one's religiosity during the teen years. In this sense, the Alberta Fertility Survey, upon which this research is based, provides a unique opportunity to examine how one's early experience with religion may relate to cumulative fertility in adulthood. As compared to the other Canadian provinces, Alberta stands out as having above average fertility. In 2010, its total fertility rate was 1.90 children per woman as compared to 1.66 for the nation. With the exception of the Territories, where the population is predominantly aboriginal, and where fertility rates remain higher than the national average, only Saskatchewan and Manitoba—the two other Prairie provinces—surpass the fertility rate of Alberta.⁴ Furthermore, as compared to most other areas of Canada a relatively higher proportion of Alberta's population is religiously unaffiliated (32 %), surpassed only by British Columbia (Statistics Canada 2011). Religious observance levels are also low in Alberta. For instance, historically, the provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have had the highest monthly church attendance rates whereas Alberta and British Columbia in the west, and Quebec in the east, have the lowest rates of church attendance (Clark 2000, 2003; Pew Centre Religion & Public Life 2013). The two leading religious denominations in Alberta are Catholics (24 %) and Protestant (18 %), with other religions comprising nearly 26 % of the population (Statistics Canada 2011).⁵ Economically, Alberta is a wealthy province, and its unemployment rate has been below the national average for quite some time. As a result of its strong economy there have been significant inflows of labor to Alberta from other parts of Canada and also from abroad. Consequently there tends to be a relatively high rate of population turnover (Hiller 2009). As is generally true of areas experiencing rapid change, this province has over the years also experienced above average rates of family dissolution (Fenelon 1971; Glenn and Supancic 1984; Breault and Kposowa 1987).

⁴ The prairie region of Canada is unique in this sense, in that it is the region that exhibits the highest fertility in the country outside of the northern territories. The structural reasons underlying the prairies' relatively high fertility is a topic worthy of further exploration but lies outside the scope of the present investigation.

⁵ The province is home to the Hutterites and Mennonites, two relatively small religious isolates that are known to have relatively high fertility. Unfortunately, the number of such cases in the sample is insufficient for proper statistical analysis.

Data and Analytical Approach

The data for this study are taken from the Alberta Fertility Survey (AFS) conducted in 2010 based on randomly selected sample of 634 currently married women in Alberta aged 20–49 living with their husband. The sampling method was random digit dialing (RDD). A computer assisted telephone interviewing system (CATI) was used to record the survey responses. The survey response rate was 27 % (i.e., number of completed interviews/number completed + number refused to be interviewed). Checks were undertaken to gain a sense of possible bias in the AFS data given this low response rate. Selected variables in the AFS were compared to the 2006 national General Social Survey. Differences in the distributions of selected variables were examined. As shown in “[Appendix](#)”, a comparative analysis of AFS with GSS data yielded small discrepancies in the distributions of the variables, the discordance being in the range of 10 %. Thus, it may be assumed that irrespective of the low response rate, the potential bias in the AFS data is not likely to severely distort the statistical analysis in this study.

The dependent variable is the number of children ever borne. The main predictor of interest is self-reported religiosity during one’s teens as indicated retrospectively by the survey respondents based on frequency of attendance of religious services other than weddings and funerals. The question asked in the AFS was: “During your teens (ages 13–19) would you say that you attended religious services other than weddings and funerals: (a) daily; (b) weekly; (c) monthly; (d) every few months; (e) yearly; (f) never”. Responses were coded into three categories: (1) non-practicing/no religion; (2) low religiosity (attended religious services monthly, every few months, or yearly); (3) high religiosity (attended religious services daily or weekly).

Children ever born is a count variable; therefore Poisson regression is a suitable method to execute the multivariate analysis. This type of regression models the expected number of events (births) as a function of selected predictors, assuming events are random and independent occurrences. The equation specified takes the form, $\mu_i t_i = \exp(\beta_0 + \sum_j \beta_j X_{ij} + \ln t_i)$, where $\mu_i t_i$ is the expected number of births to woman i given μ , the underlying rate of childbearing per unit time t ; β_0 is a constant term; β_j measures the effect of unit change in predictor X on change in number of expected births; t_i represents exposure time to the risk of childbearing, measured here as the natural logarithm of age at first marriage (the younger the age at first marriage the greater the exposure to the risk of childbearing).⁶

⁶ Given the cross-sectional nature of the data it is acknowledged that right censoring is a problem. That is, the fact that although older women in the sample might be expected to have completed their childbearing, this cannot be safely assumed of the younger respondents. Inclusion of the age variable in the regression does not solve the censoring problem but helps to control for it somewhat, as the younger group can be viewed as not having yet completed their family size as of the time of the survey whereas given their advanced age, most if not all of the older respondents would have likely completed their childbearing.

All predictors in the equation are dichotomized⁷: Teen religiosity [high vs. low/nonreligious]; age 20–34 versus age 35–49; age at first marriage [married before age 25 vs. married after age 25]; has achieved postsecondary education versus less than postsecondary; husband has postsecondary education versus less schooling; current religiosity [belongs to a religious denomination vs. is not religiously affiliated]; husband religion is same as respondent's [yes vs. no]; ever cohabited prior to marriage [yes vs. no].

The regression equation fitted to the data is in additive form. Thus, a positive coefficient would indicate that the effect of predictor *X* raises the likelihood of childbearing in relation to those in the reference category, net of the other variables in the model. A negative coefficient would denote the opposite interpretation.⁸

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics for the sample with respect to the variables in this investigation. Nearly 40 % of respondents identified themselves as having been highly religious in their teens. At the time of the survey only 27 % stated that they belonged to a religious denomination; 64 % indicated that their husband has the same religion as theirs; and nearly 3 in 4 said that they had attained postsecondary schooling, similar to their husbands'. Just over half of the sample had cohabited before marriage. The average age of respondents is 38.2, and the mean age at first marriage 25.9. The number of children borne for the sample is 2.14 per woman.

Table 2 looks at children ever born by reported level of teen religiosity and broad age category (ages 20–34 and ages 35–49). Irrespective of age category, those who reported a high degree of religious commitment in their teens have a larger average family size than respondents whose religiosity was low/nonreligious. The fertility difference between these two levels of teen religiosity among the younger subset of women is .34 of child; and among the older respondents it is .13. As shown in the table, older women have more children on average than do younger women (2.26 vs. 1.88, respectively).

It may be anticipated that in general highly religious women would on average marry earlier as compared to less religious women; and that among currently married women that had ever cohabited prior to getting married, those who were more religious in their teens would experience cohabitation relatively late. These notions are assessed with the data in Table 3. Panel (a) looks at variations in age at first marriage, while panel (b) concerns itself with age at first cohabitation. The evidence is consistent with expectation: High teen religiosity is correlated with a younger age at marriage and an older age at first cohabitation.

⁷ Preliminary analysis revealed that a dichotomous operationalization of the variables is sensible, as there was little variation in fertility between “high” teen religiosity and the “low” and “nonreligious” categories of this variable. For example, the differences in average children ever born by levels of teen religiosity are: “high religiosity” (2.26, SD = 1.25); “low religiosity” (2.06, SD = 0.95); “nonreligious” (2.06, SD = 0.95). Further analysis of children ever born by other predictor variables was generally consistent with these observations, and therefore the variables were also dichotomized.

⁸ Exponentiation produces the multiplicative form of the Poisson regression.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics; currently married women aged 20–49 (AFS, 2010)

Variable	Code	N	Mean	SD
Teen religiosity				
High religiosity	1	238	.38	.48
Low religiosity/nonreligious	0	396		
Current religious affiliation				
Belongs to a religion	1	466	.27	.44
Not religiously affiliated	0	168		
Husband’s religious affiliation				
Same as respondent	1	408	.64	.48
Different ^a	0	226		
Education				
Post-secondary	1	472	.74	.44
Below postsecondary	0	162		
Husband’s education				
Post-secondary	1	450	.71	.45
Below postsecondary	0	184		
Cohabitation history				
Ever cohabited	1	342	.54	.50
Never cohabited	0	292		
Age		634	38.2	6.8
Age at first marriage		634	25.9	5.5
Children ever born		634	2.14	1.06

^a Including “not religiously affiliated”

Table 2 Average number of children ever born to currently married women by broad age group and level of teen religiosity (AFS, 2010)

Age group and religiosity	Children ever born	SD	N
Age 20–34			
High	2.10	1.27	72
Low/no religion	1.76	.90	131
Subtotal	1.88	1.06	203
Age 30–49			
High	2.34	1.23	165
Low/no religion	2.21	.89	266
Subtotal	2.26	1.04	431
Total	2.14	1.06	634

These differences in timing of marriage and cohabitation may help explain variations in fertility on the basis of teen religiosity. Table 4 looks at this possibility. Older age at marriage is associated with fewer children on average. However, among those that married before age 25, high teen religiosity respondents show an average fertility of 2.64 children per woman as opposed to 2.16 among those with “low/no religion.” The fertility difference among those that married after age 25 is negligible (though slightly in favour of “low/no religion”, 1.95 vs. 1.98, respectively). Panel (b) of this table examines fertility differences by cohabiting

Table 3 Average age at first marriage (a) and average age at first cohabitation among currently married women that ever cohabited (b) by teen religiosity; currently married women aged 20–49 (AFS, 2010)

Teen religiosity	Age at first marriage	SD	N
<i>(a)</i>			
High	25.6	5.6	238
Low/no religion	26.2	5.3	396
Subtotal	25.9	5.4	634
Teen religiosity	Age at first cohabitation ^a	SD	N
<i>(b)</i>			
High	22.4	4.8	86
Low/no religion	21.2	4.1	125
Subtotal	21.3	4.2	337

^a Currently married women that cohabited before marriage

Table 4 Children ever born by age at first marriage (a) and by ever cohabiting status (b) by teen religiosity; currently married women aged 20–49 (AFS, 2010)

Teen religiosity	Married before age 25	Married after age 25
<i>(a)</i>		
High	2.64	1.95
Low/no religion	2.16	1.98
Total	2.34	1.97
N	282	352
Teen religiosity	Never cohabited	Cohabited before marriage
<i>(b)</i>		
High	2.35	2.12
Low/no religion	2.04	2.07
Total	2.20	2.08
N	292	342

status among respondents that ever cohabited before marriage. For these women the average family size is 2.08 as compared to 2.20 for those that have never cohabited. This suggests that cohabitation has a depressing effect on cumulative fertility. There is significant variation in fertility among those that reported a high level of teen religiosity: Those that never cohabited had more children on average than those that ever cohabited (2.20 vs. 2.08, respectively).

Table 5 shows the equation for children ever born regressed on teen religiosity and the other predictors in this study. In accordance with the hypothesis, women who were highly religious in their teens have on average more children than women

Table 5 Poisson regression of children ever born; currently married women aged 20–49 (AFS, 2010)

Predictor	b	Z	P > Z
Teen religiosity high versus low/nonreligious (ref)	.093	2.3	.02
Husband religion same as respondent versus different (ref)	.038	.9	.34
Age 20–34 versus 35–49 (ref)	–.226	–5.2	.00
Age at first marriage <25 versus >25 (ref)	.283	7.4	.00
Postsecondary education versus no (ref)	–.102	–2.3	.02
Husband postsecondary education versus no (ref)	–.118	–2.7	.01
Ever cohabited versus never cohabited (ref)	–.017	–.4	.67
Constant	–.346	–6.3	.00
Log pseudo loglikelihood	–960.7		
Wald χ^2 (7 df)	92.2		
Prob > χ^2	.00		

“ref” means reference category

Table 6 Poisson regression of children ever born; currently married women aged 20–49 (AFS, 2010)

Predictor	b	Z	P > Z
Teen religiosity high versus low/nonreligious (ref)	.096	2.2	.03
Husband religion same as respondent versus different (ref)	.038	.9	.34
Age 20–34 versus 35–49 (ref)	–.225	–5.2	.00
Age at first marriage <25 versus >25 (ref)	.281	7.3	.00
Postsecondary education versus no (ref)	–.106	–2.4	.02
Husband postsecondary education versus no (ref)	–.116	–2.7	.01
Ever cohabited versus never cohabited (ref)	.015	.4	.72
Teen religiosity \times current religiosity			
High religiosity in teens, nonreligious now	–.262	–2.5	.01
Low/nonreligious in teens, nonreligious now	–.093	–1.9	.05
Constant	–.357	–5.8	.00
Log pseudo loglikelihood	–958.4		
Wald χ^2 (9 df)	98.2		
Prob > χ^2	.00		

“ref” means reference category. The reference category for the interaction term is “High religiosity in teens, religiously affiliated now”, where “now” refers to the time of the survey. One of the interactions did not enter the equation because of collinearity (i.e., “low religiosity/nonreligious in teens, belongs to a religion now”). The exposure variable is the natural logarithm of age at first marriage

who were non-practicing or non-religious as teenagers.⁹ Having same religion as the husband is irrelevant in explaining variations in cumulative fertility. Similarly, it is statistically unimportant whether a woman had cohabited or not prior to marriage. As might be expected, young women aged 20–34 have fewer children on average as

⁹ Preliminary regressions showed no significant difference in fertility between those who reported “low religiosity” and “non-practicing/no religion.”

compared to older women aged 35–49. Having been married before age 25 has a net increasing effect on fertility, however. The education variables (respondent's and husband's) both show significant effects in reduce fertility.

Table 6 extends the analysis by including interaction terms involving teen religiosity with a measure of current religiosity. The idea behind this operationalization is that respondents may have experienced change in degree of religiosity over the life course. That is, some highly religious teens could possibly abandoned religion, and teens that had no religious involvement early in life may have become religious at some later point in life. Current religiosity is operationalized in terms of whether a respondent at the time of the survey belonged to a religious denomination as opposed to being religiously unaffiliated. The combination of teen religiosity (high vs. low/nonreligious) and current religiosity (i.e., belongs to a religion vs. is religiously unaffiliated) produced four possible subgroups: (1) high religiosity in teens but religiously affiliated now; (2) low or nonreligious in teens but not religiously affiliated now; (3) high religiosity in teens and religiously affiliated now; (4) low/nonreligious in teens and not religiously affiliated now. In the regression analysis group (3) is treated as the reference category for the three categorical variables, each coded as 1 and 0 for the reference group.

Due to collinearity, variable (2) above failed to enter the equation, thus only two combinations are shown in Table 6. As anticipated, change in religiosity between one's teens and later in life does make a difference in explaining cumulative fertility. Those who were highly religious in their teens but became nonreligious later have on average fewer children as compared to those who were highly religious as teenagers and belong to a religious denomination currently ($b = -.262$). Moreover, as shown in the table, among women whose religiosity was low or were nonreligious in their teens and are currently not religiously affiliated, their fertility is lower than expected ($b = -.093$).

Conclusion

Using retrospective survey information, this study looked at the relationship between teen religiosity and cumulative fertility among women aged 20–49 in Alberta, one of Canada's prairie provinces. It was hypothesized that higher fertility among more religious women would result as a function of early identification with and commitment to religion in the teen years. The empirical results are consistent with this hypothesis. Those who reported a high level of religious involvement in their teens also borne more children on average than women who said were uninvolved religiously as teenagers. This is accords with the notion that the effects of religious upbringing early in life can extend into adulthood in matters of family and reproduction. It was proposed that to varying degrees, all major religions share in common an orientation favoring traditional values in regard to gender roles and especially family. Some religions explicitly prohibit certain behaviors in the realm of procreation (e.g., use of birth control or abortion). Thus, higher fertility among more religious women is linked to their early identification and commitment to religion reinforced by the family and possibly also denominational sectarian

schools. More research is needed with respect to the social psychological dynamics of the transmission of religious values in children within the family context and how such values are reinforced through life by secondary sources of socialization.

Given the cross-sectional nature of the data and respondent reports, this topic requires further systematic attention, ideally with prospective survey data. Prospective information would allow for the introduction of controls into the analysis to better check for the possibility of reverse causation whereby current religiosity may be affected by fertility, as having children often induces couples and families to become more religiously observant (Pryor and Norris 1988). It is also possible that current religiosity may condition one's perception of religiosity early in life. Thus, it may be entirely possible that in a cross-sectional survey some individuals may not have been particularly religious in their teens but become religious later in life once they had children, thereby possibly retrospectively attributing a higher level of teen religiosity than may have actually been the case.

An indirect attempt was made to look at this possible type of causation by introducing an interaction term involving teen religiosity with a measure of current religiosity. The results obtained suggest that among the sample investigated there was some change in regard to level of religiosity early in life and later in adulthood, and that such change can have bearing on cumulative fertility. It was shown that the change from being highly religious in one's teens to being non-religiously affiliated later in life depresses cumulative fertility. Some research shows that in actuality many youths do abandon religion during the transition to adulthood (Chan et al. 2015). It would be important to investigate in greater detail how the transition to adulthood and other important life transitions may affect women's orientations and behaviors to family and family planning, including timing of sexual debut, of cohabitation and marriage, and the timing of first and subsequent births.

The results of this investigation are consistent with the proposition that early life experiences can have long term effects into adulthood. It appears that religiosity remains an important factor in the explanation of fertility differentials. Finally, the findings uncovered in the present analysis for Alberta province may or may not generalize to other settings in Canada. Thus, confirmatory investigations are needed.

Acknowledgments This research is based on a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Grant (441-2009-0160). The support of the Council is gratefully appreciated. Many thanks to Md. Kamrul Islam and David Odynek for their research assistance.

Appendix

See Table 7.

Table 7 Evaluation of selected variables in the Alberta Fertility Survey (AFS) in relation to the 2006 national General Social Survey (GSS)

Variables	AFS (Alberta females 18–49 N = 1105)	GSS (Alberta females 18–49 N = 428)	Discrepancy (%) ^a AFS-GSS
Average children ever born	1.75	1.63	7.4
Age group (%)			
18–34	43.3	42.6	1.6
35–49	56.8	57.3	–.9
Post-secondary education (%)	74.4	74.8	.5
Currently married (%)	57.4	51.1	11.0

The national General Social Survey (GSS) is periodically conducted by Statistics Canada involving a large sample (Ns ranging 25,000) of Canadians. The information reported here is based on the Alberta subsample of women in the 2006 GSS. For additional details see: <http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=8011&lang=en&db=imdb&adm=8&dis=2>

Source Islam (2014: 240)

^a Discrepancy = (AFS – GSS/AFS) × 100

References

- Adsera, Alicia. 2006. Marital fertility and religion in Spain, 1985 and 1999. *Population Studies* 60(2): 205–221.
- Balakrishnan, T.R., Karol J. Krotki, and Evelyne Lapierre-Adamczyk. 1993. *Family and childbearing in Canada: A demographic analysis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Balakrishnan, T.R., and Jiajian Chen. 1990. Religiosity, nuptiality and reproduction in Canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 27(3): 316–340.
- Balakrishnan, T.R., G.E. Ebanks and C.F. Grindstaff. 1979. *Patterns of fertility in Canada, 1971*. 1971 Census Analytical Study. Ottawa: Statistics Canada (Catalogue no. 99-759E).
- Balakrishnan, T.R., J.K. Kantner, and J.D. Allinham. 1975. *Fertility and family planning in a Canadian metropolis*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bengston, Vern L., Norella Putney, and Susan Harris. 2013. *Families and faith: How religion is passed down across generations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berghammer, Caroline. 2012. Church attendance and childbearing: Evidence from a Dutch panel study, 1987–2005. *Population Studies* 66(2): 197–212.
- Berkman, L.F., and S.L. Syme. 1979. Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: A nine year follow-up of Alameda County residents. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 109(2): 186–204.
- Breault, K.D., and A.J. Kposowa. 1987. Explaining divorce rates in the United States: A study of 3,111 counties, 1980. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 36: 549–558.
- Burch, Thomas K. 1966. The fertility of north American Catholics: A comparative overview. *Demography* 3: 174–187.
- Chan, Melissa, Kim M. Tsai, and Andrew J. Fuligni. 2015. Changes in religiosity across the transition to young adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 144: 1555–1566.
- Clark, Warren. 2003. Pockets or belief: religious attendance patterns in Canada. *Canadian Social Trends*. Statistics Canada (Cat. no. 11-008): 2–5.
- Clark, Warren. 2000. Pockets of religious attendance. *Canadian Social Trends*. Statistics Canada (Cat. no. 11-008): 23–27.
- Day, Lincoln H. 1968. Natality and ethnocentrism: Some relationships suggested by an analysis of Catholic-Protestant differentials. *Population Studies* 22(1): 27–50.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1897 [1951]. *Suicide: A study in sociology*. Trans. John A. Spaulding, and George Simpson. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.

- Fenelon, Bill. 1971. State variations in United States divorce rates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33: 321–327.
- Glenn, N.D., and M. Supancic. 1984. The social and demographic correlates of divorce and separation in the United States: An update and reconsideration. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46: 563–579.
- Goldscheider, Calvin, and Peter R. Uhlenberg. 1969. Minority status and fertility. *American Journal of Sociology* 74(4): 361–372.
- Gupta, Sumedha. 2010. The study of the impact of early life conditions on later life events: A look across individuals life course. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Hayford, Sarah R., and S. Philip Morgan. 2008. Religiosity and fertility in the United States: The role of fertility intentions. *Social Forces* 86(3): 1163–1188.
- Heaton, Tim B., and Kristen L. Goodman. 1985. Religion and family formation. *Review of Religious Research* 26(4): 343–359.
- Henripin, Jacques. 1972. *Trends and factors of fertility in Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Hiller, Harry H. 2009. *Second promised land: Migration to Alberta and the transformation of Canadian Society*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- House, James S., Karl R. Landis, and Debra Umberson. 1988. Social relationships and health. *Science* 241: 540–545.
- Hummer, Robert A., Richard D. Rogers, Charles B. Nam, and Christopher G. Ellison. 1999. Religious involvement and U.S. Adult Mortality. *Demography* 36(2): 273–285.
- Islam, Kamrul Md. 2014. Immigration and fertility: Comparative analysis of Alberta and Canada. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.
- Janssen, Susan G., and Robert M. Hauser. 1981. Religion, socialization, and fertility. *Demography* 18: 511–528.
- Johnson, Nan E. 1982. Religious differentials in reproduction: The effects of sectarian education. *Demography* 19(4): 495–509.
- Kennedy Jr, Robert E. 1973. Minority group status and fertility: The Irish. *American Sociological Review* 38: 85–96.
- Laing, Lorie M. 1980. Declining fertility in a religious isolate: The Hutterite population of Alberta, Canada, 1951–1971. *Human Biology* 52(2): 289–310.
- Lehrer, Evelyn L. 2004. Religion as a determinant of economic and demographic behavior in the United States. *Population and Development Review* 30(4): 707–726.
- McQuillan, Kevin. 2004. When does religion influence fertility? *Population and Development Review* 30(1): 25–56.
- Miller, Warren B. 1992. Personality traits and developmental experiences as antecedents of childbearing and motivation. *Demography* 29(2): 265–286.
- Mosher, William D., Linda B. Williams, and David P. Johnson. 1992. Religion and fertility in the United States: New patterns. *Demography* 29(2): 199–214.
- Pearce, Lisa D. 2010. Religion and the Timing of First Births. In *Religion, families and health: population-based research in the United States*, ed. Christopher G. Ellison, and Robert A. Hummer, 19–39. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Peter, Karl A. 1987. *The dynamics of Hutterite Society: An analytical approach*. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta Press.
- Pew Centre Religion & Public Life. 2013. “Canada’s changing religious landscape.” (June 23, 2013): <http://www.pewforum.org/2013/06/27/canadas-changing-religious-landscape/> Accessed 24 August 2015.
- Pryor, Edward T., and Douglas A. Norris. 1988. Religion and the family life cycle. *Canadian Studies in Population* 15(2): 159–180.
- Statistics Canada. 2011. Table 004-0128, *Socioeconomic overview of the farm population, distribution in the total population and the farm population for religious affiliation* (National Household Survey). <http://www5.statcan.gc.ca/cansim/a26>. Accessed 24 August 2015.
- Tang, Zongli. 1995. Confucianism, Chinese culture, and reproductive behavior. *Population and Environment* 16(3): 269–284.
- Thornton, Arland, W.G. Axinn, and D.H. Hill. 1992. Reciprocal effects of religiosity, cohabitation, and marriage. *American Journal of Sociology* 98(3): 628–651.
- Uecker, Jeremy E., and Jonathan P. Hill. 2014. Religious schools, home schools, and the timing of first marriage and first birth. *Review of Religious Research* 56: 189–218.
- Van Heek, F. 1956. Roman-Catholicism and fertility in the Netherlands: Demographic aspects of minority status. *Population Studies* 10(2): 125–138.

- Weber, Max. 1905 [1958]. *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons.
- Westoff, Charles F., and Elise F. Jones. 1979. The end of Catholic fertility. *Demography* 16(2): 209–217.
- White, K.J. 2002. Declining fertility among North American Hutterites: The use of birth control within a Dariusleut colony. *Social Biology* 49(1–2): 58–73.
- Zhang, Li. 2008. Religious affiliation, religiosity, and male and female fertility. *Demographic Research* 18: 233–262.