SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING FERTILITY

XVIII. THE INTERRELATION OF FERTILITY, FERTILITY PLANNING, AND EGO-CENTERED INTEREST IN CHILDREN¹

MARIANNE DEGRAFF SWAIN AND CLYDE V. KISER

NE of the hypotheses to be tested in the Study of Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility² states: "The greater the extent to which interest in children is a matter of personal satisfaction, the higher the proportion of couples practicing contraception effectively and the smaller the planned families." As stated, the hypothesis needs clarification on two points. The term "interest in children" should be interpreted as "interest in one's own children." The term "personal satisfaction" should be interpreted as "ego satisfaction." Thus the hypothesis might be stated more accurately as follows: "The greater the extent to which interest in one's

¹ This is the eighteenth of a series of reports on a Study conducted by the Com-¹ This is the eighteenth of a series of reports on a Study conducted by the Com-mittee on Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, sponsored by the Milbank Memorial Fund with grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. The Committee consists of Lowell J. Reed, Chairman; Daniel Katz; E. Lowell Kelly; Clyde V. Kiser; Frank Lorimer; Frank W. Notestein; Frederick Osborn; S. A. Switzer; Warren S. Thompson; and P. K. Whelpton. For a more extended analysis of materials presented in this report, *see* Swain, Marianne DeGraff: The Interrelation of Fertility Behavior, Ego Interests, and Se-lected Social Categories. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Sociology, Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University, June, 1951, 109 pp., plus tables and charts. (Ilnubliched)

(Unpublished)

² The general purpose, scope, and methods of the Study have been described in detail in previous articles. The Study was conducted in Indianapolis in 1941 and the data for the present analysis relate to an adjusted sample of 1,444 "relatively fecund" couples with the following characteristics: husband and wife native white, both Protestant, both finished at least the eighth grade, married during 1927–1929, neither previously married, husband under 40 and wife under 30 at marriage, and eight or more years spent in a city of 25,000 population or over since marriage. Couples with these characteristics were located by means of a preliminary Household Survey of virtually all white households in Indianapolis.

For purposes of the Study, all couples with four or more live births were classified r or purposes of the Study, all couples with four or more live births were classified as "relatively fecund" regardless of other circumstances. Couples with 0-3 live births were classified as "relatively fecund" unless they knew or had good reason for believ-ing that conception was physiologically impossible during a period of at least 24 or 36 consecutive months since marriage (24 for never-pregnant couples, 36 for others). Failure to conceive when contraception was not practiced "always" or "usually" during periods of above durations was considered "good reason" for such belief. Couples not classified as "relatively fecund" were considered "relatively sterile." children is ego-centered, the higher the proportion of couples practicing contraception effectively and the smaller the planned families."

The above hypothesis stands in contrast to another in the Indianapolis Study which states, "The stronger the interest in, and liking for, children, the lower the proportion of couples practicing contraception effectively and the larger the planned families." Thus it is hypothesized that whereas the presence of an abnormal degree of ego-centered interest in one's own children is associated with small families, a general liking for children (not necessarily one's own) is associated with large families.

This paper presents the data on the first-mentioned hypothesis. It is recognized at the outset that some degree of egocentered interest in children is a normal attribute. However, common observation supports the view that the strength of this attribute differs by cultures and by individuals. In preindustrial societies, perhaps notably in the Orient, children are frequently regarded as means of old-age insurance for the parents, as means of perpetuating the family line, and as means of giving comfort to departed paternal souls. These forms of interest in children frequently are cited as factors conducive to high fertility.

The economic, familial, and religious forms of ego-centered interests in children of the above types are not commonly associated with urban Western culture. The modern Western concept is that children are ends in themselves rather than means toward ends. It is a common maxim in psychiatric, family-guidance, and marriage-counseling circles that the child should be reared in a manner conducive to the development of self-reliance and wholesome personality of the child. The hypothesis under consideration is based on the assumption that in varying degrees parents, consciously or unconsciously, regard and use children as means toward meeting their own needs for ego satisfaction. This variable is a nebulous one, except perhaps to the psychiatrist. However, extreme cases are easily recognized. In their attitudes toward their children the inherently self-centered, the emotionally immature, and the emtionally starved parents may display to their friends, if not to themselves, their attempt to secure attention, recognition, status, and affection.

Although the hypothesis postulates an association of egocentered interest in children with low fertility, it leaves open the matter of causal sequence. It is recognized that if any relation exists it may be selective as well as determinative. For instance, "the over-mothering which psychiatrists are finding so prevalent among modern small families"³ may be largely the result rather than the cause of low fertility.

The Data. The three types of data needed for testing the central hypothesis under consideration are those of fertility. fertility-planning status, and ego-centered interest in children. The chief measure of fertility used in this report is number of live births per 100 couples. This is not standardized for age, for the data are restricted to couples of virtually similar duration of marriage (12-15 years) with wife under 30 and husband under 40 at the time of marriage.

The classification of couples by fertility-planning status has been described in previous reports.⁴ Briefly stated, it is based upon histories of pregnancies and contraceptive practice and attitudes toward each pregnancy and consists of four broad groups: number and spacing planned, number planned, quasiplanned, and excess fertility.⁵ Couples in the first two cate-

³ Lorimer, Frank; Winston, Ellen; and Kiser, Louise K.: FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN POPULATION POLICY. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1940, p. 136. ⁴ See especially Whelpton, P. K. and Kiser, Clyde V.: Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility. VI. The Planning of Fertility. The Milbank Memorial Fund *Quarterly*, January, 1947, xxv, No. 1, pp. 63-111 (Reprint pp. 209-257). ⁵ The four categories may be briefly described as follows: Number and Spacing of Pregnancies Planned. The 403 couples in this group ex-like the user second to planning of fortility in that they had no pregnancies that

hibit the most complete planning of fertility in that they had no pregnancies that were not deliberately planned by stopping contraception in order to conceive. The group consists of two major subdivisions: (a) 121 couples practicing contraception regularly and continuously and having no pregnancy, and (b) 282 couples whose every pregnancy was deliberately planned by interrupting contraception in order to conceive.

Number Planned. This group of 205 couples consists mainly of those whose last (Continued on page 55)

				Distributio	N OF REPLI	E8
QUESTION	r	Reply	v	Vife	Hu	sband
			Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
······································		Total	1,309	100.0	1,309	99.9
1) Do You Want You	r Children to	Definitely No	61	4.7	195	14.9
be Independent Eve	n lf It Means	Probably No	88	6.7	159	12.1
That They May N	ot Take Your	Doubtful	164	12.5	171	13.1
Advice?		Probably Yes	497	38.0	426	32.5
		Definitely Yes	499	38.1	358	27.3
		Total	1,309	100.0	1,309	100.0
		Definitely Yes	416	31.9	483	36.9
(2) Do You Get a Big '	'Kick" Out of	Probably Yes	524	40.2	517	39.5
Seeing Your Childre		Doubtful	238	18.2	182	13.9
They Have Seen Yo	ou Do?	Probably No	80	6.1	78	6.0
		Definitely No	47	3.6	49	3.7
		No Reply	4			
		Total	1,444	100.0	1,444	100.0
		Definitely Yes	305	21.2	386	26.7
(3) Do Parents Have	the Right to	Probably Yes	400	27.7	398	27.6
Expect That Child	ren Will Ap-	Doubtful	193	13.4	196	13.6
preciate the Sacri	fices Parents	Probably No	250	17.3	227	15.7
Make for Them?		Definitely No	294	20.4	237	16.4
		No Reply	2			
		Total	1,309	100.0	1,309	100.0
(4) Is One of Your Grea		Definitely Yes	565	43.2	583	44.5
tions in Being a Par	•	Probably Yes	398	30.4	438	33.5
That, After You Are		Doubtful	131	10.0	133	10.2
Part of You Will Liv	e on in Your	Probably No	88	6.7	66	5.0
Children?		Definitely No	127	9.7	89	6.8
		Total	1,309	100.1	1,309	100.0
(5) Could Anything G		Definitely No	971	74.2	846	64.6
Much Satisfaction in	•	Probably No	254	19.4	282	21.5
ing Children of You	r Own?	Doubtful	51	3.9	128	9.8
		Probably Yes	19	1.5	35	2.7
		Definitely Yes	14	1.1	18	1.4
		Total	1,309	100.0	1,309	100.0
		Definitely Yes	807	61.7	679	52.0
When the Going Gets Tough, I		Probably Yes	369	28.2	418	32.0
One of Your Greate		Deubtful	66	5.0	123	9.4
Thinking How Muc		Probably No	34	2.6	35	2.7
dren Love and Need	You?	Definitely No	33	2.5	52	4.0
		No Reply			2	

Table 1. Distribution of replies of wives and husbands to questions used as indicators of ego-centered interest in children.¹

			Distribution	N OF REPLI	ES
QUESTION	Reply	V	Vife	Hu	sband
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
	Total	1,309	100.1	1,309	100.0
	Definitely Yes	837	64.1	696	53.2
(7) Do You Feel That It Is Fine To	Probably Yes	338	25.9	418	31.9
Be Able to Live Over Again in the	Doubtful	83	6.4	114	8.7
Lives of Your Children?	Probably No	17	1.3	44	3.4
	Definitely No	31	2.4	37	2.8
	No Reply	3			
	Total	1,356	100.0	1,357	100.0
(8) How Much Were You and Your	Very Much	308	22.7	240	17.7
Husband (Wife) Encouraged to	Much	148	10.9	151	11.1
Have Your Last (Want a) Child	Some	327	24.1	307	22.6
by a "Desire to See What My	Little	203	15.0	163	12.0
Own Children Would Be Like?"	Very Little	370	27.3	496	3 6 .6

Table 1 (Continued).

¹ All questions listed except numbers (3) and (8) were asked only of the 1,309 couples with one or more live births. Question 3 was asked of all couples and question 8 was asked of all fertile couples, and of childless couples with wife pregnant at interview or with the respondent indicating that the couple intended to have a child in the future.

gories are regarded as "planned families" and as having "practiced contraception effectively."

The measures of ego-centered interest in children are based upon "multiple choice" replies of wives and husbands to eight questions. These questions were intermixed with many others in a questionnaire that was filled out by the wife and husband separately in the presence of the interviewer, usually at a prearranged evening appointment.

The specific questions and the distribution of the replies are given in Table 1. Although some questions may appear to be

pregnancy was deliberately planned by stopping contraception in order to conceive but who had one or more previous pregnancies under other circumstances. Because of this, the couples are regarded as having planned the number but not the spacing of their pregnancies.

Quasi-Planned. This group includes 454 couples who did not deliberately plan the last pregnancy in the manner described above but who either wanted the last pregnancy or wanted another pregnancy.

Excess Fertility. This group is composed of 382 couples classified as least successful in planning size of family because one or more pregnancies had occurred after the last that was wanted.

more loaded with the "ego" element than others, they collectively imply that "personal satisfaction" is interpreted as expectations of seeing an image, continuation, appreciation, or dominance of parents' ego.

With reference to replies it should first be noted that only the 1,309 couples reporting at least one live birth were required to answer all eight questions. Six questions were restricted to the fertile couples alone. One (number 3) was extended to all childless couples and another (number 8) was asked of childless couples if the wife was pregnant at interview or if the respondent indicated that the couple intended to have a child in the future.

In Table 1, the five possible replies to each question are arranged in order from presumed highest to lowest ECIC (egocentered interest in children) regardless of whether the reply is "yes" or "no" and regardless of the order of the replies in the original questionnaire.⁶

The distributions of the replies are of interest in themselves. For five of the questions (numbers 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7) the distributions are heavily skewed toward presumed *high* ego-centered interest in children. For one question, number 1, relating to independence of children, the distributions are heavily skewed toward presumed *low* ECIC. It is apparent that the concentrations do not arise from any tendency to answer all questions as "yes" or "no." However, the concentrations do suggest some tendency for the respondents to answer according to the "accepted" or "expected" attitudes toward children. Thus most of the people answered that they: *do* want their children to be independent even if this means that the children will not always take their advice; *do* get a big "kick" out of seeing their children imitate them; *do* think that one of the greatest satisfactions in being a parent is knowing that after they are gone

⁶ In other words, the arrangement of the replies is from low to high code number. Code numbers 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9 were used with low code number for presumed high ECIC and high code number for presumed low ECIC. This was consistent with the general principle of ordering coding according to presumed direction of fertility rates. Thus high ECIC, low fertility, low code; low ECIC, high fertility, high code.

some part of them will live on in their children; do not think that anything could give them as much satisfaction as having children of their own; do find that when the going gets tough one of their greatest comforts is thinking how much their children love and need them; and do feel that it is fine to be able to live over again in the lives of their children.

More of a spread and some bi-modality are shown in the distributions of replies to the questions regarding right of parents to expect children to appreciate the sacrifices made for them (3) and degree to which the wives and husbands were encouraged to have their last child (or to want a child, if childless) by the desire to see what their own children would be like (8). The interests in children are somewhat more egocentered among husbands than wives according to the criteria of the first four questions but the reverse is true on the basis of the last four questions. Thus, only 11 per cent of the wives but 27 per cent of the husbands stated that they would not want their children to be independent if it meant that they would not always take their advice. It is noteworthy that the ECIC of the husband excels that of the wife according to the criteria of not wanting children independent, enjoying being imitated by children, expecting children to appreciate sacrifices made by parent, and satisfaction of knowing that some part of the parent will live on in the children." The ECIC of the wife excels that of the husband according to basic satisfaction of having children of one's own, comfort out of having their children love and need them, feeling that it is fine to live over again in the lives of their children, and importance of wanting to see what their own children would be like as a reason for having the last child or for wanting children.

⁷ A previous article has indicated that (a) a significantly larger proportion of husbands than wives in the Indianapolis Study would prefer a son if they could have only one child, and that (b) a somewhat larger proportion of husbands than wives attached importance to "carrying on the family name" as a reason for having children. It is, of course, the husband's family name that is carried on. See Clare, Jeanne E. and Kiser, Clyde V.: Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility. xrv. Preference for Children of Given Sex in Relation to Fertility. The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, October, 1951, xx1x, No. 3, pp. 446 and 456 (Study Series Vol. III, pp. 627 and 637).

Interrelation of Replies. The foregoing comparisons of replies of wives and husbands to the same questions, of course, do not tell us much about the tendency of the two partners to give the same answers. It is also of interest to ascertain the interrelation of replies of each spouse to different questions. Each of these types of interrelations may be considered from the standpoint of "percentage agreement" of replies. We are concerned here with agreement as to the assumed degree of ego-centered interest in children reflected by replies to the questions. Since the five possible replies to each of the questions were coded by score numbers 1-3-5-7-9 from top to bottom as ordered in Table 1, the present task is that of studying agreement of scores.

The data are presented for two levels of agreement—"identical" and "identical or approximate." By "identical agreement" is meant a similar score on any two replies that are compared. By "identical or approximate agreement" is meant a similar

	Per Cen	f Agreement
QUESTION	Identical	Identical or Approximate
(1) Want Children Independent Regardless?	28.2	66.5
(2) "Kick" From Seeing Children Imitate You?(3) Parents Have Right to Expect Appreciation	32.4	77.1
From Children?	24.6	57.1
 (4) "Living On" in Children One of Your Greatest Satisfactions? (5) Aputhing on Satisfactory of Having Children of 	35.9	73.0
 (5) Anything as Satisfying as Having Children of Your Own? (1) Own? 	55.7	85.7
(6) One of Greatest Comforts Thinking How Much Your Children Need You?	47.2	84.9
 (7) Fine to "Live Over" in Lives of Your Children? (8) Extent Encouraged to Have Last (Want a) Child by "Desire to See What My Own 	49.2	83.0
Children Would be Like?" Average Wife-Husband Agreement on Replies	24.6	50.1
to All Eight Questions	37.2	72.2

Table 2. Percentage of couples with "Identical" and "Identical or Approximate" agreement between wife's reply and husband's reply to the same question.

score or a score differing by only one step in the scales considered. For example, there is "identical agreement" of two replies coded 7. There is "approximate agreement" if one is coded 7 and the other 5 or 9.

Table 2 presents the percentage of "identical" and "identical or approximate agreements" between replies of wives and husbands to the same questions. It will be noted that the percentage of inter-spouse "identical agreements" is highest (56 per cent) for question number 5 relating to satisfaction in having own children and lowest (25 per cent) for questions 3 and 8, relating respectively to right of parents to expect children to appreciate sacrifices made for them and the extent to which the couple was encouraged to have their last child or to want a child by the desire "to see what my own children would be like." The percentage of inter-spouse "identical and approximate agreements" is also highest (86 per cent) for question 5. The average for all eight questions is 37 per cent "identical agreement" and 72 per cent "identical or approximate agreement."

Table 3 presents data on consistency of replies of the wife to

QUESTION			Qt	UESTION	Numb	ER ¹			Averag e Identical
Number ¹	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Agreement
1	x	10.0	23.9	14.7	6.7	8.6	7.7	22.5	13.4
2	32.9	x	25.8	32.3	40.9	38.7	39.5	21.1	29.8
3	55.9	57.5	x	31.7	23.8	29.3	26.0	21.8	26.0
4	34.5	71.0	60.9	x	44.8	7.7	48.5	23.5	29.0
5	17.7	85.4	51.9	74.3	x	58.7	61.5	22.0	36.9
6	22.5	77.4	56.0	19.9	88.5	x	59.2	23.6	32.3
7	19.7	77.4	54.7	78.5	88.9	87.4	x	22.2	37.8
8	55.2	49.9	53.0	49.2	39.8	46.4	41.6	x	22.4
Average									28.5
Identical or									
Approximate									
Agreement	34.1	64.5	55.7	55.5	63.8	56.9	64.0	47.9	55.3

Table 3. Percentages of "Identical" and "Identical or Approximate" agreement of wife's reply score on different pairs of questions.

¹ See Table 1 for precise wording of each question.

different questions, and Table 4 gives similar data on replies of the husband to different questions. In each instance the percentages of "identical agreement" are shown above the X diagonal and the percentages of "identical or approximate agreement" below the X diagonal. In general, the consistency of replies of either the wife or husband to different questions is somewhat lower than the wife-husband consistency of replies to the same questions (compare Table 2 with Tables 3 and 4). Thus, as compared with a 37 per cent average "identical agreement" of replies of husbands and wives to the same questions, the average percentage of "identical agreement" of replies to different questions is 29 for the wife and 31 for the husband. The corresponding three averages of "identical or approximate agreement" are 72, 55, and 60. The last two figures also indicate that the consistency of replies to different questions was slightly lower for wives than for husbands.

With respect to replies of the wife, the highest percentage of "identical agreement" (62 per cent) was that between replies to the two questions 5 and 7 and the lowest (7 per cent) between questions 1 and 5. The highest percentage of "identical

QUESTION			Qu	JESTION	Numb	ER ¹			Average Identical
Number ¹	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Agreement
1	x	15.4	25.4	19.7	15.0	19.7	16.3	23.4	19.3
2	40.3	x	26.0	41.3	37.1	41.4	42.8	19.2	31.9
3	54.9	57.3	x	32.7	25.4	31.1	30.8	23.4	27.8
4	40.8	75.3	62.0	x	46.4	51.3	49.8	23.3	37.8
5	36.7	76.9	58.1	78.2	x	53.6	52.6	17.0	35.3
6	40.6	76.4	60.0	83.2	84.3	x	55.2	20.2	38.9
7	37.9	78.8	61.3	82.0	85.9	86.6	x	19.8	38.2
8	46.4	45.1	51.1	48.3	36.5	41.7	41.4	x	20.9
Avcrage Identical or									31.3
Approximate	42.5	64.3	57.8	67.1	65.2	67.5	67.7	44.4	
Agreement									59.6

Table 4. Percentages of "Identical" and "Identical or Approximate" agreement of husband's reply score on different pairs of questions.

¹ See Table 1 for precise wording of each question.

or approximate agreement" (89 per cent) was found in the comparison of questions 5 and 7 and also questions 5 and 6. The lowest percentage of "identical or approximate agreement" of wives' replies (18 per cent) was that between questions 1 and 5.

As noted in Table 4, the percentage of "identical agreement" of husbands' replies was highest (55 per cent) for the pair of questions 6 and 7 and lowest (15 per cent) for questions 1 and 5 and 1 and 2. The percentage of "identical or approximate agreement" of husbands' replies was also highest (87 per cent) for questions 6 and 7 and lowest (37 per cent) for questions 1 and 5 and for questions 5 and 8. For both wife and husband the replies to the question on independence of children show relatively low levels of agreement with replies to other questions. This is apparent not only in the data for specific pairs of questions but also in the averages shown in the last columns and bottom lines of Tables 3 and 4. Thus the average "identical agreement" of wives' replies to one question with replies to all other questions extended from 13 per cent for question 1 to 38 per cent for question 7 (last column, Table 3). The range of "identical or approximate agreement" extended from 34 per cent for question 1 to 65 per cent for question 2 (bottom line of Table 3). The generally low agreement of scores on question 1 with other scores arises in part from the deviant type of skewness of replies to question 1 indicated previously.

Relation of Ego-Centered Interest in Children to Fertility-Planning Status. The first part of the hypothesis stated "the greater the extent to which interest in children is a matter of personal satisfaction (i.e., ego centered), the higher the proportion of couples practicing contraception effectively." The distributions by fertility-planning status according to replies to specific questions are given in Tables 5 and 6. As in Table 1, the replies are ordered from presumably high to low degree of egocentered interest in children.

As a whole, the distributions fail to indicate much relation between fertility-planning status and extent of ego-centered

Lable 3. Fer cent distribu questions assumed to indice	tion by ate degr	cent distribution by fertility-planning status according to replies of fertile wives and husbands to specific med to indicate degree of ego-centered interest in children. ¹	nıng statı tered inte	us accordi rest in ch	ing to rep ildren. ¹	lies of 1	tertile wives	and husb	ands to sl	secific	
		For F	FOR REPLIES BY WIFE	Wife			For RE	FOR REPLIES BY HUSBAND	USBAND		
QUESTION AND REPLY	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Exccss Fertility	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	
(1) Want Children Independent Regardiess?	1										
Definitely No Probably No	88	16.4	9.8 15.9	45.9 40.9	27.9 26.1	81	24.1 13 8	15.4 13.8	29.7	30.8 31 3	
Doubtful Probably Yes	81	20.7	15.2	31.7	32.3	818	24.0	10.5	37.4	28.1 26 E	
Definitely Yes	8	26.1	18.8	28.3	26.9	3 <u>8</u>	24.3	15.4	30.4	29.9	
(2) "Kick" from Sceing Children Imitate You?											
Definitely Yes Probably Yes	88	26.4 19.8	16.8 13.2	32.0 36.8	24.8 30. 2	88	26.5 18.2	14.9 14.7	31.3 37.3	27. 3 29.8	
Doubtful Probably No Dafaitedy No	888	14.3 20.0	15.1 16.3	34.5 33.8 31.0	36.1 30.0	888	16.5 25.6	19.8	35.7 34.6	28.0 32.1	
Leannedy 100 (4) "Living On" in Children One of Your Greatest Satisfactions?	3	1.41	1.12	6.16	C.112	3	7.01	4.77	9.87	38.8	
Definitely Yes	100	19.5	17.3	33.3	29.9	100	19.9	16.0	36.2	28.0	
Probably Yes	8	15.6	14.6	37.9	31.9	130	23.5	13.7	33.6	29.2	5
Doubtful Prohably No	3 5	22.9	10.7	36.6	29.8	88	18.0	10.5	34.6	36.8	
Definitely No	88	29.9	17.3	29.9	22.8	38	20.2	28.8 16.9	25.8 32.6	21.2 30.3	

62

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

			I aDie J.	ירטוונווומכע).						
		For I	FOR REPLIES BY WIFE	Wife			For Re	FOR REPLIES BY HUSBAND	USBAND	
QUESTION AND REFLY	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility
(5) Anything as Satisfying as Having Children of Your Oun?										
Definitely No	100	23.2	17.6	33.4	25.8	100	23.2	15.8	35.0	26.0
Probably No	8	15.4	7.5	42.1	35.0	<u>1</u> 0	18.4	16.3	36.9	28.4
Doubtful Probably or Definitely Yes	88	11.8 21.2	5.9 24.2	15.7 33.3	66.7 21.2	88	18.0 11.3	13.3	25.0 34.0	43.8 47 . 2
(6) One of Greatest Comforts Thinking How Much Your Children Need You?	8									
Definitely Yes	10	20.0	16.7	34.2	29.1	100	24.0	15.3	31.1	29.6
Probably Yes	10	20.3	14.4	34.1	31.2	8	14.6	17.7	38.0	29.7
Doubtful	8	19.7	15.2	36.4	28.8	8	23.6	9.8	41.5	25.2
Probably No	8	38.2	5.9	29.4	26.5	001	20.0	17.1	51.4	11.4
Definitely No	8	45.5	3.0	42.4	9.1	8 <mark>1</mark>	32.7	9.6	19.2	38.5
(7) Fine to "Live Over" in Lives of										
1 0kt Ckttaren										
Definitely Yes	<mark>8</mark>	21.6	17.3	35.0	26.0	8	23.1	16.2	32.2	28.4
Probably Yes	8	18.6	12.4	34.3	34.6	9 <mark>1</mark>	16.5	12.7	39.7	31.1
Doubtful	8	25.3	9.6	28.9	36.1	8	21.9	23.7	31.6	22.8
Probably or Definitely No	100	25.0	12.5	29.2	33.3	0 <u>1</u>	27.2	9.9	29.6	33.3

Factors Affecting Fertility: Part XVIII

			FEB	FERTILE COUPLES	53			A	ALL COUPLES		
-	QUESTION AND REPLY	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility
(3) Parent App	(3) Parents Have Right to Expect Appreciation from Children?										
R	Reply of Wife										
	Definitely Yes	100	16.5	14.3	37.2	32.0	100	25.9	13.1	32.8	28.2
	Probably Yes	100	21.1	12.4	34.0	32.6	100	28.8	11.5	30.8	29.0
	Doubtful	100	20.0	19.4	35.2	25.5	100	31.6	16.6	30.1	21.8
	Probably No	100	19.6	14.7 18.5	36.3 20.5	29.4	88	21.2 32 3	14.4	35.6 27.9	28.8 22.4
(3) R	Reply of Huchand	8	0.04								
		çç,	0	12 2	31 E	22 2	Ş	1 76	17 4	31 1	30.1
	Definitely Yes	3	18.8	17.0	04.0		3 8	4.07 20 C	1 7 1	1.10	1.00
	Probably Yes	8	19.4	17.2	30.1	7.12	3 9	0.02	10.1	1.70	0. 1 .0
	Doubtful	89	17.0	8.61	30.3	31.0	3 8	20.02	15.0	0.02	0.12
	Probably No Definitely No	3 3	28.5	و.دا 14.6	32.0	29.7	38	29.5	13.5	29.5	27.4
(8) Extent Enu (Want a What M Like"?	(8) Extent Encouraged to Have Last (Pant a) Child by "Desire to See Phat My Own Children Would be Like"?										
R	Reply of Wife										
	Verv Much	100	23.6	18.7	30.3	77 0	10	25 K	18.2	29.2	26.9
	Much	8	20.5	9.6	44.7	25.0	001	29.1	8.8	39.9	22.3
	Some	100	21.5	14.7	31.1	32.7	100	24.8	14.1	29.7	31.5
	Little	100	24.3	15.3	36.6	23.8	100	24.1	15.3	36.9	23.6
	Very Little	100	17.5	15.6	35.5	31.4	100	18.4	15.4	35.1	31.1
(8) <i>Re</i>	Reply of Husband										
	Very Much	100	23.0	13.9	33.9	29.1	100	25.8	13.3	32.5	28.3
	Much	100	25.9	25.9	29.3	19.0	100	27.8	25.2	28.5	18.5
	Some	100	15.2	14.2	41.5	29.1	8	19.5	13.4	39.7	27.4
	Little	9 <mark>1</mark>	27.1	14.8	28.4	29.7	8	30.7	14.1	27.0	28.2
	Very Little	9 <mark>1</mark>	20.5	13.7	33.8	32.0	8	21.4	13.9	33.3	31.5
						-			-		

¹ For numerical distributions, See Appendix I.

Table 6. Per cent distribution by fertility-planning status among "fertile couples" and among "all couples," accord-ing to replies of wives and husbands to two questions that were not restricted to fertile couples.¹

j

64

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

interest in children as measured by the replies to these questions. The distributions which appear to support the hypothesis by suggesting at least a tendency toward decrease in the proportion of planned families ("number and spacing planned" and "number planned" combined) with lowering of ECIC are those based upon replies of husbands to question 2 ("big 'kick' when children imitate you?") and those based upon replies of wives and husbands to questions 5 ("could anything give as much satisfaction as having children of your own?"); 7 ("do vou feel that it is fine to be able to live over again in your children?"); and 8 ("how much were you encouraged to have your last child by a desire to see what your own children would be like?"). The distributions which tend to run counter to the hypothesis are those based upon replies of wives and husbands to questions 1 ("want children to be independent?"); 3 ("parents have the right to expect children's appreciation?"): 4 ("greatest satisfaction knowing you will live on in your children?"); and 6 ("one of your greatest comforts knowing your children love and need you?").

Questions 3 and 8 were the only ones not restricted to fertile couples. One of these (8) fell into the list of those partially supporting the hypothesis but the other (3) did not. This holds for "all couples" as well as for "fertile couples," as indicated in Table 6. The consistently lower proportion of "number and spacing planned" couples among the "fertile couples" than among "all couples" arises from the fact that the childless couples in the Study are by definition restricted mainly to the "number and spacing planned" group. (See footnotes 2 and 5.)

Summary Score of Ego-Centered Interest in Children. Composite or summary scores of ego-centered interest in children were computed for each wife and husband with children in the Study by the simple summation of reply scores to the eight questions. With the previously-described 1-3-5-7-9 possible scores for each question, the total summary score on all eight questions could range from 8 to 72. Codes were assigned for

	NING STATUS NUMBER OF FERTILE COUPLES	Iasi- Excess Number and Spacing Number and Planned Number Planned Excess nncd Fertility Planned Planned Fertility		5.1 27.8 561 123 85 197 156 5.1 27.8 561 55 85 197 156 5.1 21 21 21 20 100 100	29.2 428 98 61 144		2.2 29.2 578 139 84 186 169 7.3 26.5 351 55 72 131 93	31.3 380 83 45 133			27,2 294 81 40 93	27.1	30.1 123 19 15 52	33.3 150 35 19 46	26.0	32.0 97 15 13 38	29.1 134 23 25 47	26.1 134 26	31.9 160 49 17 43
	INING STATUS	Total			29.2		<u></u>	31.3			27.2	- ::	30.1		26.0	32.0		26.1	31.9
	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY PLANNING STATUS	Number Planned		15 2 17 2			14.5 20.5					20.8			31.5		18.7		
and husband.	PER CENT DI	Total Number and Spacing Planned		100 21.9			100 24.0 100 15.7					100 16.0	.,	100 23.3			100 17.2		
interest in children of the wife and husband.		2	Wife	High Medium	Low	Husband	High Medium	Том	Wife and Husband Jointly Considered	Wife Husband	HH			H			LH		

Table 7. Percentage distribution of "fertile couples" by fertility-planning status, according to score of ego-centered

U

.

66

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

ten class intervals but only three groupings: those of "high," "medium," and "low" ECIC are utilized in this report⁸. The childless couples are not incorporated since they did not reply to all questions.

Virtually no relation of fertility-planning status to summary score of ego-centered interest of the wife is found (Table 7). A slight but direct relation of fertility-planning status to ECIC status is found in the data for husbands. In this case the proportions of "planned families" ("number and spacing planned" and "number planned" combined) are 39, 36, and 34, respectively, for husbands of "high," "medium," and "low" ECIC status. The differences, however, are not significant at the 5 per cent level. The classifications by the jointly-considered summary scores of ECIC of the wife *and* husband also yield little relation of this variable to fertility-planning status. The proportions of "planned families" are almost precisely the same (40-41 per cent) for the three groups in which both husband and wife are of "high," "medium," and "low" ECIC status.

In general, therefore, the hypothesis that high ego-centered interest in children is associated with high proportions of planned families finds little support in the data.

Relation of Ego-Centered Interest in Children to Socio-Economic Status and Other Characteristics. A rather marked inverse relation of ECIC status to socio-economic status is found for fertile wives (Appendix II) and fertile husbands (Appendix III). The proportional representation of the "high" socio-economic classes tends to increase with lowering of ECIC status. This relationship is stronger among the planned families with

ECIC	RANGE OF	N	UMBER
Status	SUMMARY SCORE	Wives	Husbands
High	8–27	561	578
Medium	28-32	320	351
Low	33-72	428	380

⁸ The system for the three-fold classification of fertile couples by summary score of ECIC was:

and husbands' replies	
lanning status, and by wives' and husban	
Children ever born per 100 fertile couples by fertility-plannin relevant to ego-centered interest in children.	
Table 8. Children ever born per 100 fertile to questions relevant to ego-centered interest i	
Table 8. to question	

00			1 ne	1	11	loar	ιĸ	1		511	iorii	u	1	'u'i	u	<u>ک</u>	<i>yu</i>	u	~	~~		'y
S3	Excess Fertility		07	53	154	134	113	48	113	107			103	158 86	3	34		777	154	51		44
NUMBER OF FERTILE COUPLES	Quasi- Planned		73	52	193	141	120	64	157	109			133	193	3	42		161	193	65		41
MBER OF FER	Number Planned		ç	25	62	7	52	18	76	55			2	69 %	S	26	i	77	76	36		17
N	Number and Spacing Planned		ų	34.0	88	130	69	41	80	87			110	104	4	25		871	64	30		25
	Total Planned Families		200	222	183	178	194	156	161	192			170	197 206	2	202		187	185	189		188
CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 100 FERTILE COUPLES	Excess Fertility		315	6 00 00 00	312	272	277	317	263	344			304	303 276	5	300	200	167	298	308		277
ER 100 FER1	Quasi- Planned		736	192	192	201	183	200	215	202			207	201		200	22	174	204	218		188
VER BORN F	Number Planned		200	276	235	216	262	*	234	216			213	243		258		CC7	228	228		265
CHILDREN E	Number a nd Spacing P!anned		173	182	147	150	143	139	150	176			143	165 176		144	2	t	151	143		136
	Total		340	238	227	210	217	218	219	240			215	230	1	228	000	277	226	233		219
	QUESTION AND REPLY	(1) Want Children Independent Regardless?	Reply of Wife Definitely or Dechahlar No	Doubtful	Probably Yes	Definit.ly Yes Reply of Husband Definition of	Probably No	Doubtful	Probably Yes	Definitely Yes	(2) "Kick" From Seeing Chil- dren Imitate You?	Reply of Wife	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably or	Definitely No	Reply of Husband		Probably Yes	Doubtful	Probably or	Definitely No

68

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

led)
ntin
ပ္ပိ
ŵ
ble
Ta

		CHILDREN EV	CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 100 FERTILE COUPLES	ER 100 FERT	ILE COUPLES		ΝΩ	NUMBER OF FERTILE COUPLES	TILE COUPLI	ş
QUESTION AND REPLY	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	Total Planned Families	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility
(4) "Living on" in Children One of Your Greatest										
Satisfactions? Reals of Wife										
Definitely Yes	232	151	231	219	302	188	110	86	188	169
Probably Yes	225	165	243	189	288	203	62	58	151	127
Doubtful Drohahly or	221	147	250	196	297	180	30	14	48	65
Definitely No	203	156	213	183	300	173	75	31	63	46
Reply of Husband						:		ł		Ş
Definitely Yes	232	151	229	202	329	186	116	93	117	163
Probably Yes	217	149	242	204	274	183	103	09;	147	871
Doubtful	233	154	*	200	292	197	24	14	40	47
Probably or Definitely No	202	188	212	189	241	200	34	34	46	41
	997 7	001	717			2				
(5) Anything as Satisfying as Having Children of Your Own?							•			
Reply of Wife										
Definitely No	225	156	240	209	298	193	225	171	324	251
Probably No	227	151	*	186	315	169 ÷	39	61 ,	107	69
Doubtful	202	*	*	ŧ	141	ŧ	0	n	0	5
Probably or Definitely Yes	197	*	*	*	*	167	7	8	11	7
Reply of Husband										
Definitely No	232	161	235	215	317	191	196	134	296	220
Probably No	196	138	222	170	253	178	52	46	104	80
Doubtful	226	152	÷	178	282	185	23	17	32	56
Probably or										ł
Dcfinitely Yes	236	*	*	*	288	*	9	4	18	25

Factors Affecting Fertility: Part XVIII

69

		CHILDREN EVER BORN	ver Born P	PER 100 FERTILE COUPLES	TILE COUPL	Sa	Νυ	IBER OF FEI	NUMBER OF FERTILE COUPLES	SI
QUESTION AND REPLY	'Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	Total Planned Families	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fcrtility
(6) One of Your Greatest Com- forts Thinking How Much Your Children Need You?										
Reply of Wife Definitely Yes	226	148	239	207	295	190	161	135	276	235
Probably Yes Doubtful	225	* 169	228 *	198	291 *	19 4 178	75	53 10	126 24	115 19
Probably or Definitely No	194	150	*	179	÷	152	58 28		24	12
Reply of Hushand Definitely Yes	233	154	246	206	319	190	163	104	211	201
Frobably I es Doubtful	212 193	15 4 152	224	201 188	271 245	193 161	59	12	159 51	124 31
r robably or Definitely No	215	167	*	182	300	183	24	II	28	24
(7) Fine to "Live Over" in Lives of Your Children?										
Reply of Wife Definitely Yes	223	156	234	206	294	191	181	145	293	218
Probably Yes ' Doubtful	225 233	152 143	231 *	183 229	303 303	184 162	21	42 8	116 24	30
Probably or Definitely No	219	¥	*	*	*	189	12	o o	14	16
Reply of Husband	200	100	230	100	LCC	007	3	;	ţ	
Probably Yes	220	138	249	193	285	189	191 191	53	166	861
Doubtful Detetle	218	156	211	203	304	185	25	27	36	26
Lrobapy or Definitely No	233	173	*	229	285	190	22	8	24	27

Table 8. (Continued)

70

1

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

* Rates not shown if based on fewer than 20 cases.

children than among all couples with children. It is somewhat stronger for husbands than for wives but it will be noted that the criteria of socio-economic status used are husband's longest occupation, husband's average annual earnings since marriage, and index of socio-economic status of the couple.

One of the other characteristics considered is number of brothers or sisters with whom the wife or husband was reared. It might be supposed that wives or husbands who grew up as an "only" child would be more heavily represented in the groups of "high" than of "low" ECIC status. Actually, however, the small differences that do exist are in the opposite direction.

No consistent relation is found between number of years the wife worked after marriage and ECIC status of the wife. The proportion of wives working "9 or more" of the 12–15 years of married life increases with lowering of ECIC of the wife but so also does the proportion working under 2 years or none at all after marriage.

By age, the wives and husbands of "high" ECIC status are a little younger than those of "low" ECIC status. Since all couples had been married 12–15 years at interview, the age at marriage tends to be somewhat lower for wives or husbands of "high" than of "low" ECIC status.

Relation of Ego-Centered Interest in Children to Fertility. The second part of the hypothesis, "The greater the extent to which interest in children is a matter of personal satisfaction (i.e., ego centered) the smaller the planned families" may now be considered. Fertility rates are shown in Tables 8 and 9 by replies of wives and husbands to questions designed to indicate degree of ego-centered interest in children. Table 8 relates exclusively to "fertile couples" and Table 9 presents the data for "all couples" and for "fertile couples" replying to questions 3 and 8. The data are shown separately for the total groups regardless of fertility-planning status, for each fertility-planning group, and for the "planned families" as a group.

Since the hypothesis relates to size of "planned family," attention may first be called to the last column concerning fer-

72

	. 2				1		10	11.			wi	010	1		1100		w	-			~	×				• •	• 5
	Total Planned Families			137	137	145	170	ccI	139	140	151	157	161				124	136	164	194	190		171	179	163	155	180
-	Excess Fertility			314	314	293	269	1/7	280	296	292	290	331				205	567 208	261	310	318		334	246	312	246	294
ALL COUPLES	Quasi- Planned			207	194	203	199	861	186	212	195	2 2 2 2	201	-			206	9 9 9	107	185	208		203	195	193	207	204
AL	Number Planned			245	220	231	228	777	238	110	256	212	244				726	070	027	229	233		238	242	239	196	228
	Number and Spacing Planned			82	104	100	130	170	6	6	× %	132	123				112		6 E	121	153		137	121	112	136	149
3	Total			210	206	195	209	561	196	202	204	200	219					117	207	218	236		228	196	216	194	224
	Total Planned Families			195	186	208	81	N	187	180	213	171	195		1		170	190	184	194	196		189	188	194	174	189
LES	Excess Fertility			318	314	293	269	1/7	283	966	292	290	331				105	567 908	264	310	318		339	246	312	246	294
FERTILE COUPLES	Quasi- Planned			209	198	203	199	97	187	212	202	203	201				306	202	197	188	208		203	195	196	207	204
Fer	Number Planned			258	230	231	228	777	248	218	256	212	244				744	738	220	229	233		238	242	239	196	234
	Number and Spacing Planned			148	160	185	144	148	145	147	172	157	165				177	171	160	171	163		160	134	152	162	158
	Total			241	231	228	213	107	219	223	233	212	237				110	224	213	219	239		237	201	229	205	228
	QUESTION AND REPLY	(3) Parents Have Right to Expect Appreciation from Children?	Reply of Wife	Definitely Yes	Frobably Yes	Doubtful D-ot-ot-1-M-	Definitely No	Reply of Husband	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Doubtful	Probably No	Definitely No	(8) Extent Encouraged to Have Last(a) Child by "Desire to See	What My Own Children Would he Liber	Reply of Wife	Very Much	Much	Some	Little	Very Little	Reply of Husband	Very Much	Much	Nome	LITTIC TTT	A GLA TILLIC

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

¹ See Appendix I for numbers on which rates are based. ² Question 3 was answered by all childless couples and Question 8 by childless couples with wife pregnant at interview or respondent indicating intention to have child in the future.

tility rates for all planned families by replies to various questions. Again, for each question, the replies are ordered from the top down in the direction of presumed decreasing degree of ego-centered interest in children. Thus if the hypothesis were borne out, the lowest fertility rates would be at the top and the highest at the bottom within each section. Among fertile couples of "planned family" status, the nearest approaches to this pattern are found in the classifications by replies of wives to questions 2 (" 'kick' from seeing children imitate you?") and 8 ("see what own children are like?"), and by replies of husbands to question 4 ("greatest satisfaction knowing you will live on in your children?"). (See Table 8.)

Results tending to run counter to the hypothesis are found in classifications by replies of wives to questions 1 ("want children to be independent?"); 4 ("greatest satisfaction knowing you will live on in your children?"); 5 ("satisfaction in having own children?"); and 6 ("one of your greatest comforts knowing your children love and need you?") (Table 8).

When the fertile couples of "number and spacing planned" status are considered separately the hypothesis is partially supported in classifications by replies of wives to questions 2, 3, and 8. It is also partially supported in replies of husbands to questions 1, 3, and 4 mentioned above. However, results counter to the hypothesis are found in classification of the "number and spacing planned" group by replies of wives to questions 1 and by replies of husbands to question 2.

Rather striking support of the hypothesis is found in the right-hand section of Table 9 devoted to "all couples" (including the childless) replying to questions 3 and 8. This holds true in the data by replies of wives and husbands within the "number and spacing planned" group and also within the group of "total planned families."

Table 10 points up the role of the childless couples in the fertility differentials by replies to questions 3 among "number and spacing planned" couples and all "planned families." The proportions childless are consistently higher for wives or hus-

		Number A	AND SPACIN	ig Planne	D
Replies to Question on Right of Parents to Expect Children to Appreciate	1	ber of ples		Ever Born Couples	Per Cent
SACRIFICES MADE FOR THEM	All Couples	Fertile Coup!es	All Couples	Fertile Couples	Childless
Reply of Wife					
Definitely or Probably Yes	194	119	95	155	38.7
Doubtful	61	33	100	185	45.9
Definitely or Probably No	148	125	124	146	15.5
Reply of Husband					
Definitely or Probably Yes	208	135	95	146	35.1
Doubtful	52	29	96	172	44.2
Definitely or Probably No	143	113	127	161	21.0
		TOTAL]	PLANNED F	AMILIES	
Reply of Wife					
Definitely or Probably Yes	280	201	137	191	28.2
Doubtful	93	65	145	208	30.1
Definitely or Probably No	235	212	161	178	9.8
Reply of Husband					
Definitely or Probably Yes	320	243	139	184	24.1
Doubtful	79	56	151	213	29.1
Definitely or Probably No	209	179	159	185	14.4

Table 10. Fertility rates for "all couples" and "fertile couples," and proportions childless, among couples classified as "number and spacing planned" and as "planned families," according to replies of wives and husbands to the question on right of parents to expect children to appreciate sacrifices made for them.

bands replying "definitely or propbably yes" to question 3 (presumed to be indicative of "high ego-centered interest in children") than for those replying "probably or definitely no" (presumed to be indicative of "low" ECIC). Although not shown, the proportions childless are consistently higher for wives or husbands stating that they were "very much or much" encouraged to have their last child (or to "want a child," if childless) in order to "see what my own children would be like" than for those replying "little or very little" to this question.⁹

⁹ The proportions childless by replies to question 8 are not shown since only about one-third of the childless couples, i.e., those pregnant at interview and those stating that they were planning to have a child in the future, were required to reply to question 8.

However, there probably are biases in this question, as is indicated in the following section.

It will be noted from Tables 8 and 9 that the relation of fertility to replies is not always the same for the "number planned" as for the "number and spacing planned" group. This characteristic has been observed in previous analyses of other hypotheses.

The hypothesis is not concerned with the relation of fertility to ego-centered interest in the remaining fertility-planning groups nor in the sample as a whole. These data are shown, however, for purposes of comparison. They indicate similar irregularities and lack of consistent patterns.

Thus the data for specific questions yield no consistent or conclusive evidence that greater ego-centered interest in children is associated with smaller planned families.

Partial support of the hypothesis is found in Table 11 where fertility rates are presented for "fertile couples" according to summary score of ECIC of the wife and husband, considered separately and jointly. Within the "number and spacing planned" group the fertility rate for wives or husbands of "high" ECIC status is smaller than that for wives or husbands of "low" ECIC status. This situation also holds for husbands but not for wives within the group of "total planned families." However, in none of these instances is the fertility rate for the "medium" ECIC group in intermediate position.

Similar situations are found in the classifications based upon joint consideration of wife's and husband's ECIC status (lower section of Table 11). Thus within the "number and spacing planned" group the fertility rate for fertile couples is 141 for couples with both partners of "high" ECIC status and 171 for those of "low" ECIC. Among fertile couples in "total planned families" the rates are 179, 221, and 186, respectively, for couples with both partners of "high," "medium," and "low" ECIC.¹⁰

¹⁰ There appears to be little difference between ECIC of the wife and that of the husband with respect to impact on fertility rates of the "fertile couples."

				Feriile Co	UPLES		
O	C Status n tre ary Score	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	Total Planned Families
	Wife						
	High	228	142	246	212	306	185
	Medium	234	173	227	212	297	200
	Low	211	160	220	178	285	183
	Husband						
	High	226	150	244	203	304	186
	Medium	223	138	219	205	300	184
	Low	222	173	233	194	284	195
Wife as	nd Husband						
Jointly	Considered						
Wife	Husband						
Н	н	222	141	258	210	303	179
н	Μ	228	130	223	221	300	183
н	L	240	163	260	206	319	206
м	н	224	166	232	209	276	189
М	М	252	167	235	220	342	221
м	L	237	193	208	211	303	200
L	н	235	161	232	185	341	198
ĩ	M	201	138	195	183	277	162
Ĺ	L	200	171	229	165	247	186

Table 11. Fertility rates of "fertile couples" by fertility-planning status, according to summary score of ego-centered interest in children of the wife and husband.

Other Evidence. One or two other types of evidence of the unimportance of the criteria of ECIC presented here to fertility differentials may be mentioned. The couples with one or more live births and childless couples with wife pregnant at interview or indicating intention to have a child in the future were asked to choose from a set of ten factors (relating to various hypotheses in the Study) those that were of first, second, and third importance in encouraging them to have their last child or to want a child. One of the listed factors was "a desire to see what my own children would be like." Among 1,357 couples eligible to reply, only 5 per cent of the wives and only 3.5 per cent of the husbands regarded the "desire to see what my own children would be like" as the most important reason for en-

couraging them to have their last child. The factor was listed as of first, second, or third importance by approximately onethird of the wives and one-fourth of the husbands.¹¹

It is true that the fertility rates rise sharply and consistently with diminishing degree of importance attributed to "desire to see what my own children would be like" as a reason for having the last child. Thus the fertility rates are 150, 161, and 179 live births per 100 couples for those in which the wife ascribed first, second, and third importance, respectively, to the abovementioned motivation. The rate is 242 for wives who did not include the above as one of the three most important reasons for having the last child. On the basis of husbands' replies the corresponding four fertility rates are 140, 192, 202, and 225.12 However, it seems clear that selective as well as determinative factors may be present in the above comparisons. That is, the desire to see what one's own children would be like logically would seem to be a stronger motivation for the first than for subsequent pregnancies. In other words, one would expect that wives or husbands attaching first importance to the above factor as a reason for wanting the last child would be more heavily weighted by those whose last child was also the first child than would be the case among couples attributing smaller importance to the reason under consideration.

Planning Additional Children. The data in Table 12 fail to indicate any consistent relation of planning of additional children¹³ to summary score of ego-centered interest in children of wives or husbands in completely planned or planned families. This analysis was made by number of live births experienced on the assumption that this variable would be related to the planning of additional children. Among childless wives within

¹¹ Approximately the same proportions (34 per cent of the wives and 29 per cent of the husbands) stated that they were "very much or much" encouraged to have their last child (or to want a child) by the "desire to see what my own children would be like." See distributions of replies to question 8, Table 1. ¹² Clare and Kiser, op. cit., p. 458 (Study Series Vol. III, p. 639). ¹³ The data on planning of additional children in all cases are based upon reply

of the wife as to whether the *couple* was planning to have another child (a "child" if childless). It will be recalled that all couples had been married 12-15 years at interview.

ve births and summary score of ego-centered	
t to the number of live births and sum	
ren in relation to the number ad.	
ional child and husbar	
anning o ren of th	
Table 12. Pl interest in child	

	NUM	NUMBER AND SPACING PLANNED	ACING PL	ANNED			TOTAL PLANNED FAMILIES	ined Fam	ILIES		
AND ECIC SUMMARY SCORE STATUR	Number of		Per Cen	Per Cent by Replice		Number of		Per Cent ł	Per Cent by Replies		
	Couples	Total	Not	Doubtful	Yes ²	Couples	Total	No1	Doubtful	Yes ²	
Wife 0 Live Births											,
High	75	100	84.0	6.7	9.3	62	100	84.8	6.3	8.9	Th
Low	23	8	04.3 71.4	17.9 14.3	14.3	23 28	89	64.3 71.4	17.9	17.8	e.
I Live Birth											M
High	77	100	62.4	15.6	22.1	81	100	61.8	14.8	23.4	ill
Medium	23	100	52.2	0.0	47.8	26	100	46.2	0.0	53.8	ba
мот	48	100	70.9	12.5	16.7	57	100	63.2	14.0	22.8	n
2 Live Births											k
High	41	100	73.2	14.6	12.2	94	100	61.7	14.9	23.4	Ν
Medium	26	100	57.7	42.3	0.0	63	100	41.4	17.5	11.1	1
Тож	45	100	92.6	0.0	4.4	81	100	80.2	1.4	12.4	er
Husband											nc
o Live Births)r
High	73	100	76.8	11.0	12.3	11	100	77.9	10.4	11.7	ia
Medium	23	100	61.9	23.8	14.3	23	100	61.9	23.8	14.3	l
Low	30	100	90.0	0.0	10.0	30	100	90.0	0.0	10.0	F
I Live Birth											u
High	83	100	54.2	16.9	28.9	85	100	53.0	18.8	28.2	n
Medium	34	100	82.3	5.9	11.8	43	100	69.8	4.7	25.6	ł
Low	31	100	67.7	6.5	25.9	36	100	63.9	5.6	30.6	Q
2 Live Burks											u
High	44	100	81.8	11.4	6.8	103	100	6.9	13.6	16.6	aı
Mcdium	21	100	66.7	23.8	9.5	66	100	66.7	15.2	18.2	te
Low	47	8	80.8	14.9	4.3	69	100	75.3	10.1	14.4	erl

either the "number and spacing planned" or "planned family" group, the proportion of those stating that they were definitely or probably planning a child was a little lower for those of "high" ECIC (9 per cent) than for those of "low" ECIC (14 per cent).¹⁴ However, the opposite type of relation tends to hold for wives with one or two live births and for husbands of each parity considered. In about half of the cases the wives or husbands of "medium" ECIC exhibit highest proportions "definitely or probably" planning another child and lowest proportions "definitely or probably" not planning a child or another child.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The Indianapolis Study data yield only very limited support to the hypothesis "the greater the extent to which interest in children is a matter of personal (ego-centered) satisfaction, the higher the proportion of couples practicing contraception effectively and the smaller the planned families."

The multiple-choice replies of wives and husbands to eight questions constituted the bases for classification by degree of ego-centered interest in children. Six of the questions were applied to fertile couples only, i.e., those with one or more live births. Only one question was answered by all couples, including the childless. Another was answered by all the fertile couples and by childless couples only if the wife was pregnant at interview or the respondent stated that the couple planned to have a child in the future.

The analysis of fertility-planning status by replies to specific questions yields no consistent indication that the proportion of planned families increases with ego-centered interest in children. The classifications by replies to several of the questions

¹⁴ Since the analysis is made separately by number of live births, childless couples were introduced and classified by ECIC status on the basis of their replies to question 3. Thus childless couples of "high," "medium," and "low" ECIC status are, respectively, those replying "definitely or probably yes," "doubtful," and "probably or definitely no" to the question regarding right of parents to expect children to appreciate the sacrifices made for them. The ECIC status of "fertile couples," as before, is based upon summary score of replies to all questions.

yield partial support of this part of the hypothesis but in no case is the relationship complete. No relation is found between fertility-planning status and summary score of ego-centered interest of fertile wives (based upon replies to all eight questions). The proportion of planned families decreases slightly with lowering of fertile husbands' ECIC status as determined by the summary scores but the differences are not statistically significant.

The data do provide limited support of the hypothesis that size of planned family is inversely related to ego-centered interest in children. The data by replies to individual questions again provide partial support in some instances and non-support in others. However, the results from the question (number 3) that was asked of all childless as well as fertile couples suggest that childless couples may exhibit a higher degree of egocentered interest in children than do fertile couples. Furthermore, partial support of the hypothesis is found in the data by size of planned family among fertile couples classified by summary score of ego-centered interest in children.

At least two considerations may account for the lack of stronger relationships than those observed in this study. In the first place the variable in question appears to have been poorly conceptualized and poorly measured. The distributions of the replies have suggested strongly that many respondents replied to some of the questions in terms of what they considered to be "expected" or "accepted." A side analysis indicated that people of high socio-economic status are somewhat more heavily represented in the groups of "low" than of "high" ego-centered interest in children. This may simply mean that these people were more discerning in their replies to the questions and hence somewhat less likely to give the "expected" or "accepted" reply.

In the second place, even if the factor considered were accurately measured it seems doubtful that its relation to fertilityplanning and size of planned family is sufficiently strong to show very much in simple classifications by this variable alone. In other words the many other factors affecting fertility—some operating in one direction and others in another—might easily obscure any relation that this factor may have to fertility behavior.

ls to	
band	
d hus	
and	
rives	
of v	
plies	
nd re	
us ai	
stat	
ning	
plan	
ility-	
fert	
μ	
couples	
tile	
d fer	
s an	
uple	
r of couple	
ber	
Num	
г.	3 pu
pendix I.	s 3 å
pper	stion
Y	gue

QUESTION AND REPLY Number and Spacing (3) Parents Have Right to Expect Number and Spacing (3) Parents Have Right to Expect 104 Appreciation from Children? 266 Reply of Wife 266 Probably Yes 356 Probably No 245 Probably No 275 Definitely No 275	Number Planned							
<i>Expect</i> <i>Shildren?</i> 266 356 165 245 275		Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility	Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility
ea 266 ea 356 o 245 to 275								
356 165 245 275	0	ę	or	30E	70	ç	100	70
165 245 275	oc 44	121	116	5 Q	115	46	123	00 116
245 275	32	28	42	193	19	32	58	42
275	36	89	72	250	53	36	68	72
	51	81	99	294	95	51	82	99
	46	119	115	386	102	48	120	116
Probably Yes 360 70	3	130	8	398	106	64	130	88
171	27	62	53	196	52	27	64	53
	34	69	50	227	73	34	2	50
	32	2	65	237	20	32	2	65
(8) Extent Encouraged to II are Last (a) Child by "Desire to See What My Own Children Would Be Like"								
	54	06	83	308	79	56	6	83
Much 132 27	13	2 65	33	148	43	13	59	33
	46	67	102	327	81	46	67	103
202	31	74	48	203	49	31	75	48
	57	130	115	370	68	57	130	115
ind built								
Much 230	32	78	67	240	62	32	78	68
	38	43	28	151	42	38	43	28
289	41	120	84	307	60	41	122	84
Little 155 42	23	44	46	163	50	23	44	46
	67	165	156	496	106	69	165	156

The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly

82

Factors Affecting Fertility: Part XVIII

Appendix II. Relation of ECIC status of the wife to selected characteristics; data for all fertile wives and for fertile wives in planned families.

	Δ	LL FERT WIVES			TILE WI	
CHARACTERISTICS	W	'ife's EC	IC Statu	ıs (Sumr	nary Sco	re)
	High	Me- dium	Low	High	Me- dium	Low
Number of Wives		1		-		
(Bases for Percentages)	561	320	428	208	111	159
Per Cent Distribution By :				200	111	108
Husband's Longest Occupation						
Professional and Managerial Clerical Manual Work, Service, etc.	18.0 23.2 58.8	22.2 19.4 58.4	30.8 27.3 41.8	21.6 29.8 48.6	32.4 18.0 49.5	44.0 20.1 35.8
Husband's Average Annual Earnings Since Marriage					10.0	00.0
\$2,400 and Over \$1,600-\$2,399 Under \$1,600	11.4 32.3 56.3	18.4 25.9 55.6	21.7 33.2 45.1	14.4 37.0 48.6	29.7 24.3 45.9	38.4 26.4 35.2
Index of Socio-Economic Status of the Couple				10.0	10.0	30.2
High SES Medium SES Low SES	9.3 41.0 49.7	15.0 31.3 53.8	23.6 38.3 38.1	15.4 45.7 38.9	27.0 33.3 39.6	37.1 39.0 23.9
Number "Sociological Sibs" of Wife ¹		0010	00.1	00.0	55.0	20.9
None 1–3 4 or More	10.1 62.1 27.9	7.8 65.0 27.2	13.0 60.8 26.2	10.3 64.2 25.5	$5.4 \\ 66.7 \\ 27.9$	16.1 63.9 20.0
Years Wife Worked After Marriage						
9 or More 2-8 Under 2 or None	4.5 30.7 64.9	5.0 25.6 69.4	7.2 27.6 65.2	6.2 43.7 50.0	7.2 35.1 57.7	11.3 27.0 61.6
Personal Adequacy of Wife (Interviewer's Rating)						
Self-Confident or Few Anxieties Average Some Worries or Feeling of Inferiority	53.7 23.8 22.5	49.7 28.4 21.9	53.5 25.0 21.5	63.4 15.6 21.0	59.5 29.7 10.8	65.4 18.9 15.7
ge of Wife at Marriage						
Under 19 19-21 22 and Over	35.7 37.1 27.3	36.9 37.8 25.3	32.2 34.8 32.9	33.7 37.5 28.8	37.8 35.1 27.0	25.2 32.7 42.1

¹ See footnote 1, Appendix III.

Appendix III. Relation of ECIC status of the husband to selected characteristics; data for all fertile husbands and for fertile husbands in planned families.

CHARACTERISTICS	ALL FERTILE HUSBANDS			FERTILE HUSBANDS IN PLANNED FAMILIES		
	Husband's ECIC Status (Summary Score)					
	High	Me- dium	Low	High	Me- dium	Low
Number of Husbands						
(Bases for Percentages)	578	351	380	223	127	128
Per Cent Distribution By:						
Husband's Longest Occupation						
Professional and Managerial Clerical Manual Work, Service, etc.	15.2 24.4 60.4	22.5 20.5 57.0	39.2 22.9 37.9	19.3 24.7 56.1	36.2 17.3 46.5	57.8 21.9 20.3
Husband's Average Annual Earnings Since Marriage						
\$2,400 and Over \$1,600-\$2,399 Under \$1,600	11.6 29.1 59.3	14.2 31.9 53.8	26.1 33.2 40.8	15.2 31.4 53.4	22.8 30.7 46.5	47.7 28.9 2 3.4
Index of Socio-Economic Status of the Couple						
High SES	7.4	11.7	30.8	13.0	21.3	50.8
Medium SES Low SES	38.1 54.5	39.9 48.4	35.3	41.3	42.5	37.5
Number "Sociological Sibs" of Husband ¹	54.5	40.4	33.9	45.7	36.2	11.7
None	10.2	13.3	17.7	14.0	16.5	18.0
1–3 4 or More	60.3 29.5	55.0 31.7	$56.6 \\ 25.7$	59.5 26.6	54.3 29.1	64.1 18.0
Personal Adequacy of Husband (Interviewer's Rating)	29.0	91.4	20.1	20.0	29.1	18.0
Self-Confident or Few Anxieties	57.2	62.0	54.6	70.9	71.7	74.4
Average	25.1	25.1	24.9	16.4	17.3	15.2
Some Worries or Feeling of Inferiority	17.6	12.9	20.4	12.7	11.0	10.4
Age of Husband at Marriage						_,,,_
Under 21	33.0	27.9	26.3	30.0	19.7	11.7
21-23	35.6	33.0	34.2	38.1	40.9	43.0
24 and Over	31.3	39.0	39.5	31.8	39.4	45.3

¹ Number of brothers and sisters (including half, step, and adopted) sharing husband's parental home while he was 6-16 years of age.