

IN THIS ISSUE

THE article "Effect of Frequency of Family Visiting Upon the Reporting of Minor Illnesses" by Jean Downes and Jane Coulter Mertz indicates some of the factors inherent in studies of morbidity based on observation of families which affect the completeness of reporting of minor illness. The material used was drawn from five different morbidity studies: Hagerstown, the study made by the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care; the Baltimore study, made by Frost and his associates; the study made in the Eastern Health District of Baltimore; and a study of two suburban communities in Westchester County, New York.

The interval between visits to the family was found to be of first importance because of the inability to remember accurately past events which are considered minor. The point of emphasis of the study is also of importance. Concentration on the reporting of one or two types of illness or upon one particular class of illnesses will result in greater precision in their reporting. These points are important in planning future studies of morbidity.



The longitudinal observation of families for purposes of studying disease and ill health among their members afforded the opportunity to study also the progress of children in their school work in relation to their health status and other social factors. The article "Progress in School of Children in a Sample of Families in the Eastern Health District of Baltimore" by Marguerite Keller presents data for children from 6 to 16 years of age.

The children were divided into two groups: those whose

school progress was satisfactory and those whose progress in school was considered as unsatisfactory. The prevalence of hay fever, asthma, and other chronic illness was much higher among children whose progress in school was rated as unsatisfactory compared with those who were promoted from one grade to another in each year. Also, home conditions such as adequacy of family income and living space were believed to have some influence upon the school status of the child.

• • •

The paper "Social Mobility and Fertility within an Elite Group" by E. Digby Baltzell contributes some suggestive evidence on the effect of social mobility on size of family. The analysis of the fertility of Philadelphia male parents listed in WHO'S WHO in 1940, utilizing such inferred indices of social mobility as Social Register affiliation, private schooling, religion, and birthplace, provides consistent though limited support to the hypothesis that upward social mobility is inversely related to size of family.

• • •

The article by Charles F. Westoff and Clyde V. Kiser entitled "An Empirical Re-Examination and Intercorrelation of Selected Hypothesis Factors" is the twenty-first of a series of reports from the Indianapolis Study on the Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility. This report represents the first systematic attempt to integrate and evaluate the comparative relationships with fertility planning and fertility of a number of variables analyzed previously in separate publications. These factors are: socio-economic status, income, occupation, education, marital happiness, tendency to plan in general, feeling of personal adequacy, feeling of economic security, and fertility-planning status.

• • •

One of the round-table groups organized in connection with the 1952 Annual Conference of the Milbank Memorial Fund

discussed the topic Exploration of Possibilities for New Studies of Factors Affecting Size of Family. Since this was largely a "workshop" session, the transactions will not be published in full. However, a digest of the papers and some of the discussion has been prepared for this issue by Clyde V. Kiser. All of the contributors cited were given the opportunity to edit the digests of their papers or remarks.