

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING FERTILITY

XXVI. THE PREDICTION OF PLANNED FERTILITY¹

CHARLES F. WESTOFF AND EDGAR F. BORGATTA²

THIS is the second of two articles in the Indianapolis Study series which, by the use of scale and factor analysis techniques, have endeavored to integrate the various findings resulting from the individually published analyses of data that were designed to test a large number of hypotheses on the social and psychological factors affecting fertility. The first of these two articles was published in the last issue of this *Quarterly*³ and was directed primarily toward the prediction of *total* fertility. This current paper, as the title indicates, is concerned mainly with the prediction of *planned* fertility. A more detailed statement of the three general objectives of these two reports was made in the first article: (1) to achieve the maximum prediction of fertility (utilizing scalable areas of content); (2) to achieve greater integration of the individual results; and (3) to test the sensitivity of the data to more advanced techniques of statistical analysis. In this analysis, as in the former article, these techniques consist mainly of cumulative scaling using the H-technique improvement, and the centroid method of factor analysis. Since this current article follows the same outline and utilizes the same procedures of analysis that were developed in the first article, the reader is

¹ This is the twenty-sixth of a series of reports on a study conducted by the Committee 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.

² From the Milbank Memorial Fund and Russell Sage Foundation respectively. The authors wish to acknowledge with thanks the material assistance in the treatment of these data generously afforded by the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University.

³ See Borgatta, Edgar F. and Westoff, Charles F.: Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility. xxv. The Prediction of Total Fertility. The Milbank Memorial Fund *Quarterly*, October, 1954, xxxii, No. 4, pp. 383-419 (Reprint pp. 1087-1123).

referred to the former publication for a description and account of the data and methods. It is recommended that both articles be read jointly.

The basic rationale underlying this second article is that the most significant theoretical questions that have been posed in the Indianapolis Study refer to differences in the fertility of *completely planned families*, that is, to the fertility of those couples (approximately one-fourth of the total sample) whose records of contraceptive practice and interview responses indicate that every pregnancy, or their voluntary childlessness, was the result of a deliberate process of planning.⁴ Eliminating the unplanned or "accidental" pregnancy as a variable permits a more refined analysis of the sociological and motivational factors that relate to decisions governing size of family. The restriction of the analysis to a selected sample of this nature, of course, reduces the demographic significance of the results. The preceding article, for this reason, dealt with the entire sample.⁵

The results of this first analysis indicated that the two chief factors accounting for most of the controlled variance of total fertility (the maximum proportion of the variance accounted for by all factors was 61 per cent) are the extent to which fertility was planned (located in a factor which was generalized as a "successful-rational-modern family" dimension), and a factor called the "material style of life" or socio-economic factor. Together these two factors accounted for over 59 per cent of the variance of total fertility. (See Appendix B.) The general nature of these relationships was, of course, realized by all

⁴ This group is classified in the Indianapolis Study in the "number and spacing planned" category and consists of couples who had no pregnancies that were not deliberately planned by stopping contraception in order to conceive.

⁵ Both studies, however, relate only to the "relatively fecund" wives, eliminating, for various reasons, those for whom there was some evidence of a history of sterility.

There is an intermediate level of analysis possible. Planning, in essence, suggests that the natural course of events is not the desirable or acceptable one. Thus, one major type of "residual" motivation factor is the general receptivity to having children with only a casual or loosely defined kind of planning. In other words, there are couples who are not actively trying to have another child but who are comparatively unconcerned about the possibility and may not use contraception regularly or efficiently. This type of difference was, to some extent, taken into account in the fertility-planning status classification of the Indianapolis Study.

Table 1. The intercorrelations¹ of fertility, thirteen attitudinal scales, and seven socio-economic variables for completely planned families.

| | | VARIABLE IDENTIFICATION CODES ² | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|--|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|------|--|
| | | F | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6a | 6b | 7 | 8a | 8b | 9 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | |
| F | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | .02 | | | | | | | | | | | .15 | -.02 | -.01 | -.03 | .14 | .14 | .07 | .06 | .19 | .04 | |
| 2 | | .10 | .23 | | | | | | .15 | .13 | .00 | .02 | .18 | .11 | .17 | .19 | .16 | .22 | .17 | .19 | .28 | .18 | |
| 3 | | .16 | -.06 | .22 | | | | | -.07 | -.03 | .14 | .13 | .18 | .11 | .22 | .12 | .19 | .28 | .32 | .25 | .48 | .37 | |
| 4 | | X | .07 | -.05 | -.12 | .11 | | | .02 | -.06 | .18 | -.10 | .06 | .28 | .22 | .12 | .19 | .28 | .32 | .25 | .48 | .37 | |
| 5 | | | X | .23 | .11 | -.04 | .19 | | .15 | .08 | .15 | .08 | .40 | .17 | .16 | .14 | .16 | .06 | .05 | .13 | .09 | .10 | |
| 6a | | | | X | .14 | .01 | .02 | .02 | .05 | .05 | .38 | .15 | .21 | .15 | .21 | -.05 | .05 | -.02 | .10 | -.13 | -.06 | -.10 | |
| 6b | | | | | X | .00 | -.10 | .11 | .17 | .10 | .20 | .19 | .05 | .17 | .24 | .08 | .07 | .13 | .19 | .12 | .19 | .14 | |
| 7 | | | | | | X | -.03 | .04 | .00 | .07 | .01 | -.18 | .04 | -.12 | .00 | .02 | .10 | .10 | .10 | .10 | .09 | .14 | |
| 8a | | | | | | | X | .03 | .21 | .01 | .02 | -.04 | .00 | .06 | -.15 | -.20 | -.11 | -.11 | .11 | .10 | .27 | .16 | |
| 8b | | | | | | | | X | .37 | .05 | .36 | .26 | .14 | .09 | .11 | .11 | .10 | .06 | .02 | .11 | .06 | .06 | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | X | .16 | .22 | .21 | .02 | .20 | .01 | -.06 | .10 | .08 | .10 | .06 | .10 | .06 | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .13 | .16 | .23 | .14 | .08 | .10 | .25 | .27 | .27 | .22 | .22 | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | X | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | .14 | .03 | .10 | .14 | .03 | .15 | .12 | |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | .25 | .27 | .27 | .22 | .22 | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | .14 | .03 | .15 | .12 | |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | .14 | .03 | .15 | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | .14 | .03 | |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | .14 | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | .10 | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | .07 | .16 | .11 | .23 | |

¹ N = 159 (the highest number of known scores on all variables). These coefficients were calculated by the Pearsonian product-movement formula. A coefficient of approximately $\pm .20$ is required for a statistically significant departure from zero at the 1 per cent level of probability and one of approximately $\pm .16$ at the 5 per cent level according to K. A. Fisher's formula.

² The meaning and correlated direction of the variables:

- F. High fertility.
- 1. Low sensitivity to inducements to fertility.
- 2. Favorable assessment of conditions.
- 3. Most liking for children
- 4. Low felt restriction.
- 5. High assessment of childhood.
- 6a. Low adherence to tradition (behavior of women).
- 6b. High adherence to tradition (general values).
- 7. High interest in religion.
- 8. Least feeling of personal inadequacy (self).
- 8a. Least feeling of personal inadequacy (husband).
- 8b. Least feeling of personal inadequacy (husband).

- 9. Least perception of deterrents to fertility.
- 10. High tendency to plan in general.
- 13. High satisfaction with husband.
- 14. High education of wife.
- 15. High education of husband.
- 16. High occupational class.
- 17. High net worth.
- 18. High rating on Chapin's scale.
- 19. High average annual earnings of husband.
- 20. Rent at interview.

connected with the Indianapolis Study. The main contribution of the first analysis (aside from its testing the data for scalability) was that it demonstrated how little the social-psychological variables collectively considered added to the prediction of total fertility. One of our main interests in this second analysis is to see whether a similar pattern prevails for the prediction of *planned* fertility.

THE CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

Our analytical problem in this paper, as in the preceding one, is to evaluate the relationships of twenty variables with planned fertility. For each of these variables, with the exception of fertility itself and the socio-economic variables, a cumulative scale had been constructed.⁶ The interrelationships of these variables are shown in Table 1. The first row of the table shows the correlational values of all variables with planned fertility. The only two variables that reveal a statistically significant association with planned fertility are Scale 3 which is liking for children (a correlation of +.23) and variable 19 which is the husband's average annual income since marriage (a correlation of +.19). It is interesting to note that of the total of 20 correlation coefficients, 15 are of a lower value than the comparable relationships with total fertility evidenced in the preceding article.⁷ The reason for this decrease in prediction is the fact that the variable of fertility planning has, by definition, been eliminated in the current analysis. The consequence of this is a reduction in the magnitude of the relationships that are correlated with fertility through the jointly related variable of fertility planning. Also involved is the reduced sample size and the lowered variance of fertility in the restriction of the sample to planned families.⁸ However, neither of these latter two considerations have any automatic consequences for the magnitude of the correlations. The net implication of this reduction in

⁶ *Op. cit.*, see Table 1 for the scale distributions, and Appendix B for a listing of the items included in each scale.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, see Table 2.

⁸ The standard deviation for the distribution of size of planned families is ± 1.06 as compared with ± 1.47 for the distribution of total fertility.

prediction would appear to be that at the level of completely planned fertility, having removed the variable of fertility planning with its high association with total fertility, we are confronted with the exceedingly complicated task of trying to account for the wide range of couples' feelings, values, attitudes, and circumstances relevant to the number of children they decide to have during a period of some twelve to fifteen years of married life.

THE FACTOR ANALYSIS

The purpose in employing factor analysis in this (and in the preceding) study is to attempt to uncover and specify the number and types of common dimensions or "factors" that account for the intercorrelations of the 21 variables. In other words, one objective is to reduce the number of variables to a smaller number of common factors. The results of the factor analysis after rotation⁹ are presented in Table 2. As before, the rotation was determined chiefly by our interest in the variance of fertility. Whatever is common to planned fertility, thus, is directly readable in the columns of the factors in which this variable is loaded.

It will be noted from Table 2 that only two of the five factors found are of any relevance to planned fertility—Factor I and Factor IV—and of these two, Factor IV is by far the more significant. With some exceptions, the factor matrix in Table 2 is very similar in structure to that in the preceding analysis of total fertility.¹⁰

Looking first at Factor I, we again clearly recognize the "material style of life" or socio-economic factor. The variables most highly related to this Factor are rent, income, rating on Chapin's Social Status Scale, education of husband, net worth, education of wife, occupational class, assessment of (material) conditions,¹¹ and sensitivity to (economic) inducements to

⁹ The factor matrix before rotation appears in Appendix A.

¹⁰ Compare Table 2 with the corresponding table reproduced from the former article, in Appendix B.

¹¹ This scale includes 6 items from the Index of Economic Tension and 3 items from the Index of Economic Security. These two Indexes were used separately in earlier analyses of Indianapolis data.

have children. The loadings of these variables in this Factor range from .82 to .31, in the order listed. The obvious and significant difference between this Factor and the corresponding Factor in the first article, is that *planned fertility* exhibits a loading of only .12 here while in the first factor analysis *total fertility* revealed a loading of .38. This difference, as we stated above, is due, in part at least, to the restriction of the sample to completely planned families and the resultant elimination of the variable of fertility planning. In other words, our previous higher correlations between the socio-economic variables and

Table 2. The rotated¹ factor matrix.

| IDENTIFICATION CODE | VARIABLE | ROTATED FACTORS | | | | | Communality |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | |
| F. | High Fertility | .12 | -.02 | -.01 | -.40 | -.02 | .18 |
| 1. | Low Sensitivity to Inducements to Fertility | .31 | -.13 | -.27 | .08 | -.10 | .20 |
| 2. | Favorable Assessment of Conditions | .38 | -.07 | -.02 | -.08 | -.51 | .42 |
| 3. | Most Liking for Children | .14 | -.25 | -.10 | -.58 | .16 | .45 |
| 4. | Low Felt Restriction | -.03 | -.22 | -.46 | -.22 | -.05 | .31 |
| 5. | High Assessment of Childhood | .20 | -.27 | -.02 | -.02 | .26 | .18 |
| 6a. | Low Adherence to Tradition (Behavior of Women) | .15 | -.02 | .16 | .15 | -.12 | .09 |
| 6b. | High Adherence to Tradition (General Values) | .05 | -.12 | .11 | -.35 | -.12 | .17 |
| 7. | High Interest in Religion | -.14 | -.29 | .22 | -.25 | .15 | .24 |
| 8a. | Least Feeling of Personal Inadequacy (Self) | .18 | -.55 | -.11 | .12 | -.07 | .37 |
| 8b. | Least Feeling of Personal Inadequacy (Husband) | .03 | -.54 | -.04 | .03 | .13 | .31 |
| 9. | Least Perception of Deterrents to Fertility | .20 | -.11 | -.49 | -.38 | .22 | .49 |
| 10. | High Tendency to Plan in General | .28 | -.50 | .00 | .04 | -.17 | .36 |
| 13. | High Satisfaction with Husband | .14 | -.31 | -.30 | .04 | -.13 | .22 |
| 14. | High Education of Wife | .59 | -.03 | .10 | .05 | .19 | .40 |
| 15. | High Education of Husband | .64 | -.20 | .08 | -.11 | .20 | .51 |
| 16. | High Occupational Class | .55 | .09 | -.10 | -.03 | -.06 | .33 |
| 17. | High Net Worth | .62 | -.01 | -.15 | .07 | -.21 | .46 |
| 18. | High Rating on Chapin's Scale | .74 | .03 | .05 | -.05 | .19 | .59 |
| 19. | High Average Annual Earnings of Husband | .77 | -.07 | -.03 | .00 | -.20 | .64 |
| 20. | Rent at Interview | .82 | .04 | .03 | .08 | .00 | .68 |

¹ The factor matrix before rotation appears in Appendix A.

total fertility were due in large part to the relationships between the socio-economic variables and fertility-planning status and the latter's association with total fertility. The reduction in the predictive value of this "material style of life" factor is considerable; it accounts for only between 1 and 2 per cent of the variance of planned fertility.

The main factor relevant to planned fertility in this analysis is unquestionably Factor IV, which contains 16 per cent of the variance of planned fertility. When we consider the fact that *all* five factors defined in this study collectively account for only 18 per cent of the total variance, Factor IV assumes an even greater significance.

Fortunately, the identity of Factor IV seems relatively clear. The variable with the heaviest loading (.58)¹² in this Factor is the scale on "liking for children." A close examination of the correlation between the scale on "liking for children" and size of planned families reveals that the correlation is defined primarily at the break between childlessness and having children. In other words, the predictive value of this scale is not as sensitive to the differences between small and large planned families as it is to the differences between childless couples and those with children.¹³ Two other variables with significant loadings in Factor IV support this interpretation, namely the scale on the perception of (non-economic) deterrents to fertility and the scale on felt restriction (non-economic) of personal freedom as a result of children.¹⁴ The two other variables loaded in this Factor which provide some further clues to the substantive nature of the factor are adherence to tradition and interest in religion. Specifically, these findings indicate that *high* planned

¹² For the sake of simplicity, we are ignoring signs in our discussion. Examination of Table 2 will reveal that "high fertility" has a loading of -.40 and "most liking for children" a loading of -.58. Reversing the signs and discussing the relationships in the "positive" direction contributes to easier reading.

¹³ Lois Pratt and P. K. Whelpton are undertaking the preparation of an article which will analyze in more detail the data on "liking for and interest in children" and they will elaborate this point more fully.

¹⁴ Part xxvii of the series, by Ruth Riemer and P. K. Whelpton, also in this issue, treats the original Indianapolis Study hypothesis on personal freedom in detail.

fertility is directly associated with a *high* liking for children combined with *little* perception of children interfering with the style of life the parents wish to follow, and is also associated with a *strong* commitment to traditional values and a *high* interest in religion. This configuration of common variance prompts an identification of this Factor as a "child affect—respectability" factor. Our reasoning is that although American society is composed of sub-cultures which vary in the extent to which children and family life are perceived as compatible with different life styles, the dominant cultural definition of children is clearly "positive." Social scientists are increasingly characterizing American society (especially the so-called "middle class" with its family adjustment and child psychology consciousness) as a child-centered culture.¹⁵ Couples who remain childless to some extent feel defensive in the presence of parents if the subject of children is raised. One sociological consequence of being childless (especially during the first ten to fifteen years of marriage) is a decreased commonality of interests and concerns, and thus, a diminished basis for shared group participation. This group differentiation tends to be reinforced by the partial ecological segregation of the two groups.¹⁶ The suburban trend in America, for example, is definitely a family-oriented phenomenon. Thus, the cluster of liking for and interest in children, traditional values and religious interests would appear simply to reflect one of the dominant, though not imperative, ideological patterns of American culture. The fact is, nevertheless, that there *are* voluntarily childless couples in American society who express only moderate interest or even disinterest in children. It is plausible to assume that this *type* of couple will be more career-oriented, less community minded,

¹⁵ This characterization, even if accurate, has no necessary implications for size of family since a concentration on the raising of children does not in any way imply large families.

¹⁶ The reasons why this pattern of differentiation does not produce any marked social isolation of childless couples is obviously that there are areas of common interest (e.g. professional interests) that transcend family interests plus the fact that childless couples (particularly if the childlessness is voluntary as it presumably is for these couples) are themselves socially grouped around other interests.

regard themselves as more "emancipated," and will be more interested in extra-familial leisure activities. In short, the internalization of positive traditional and religious values is to some extent inconsistent with this style of life. In the context of the American normative system generally, this style of life is a deviant although permitted variation. Conformity to group norms, in itself, will not suffice as an adequate explanation of this Factor since one can readily perceive types of reference groups to which childlessness *per se* would be the mode of conformity.¹⁷

A significant aspect of the statistical relationships presented in Table 2 is the fact that Factors I and IV are, by definition, orthogonal. In substantive terms, this means that the "child affect—respectability" factor is distinctly different from, or independent of, the "material style of life" factor. Only husband's education shows some slight involvement. The variable of income has an absolute zero loading in Factor IV.

There is an important problem of methodology that complicates the interpretation of the main findings, namely, the *ex post facto* nature of the Indianapolis Study. The net result of this type of research design for the relationships described above is that we cannot determine the extent to which liking for children is a motivational precedent or consequent to having children. The fact that the sample in the analysis is confined only to planned pregnancies modifies the problem to some extent. Nevertheless, we are forced to make the plausible but indeterminate assumption that the variable operates in both directions.

In evaluating the significance of these findings, one question recurrently intrudes itself. To what extent is the relationship between liking for children and having children simply a truism? Is this relationship a "sufficient" explanation of planned fertility? Of course, the fact that this Factor accounts for only 16 per cent of the variance of planned fertility makes this con-

¹⁷ Illustratively, one might think of certain types of intellectual and artistic interest groups, or friendship groups that develop around work interest or social and recreational activities.

cern somewhat academic. However, our opinion is that "liking for children" is by no means the "ultimate" researchable level of analysis and that any new studies of fertility that develop in the future might very legitimately aim at the antecedents to the factor we have described. Such a theoretical point of departure could well proceed from the general question of what styles of life in American society are compatible or incompatible with the complex of psychological, time, energy, and economic demands that having children implies.

We are not basically concerned with the identification of those Factors which are irrelevant to our fertility variable. In general, their structure is similar to that evidenced by the factor analysis for the total sample. We can, as before, identify Factor II with its main loadings on feelings of personal adequacy, tendency to plan in general, and marital satisfaction as the "personal-family adjustment" factor. The pattern of Factor III reveals several changes from its previous structure. These changes make its previous identification as a "conformity-tradition" factor no longer applicable. The new Factor V is very similar to its predecessor and retains its interesting residual inverse relationship between "status" (education and Chapin's Social Status Scale) and "class" (income and net worth).

GENERAL SUMMARY

The basic purpose of this general re-examination of the Indianapolis Study data was to test the sensitivity of the data to the recently developed techniques of scaling and within the limits of the scale definitions (which deliberately cut across the original hypothesis designations)¹⁸ to ascertain the maximum level of prediction of fertility. A total of thirteen scales was constructed and a factor analysis was performed with the intercorrelation of these thirteen variables in addition to seven

¹⁸ In this important sense, these two articles differ in method and results from the article by Westoff and Kiser. See Westoff, Charles F. and Kiser, Clyde V.: *Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility*. xxi. An Empirical Re-Examination and Intercorrelation of Selected Hypothesis Factors. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, October, 1953, xxxi, No. 4, pp. 421-435 (Reprint pp. 953-967).

socio-economic variables, fertility planning and fertility. The first of the two articles focussed on the prediction of total fertility. The significant factors in this prediction were found to be the socio-economic or "material style of life" factor and the extent to which fertility was planned (a factor generalized as the "successful-modern-rational family" factor) which together accounted for 59 per cent of the total fertility variance that was controlled. The remaining factors added only 2 per cent to this prediction.

In the analysis just concluded, the identical statistical procedures were employed. Here our interest was confined to the more theoretically significant question of the prediction of *planned* fertility. The five factors isolated for this population, however, contributed a net control of only 18 per cent of the variance of planned fertility. Of the total variance only a little over 1 per cent was contributed by the socio-economic or "material style of life" factor. The major factor relevant to planned fertility (accounting for 16 per cent of the variance) is a factor which we identified as a "child-affect—respectability" factor. This factor was defined largely by variables relating to liking for and interest in children, adherence to traditional values, and interest in religion. The main reason for the reduction in prediction is the exclusion (by definition) of the fertility planning variable.

The nature of these findings leads us to suggest that future studies should, for theoretical purposes, conceptualize liking for children and its attendant value orientations (tradition and religion) theoretically as the "correct" response to American middle-class values and to examine deviations from this response pattern in terms of the compatibility of children with different styles of life.

Appendix A. The factor matrix before rotation.¹

| IDENTIFICATION CODE | VARIABLE | UNROTATED FACTORS | | | | | Communality |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | |
| F. | High Fertility | .20 | -.11 | .22 | -.20 | -.18 | .17 |
| 1. | Low Sensitivity to Inducements to Fertility | .35 | .05 | -.21 | -.11 | .16 | .21 |
| 2. | Favorable Assessment of Conditions | .42 | .22 | -.26 | -.17 | -.31 | .42 |
| 3. | Most Liking for Children | .38 | -.41 | .33 | -.16 | -.11 | .46 |
| 4. | Low Felt Restriction | .20 | -.36 | -.14 | -.35 | .13 | .33 |
| 5. | High Assessment of Childhood | .28 | -.15 | .11 | .19 | .18 | .18 |
| 6a. | Low Adherence to Tradition (Behavior of Women) | .10 | .20 | -.10 | .14 | -.08 | .09 |
| 6b. | High Adherence to Tradition (General Values) | .06 | -.22 | .12 | -.06 | -.30 | .16 |
| 7. | High Interest in Religion | .04 | -.35 | .20 | .23 | -.18 | .25 |
| 8a. | Least Feeling of Personal Inadequacy (Self) | .39 | -.23 | -.32 | .23 | .08 | .37 |
| 8b. | Least Feeling of Personal Inadequacy (Husband) | .26 | -.37 | -.13 | .28 | .10 | .31 |
| 9. | Least Perception of Deterrents to Fertility | .37 | -.31 | .18 | -.39 | .27 | .49 |
| 10. | High Tendency to Plan in General | .47 | -.14 | -.27 | .20 | -.08 | .36 |
| 13. | High Satisfaction with Husband | .31 | -.17 | -.30 | -.10 | .13 | .24 |
| 14. | High Education of Wife | .48 | .29 | .20 | .16 | .16 | .41 |
| 15. | High Education of Husband | .64 | .13 | .24 | .16 | .09 | .52 |
| 16. | High Occupational Class | .45 | .33 | .06 | -.15 | .07 | .34 |
| 17. | High Net Worth | .53 | .34 | -.15 | -.13 | .06 | .44 |
| 18. | High Rating on Chapin's Scale | .59 | .43 | .19 | .13 | -.10 | .60 |
| 19. | High Average Annual Earnings of Husband | .72 | .36 | -.06 | -.03 | -.04 | .65 |
| 20. | Rent at Interview | .65 | .50 | .07 | .05 | .08 | .69 |

¹ The factor matrix after rotation appears in Table 2 in the text.

Appendix B. The rotated factor matrix¹ (based on data for all couples and relevant to total fertility).

| IDENTIFICATION CODE | VARIABLE | ROTATED FACTORS | | | | | Communality |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | |
| FP. | Effective Fertility Planning | .40 | -.04 | .01 | .61 | .08 | .54 |
| F. | Low Fertility | .38 | .08 | -.10 | .67 | .00 | .61 |
| 1. | Low Sensitivity to Inducements to Fertility | .18 | -.21 | -.34 | -.06 | -.07 | .20 |
| 2. | Favorable Assessment of Conditions | .47 | -.26 | .04 | -.03 | -.27 | .36 |
| 3. | Most Liking for Children | .06 | -.40 | .11 | -.11 | .24 | .25 |
| 4. | Low Felt Restriction | -.04 | -.57 | -.36 | .10 | -.06 | .47 |
| 5. | High Assessment of Childhood | .17 | -.28 | .00 | -.05 | .24 | .17 |
| 6a. | Low Adherence to Tradition | .14 | .10 | -.21 | .10 | -.09 | .09 |
| 6b. | Low Adherence to Tradition | .17 | .04 | -.28 | .05 | .14 | .13 |
| 7. | Low Interest in Religion | .08 | .22 | -.26 | .15 | -.14 | .17 |
| 8a. | Least Feeling of Personal Inadequacy (Self) | .26 | -.54 | .18 | .19 | -.07 | .43 |
| 8b. | Least Feeling of Personal Inadequacy (Husband) | .07 | -.36 | .19 | .11 | -.04 | .18 |
| 9. | Least Perception of Deterrents to Fertility | .06 | -.51 | -.29 | -.05 | .18 | .38 |
| 10. | High Tendency to Plan in General | .28 | -.35 | .19 | .05 | -.06 | .24 |
| 13. | High Satisfaction with Husband | .10 | -.46 | .04 | .20 | -.08 | .27 |
| 14. | High Education of Wife | .59 | -.02 | -.05 | .06 | .36 | .49 |
| 15. | High Education of Husband | .58 | -.03 | -.01 | -.03 | .19 | .38 |
| 16. | High Occupational Class | .55 | -.04 | -.10 | -.01 | .02 | .31 |
| 17. | High Net Worth | .67 | -.04 | .04 | .04 | -.31 | .55 |
| 18. | High Rating on Chapin's Scale | .80 | .02 | -.06 | .08 | .01 | .65 |
| 19. | High Average Annual Earnings of Husband | .75 | -.03 | .01 | -.09 | -.20 | .62 |
| 20. | Rent at Interview | .85 | .04 | .02 | .03 | -.15 | .75 |

¹ Source: Table 3 in Borgatta, Edgar F. and Westoff, Charles F.: *Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility*. xxv. *The Prediction of Total Fertility*. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, October, 1954, xxxii, No. 4, pp. 383-419 (Reprint pp. 1087-1123).