

SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING FERTILITY

XXX. EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION OF WIVES IN RELATION TO INTEREST IN AND LIKING FOR CHILDREN, FERTILITY PLANNING, AND ACTUAL AND DESIRED FAMILY SIZE¹

LOIS PRATT AND P. K. WHELPTON

IT IS hypothesized that: "The extent of a wife's participation in activities outside the family is directly related to her interest in and liking for children and the effectiveness of her fertility planning, and inversely related to her fertility and desired family size.² Some assumptions underlying this hypothesis are briefly as follows: Outside activities are thought to affect a woman's interest in children in many ways—some tending to encourage her interest and others tending to discourage it. However, it is proposed that the positive influences are predominant. First, regular absences from the home may promote strong affection between mother and child because the mother's contact with the child does not consist primarily in *directing* the child. Since women with outside interests are not totally reliant on the family as an avenue of self expression they may be less likely to be bored with any facet of their lives and less likely to consider their children as a restriction. Some women who are active outside the home may also escape some of the drudgery of children by bringing in outside help. The time they spend at home may be spent in playing with, rather than working for, their children. The influence of the employed wife's earnings may be to prevent feelings of resentment of the sacrifices children entail. Participation outside the home also

¹ This is the thirtieth 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 This is not one of the original hypotheses of the Indianapolis Study. It emerged from work on the Indianapolis hypothesis concerning the relationship of interest in children to fertility planning and size of planned family.

provides a general training in interpersonal relations, one aspect of which is the development of an enlightened interest in children as distinctive human beings whom it is pleasurable to watch develop. Outside experience may also teach the woman that role *alternatives* are available. The consequence of this may be that the decision to bear children becomes a more voluntary choice than submission to fate. This atmosphere may be conducive to attitudes of interest in and liking for one's children.³

Both negative and positive pressures operate to make a small planned family, and the desire for a small family, more likely among women who participate actively outside the home. The negative pressure is the competition for time, effort, and financial resources from the alternative activities; it creates a need to restrict the amount of family resources spent for children. The stimulus for family planning under these circumstances is to prevent becoming overburdened by children. The positive pressures include training in interpersonal relations and development of values about the obligations of parents to children. The influence of these experiences tends to be to make women undertake planning in order to further the interests of children and family.⁴

³ The following studies provide relevant data concerning the relationship of outside participation to the wife's adjustment to her husband. The influence of outside participation on the husband-wife adjustment is probably similar in many ways to its influence on the mother-child relationship.

La Follette, C. T.: *A STUDY OF THE PROBLEMS OF 652 GAINFULLY EMPLOYED MARRIED WOMEN HOMEMAKERS*, Columbia University, Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 619, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934. More than half the women studied reported they were better companions to their husbands because of having outside work.

Locke, Harvey and Mackeprang, Muriel: *Marital Adjustment and the Employed Wife*. *American Journal of Sociology*, LIV, 1949, pp. 536-538. No difference was found in the marital adjustment of women engaged in fulltime employment and women in fulltime homemaking.

Pratt, Lois: *Student Marriages at Michigan State College*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Michigan State College, East Lansing, 1948. The wives who worked were better adjusted maritally than those who did not work.

⁴ A previous article in this series contains evidence suggestive of this positive aspect of fertility planning motivation. It was shown that among couples who have children a strong interest in children is associated with effective fertility planning; other suggestive Indianapolis evidence was also cited.

Pratt, Lois and Whelpton, P. K.: *Social and Psychological Factors Affecting*

(Continued on page 46)

Since this is an *ex post facto* study no genuine test of causal hypotheses was possible. Nevertheless, it appeared desirable to propose that extra-familial participation may be the causal factor. In order to have a sounder basis for judging the plausibility of the suggested causal sequence, certain checks were made as follows. Extra-familial participation is thought to include several sub-elements, such as an adequate chance for self-expression and other value and behavior patterns discussed above as accounting for the relationship of social participation to liking for children and fertility behavior. Thus, if the causal implications of the hypothesis are correct, one should expect the sub-elements to be related to liking for children and fertility behavior in the same manner hypothesized for social participation. Measures of these sub-elements of social participation which were available were found to be related to liking for children, fertility planning and family size as predicted, thus lending some support to the reasoning underlying the hypothesis.⁵

1. THE DATA

The data pertain to the 1,309 couples with children in the inflated sample of 1,444 "relatively fecund" couples of the Indianapolis Study.⁶ These couples were native white, Protestant,

Fertility. xxix. Interest in and Liking for Children in Relation to Fertility Planning and Size of Planned Family. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, xxxiii, No. 2, October, 1955, pp. 430-464. (Reprint pp. 1211-1244.)

⁵ The following measures were used to represent the elements subsumed under extra-familial participation:

"How good a chance do you have to express yourself?"

"How much has it bothered you to be tied down by your children?"

"Do you plan things in advance?"

"Which spouse should make the final decision whether to have another child?"

Amount of domestic help since the first child was born.

"How do you feel about childless families among couples in moderate circumstances?"

"Do you approve of a married woman with children holding a paid job?"

Before checking the relationship of these measures to liking and fertility behavior, a check was made which disclosed that these presumed sub-elements of social participation were closely related to social participation, providing some rationale for considering them to be included in this variable.

⁶ All couples reporting four or more live births were classified as "relatively fecund" regardless of other circumstances. Couples with three or fewer live births were also classified as "relatively fecund" unless they knew or had good reason to believe that having a live born child was physiologically impossible during a period of at least 24 or 36 consecutive months since marriage (24 if never pregnant, 36 if

(Continued on page 47)

at least eighth grade graduates, married during 1927-1929, neither previously married, husband under 40 and wife under 30 at marriage, and residents of a large city most of the time since marriage.⁷

As in other articles in this series, four fertility planning categories are used. In descending order of success in fertility planning they are: Number and Spacing Planned, Number Planned, Quasi-Planned and Excess Fertility.⁸ Fertility is represented by number of live births to the couple; the fertility rates used are the number of live births per 100 couples. Desired family size is represented by answers to the question "If you could begin your married life over again, and the size of your family could be determined by your liking for children, how many would you have?"

Childless couples (of whom there were 135) are not considered in the present study because the reasons underlying any relationship found between wives' extra-familial participation on the one hand, and their liking for children and fertility behavior on the other, may be quite different from those for couples with children. While no causal link is established here, it is suggested that the explanation for the relationships may lie in the influence of social participation on liking for children and fertility behavior. While it is possible that the influence is in the opposite direction even for couples with children, the suggested pattern seems totally inappropriate for childless couples, for there is an even greater likelihood that the childlessness and attitudes toward children of the latter group were prominent in establishing the wife's level of extra-familial participation.

ever pregnant). Failure to conceive in the absence of contraception practiced "always" or "usually" during periods of the above durations was considered "good reason" for such belief.

⁷ A detailed account of the sampling procedure may be found in Whelpton and Kiser: *Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility*. v. The Sampling Plan, Selection, and Representativeness of Couples in the Inflated Sample. The Milbank Memorial Fund *Quarterly*, January, 1946, xxiv, No. 1, pp. 49-93 (Reprint pp. 163-207).

⁸ See Whelpton and Kiser: *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).

The measures of extra-familial participation used here are work history and participation in the system of unpaid social activities, labeled here the "club" system. The three levels of business participation, labeled long, moderate, and none, are based on the number of years of full or part time employment since marriage. Long participation is five or more years, moderate is 1 to 4.9 years, and non-participation is less than one year or no work since marriage. Participation in clubs is measured by answers to the question, "Since your first child was born, how often have you gone to clubs, lodges, meetings, dances, parties, etc?" "Sometimes," "often" or "very often" represent participation; "seldom" or "very seldom" stand for non-participation.⁹ The terms "Clubs" and "No Clubs" are used as a simple way of referring to these groups. While these terms do not adequately represent the two response groups, better designations were not at hand. It would have been preferable to measure club participation with questions on the amount of time devoted to different kinds of social activity at different times during marriage, as was done with work history.

The per cent distribution for each work group by "Clubs" and "No Clubs" is as follows:

Table A

	NUMBER OF WIVES	TOTAL	"CLUBS"	"NO CLUBS"
Long Work	223	100	44	56
Moderate Work	388	100	46	54
No Work	698	100	48	52

Approximately the same proportion (somewhat under one-half) of each work history group participate in clubs, lodges, meetings, dances, parties, etc.

⁹ Although it would have been desirable to keep those who "sometimes" participated in social activities separate from those who participated "often or very often," it was not feasible to do this. The cells were too small when the cross-tabulation by work history was made. The effect of retaining three work divisions but only two "club" divisions may be to accentuate unduly the importance of work in the findings. However, examination of results when three "club" groups are used suggests that separating the "sometimes" and "often or very often" groups would not significantly alter the results.

2. EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION IN RELATION TO INTERESTS IN AND LIKING FOR CHILDREN

It is found for the sample as a whole that women who participate outside the home are characterized, as hypothesized, by a somewhat higher degree of interest in and liking for children than women whose activities are restricted primarily to the home.¹⁰ Both employment and participation in clubs, lodges, meetings, dances, parties, etc., are, to a slight degree, positively related to a woman's interest in and liking for children, as measured by the summary index of "interest," but these differences are not significant statistically. When combined into social participation "levels," these factors show a significant relationship to interest in children, as shown in Table 1. Women who engaged in both "club" and work activity have the highest level of interest in children, on the average; those who participated in only one of the systems or in both for a short period of time are intermediate in liking; and the women who participated in neither system have the lowest interest.

Looking again at Table 1, we see that the relationship of participation to interest in children is absent among effective planners and the Quasi-Planned, and negligible among the Excess Fertility group.

While the relationship of participation to liking is not sus-

¹⁰ The questions used here to represent interest in and liking for children are:

1. "Do you get tired of hearing the constant questions children ask?"
2. "How does the fun you get compare with the trouble when children of your neighbors or friends come in and make themselves at home?"
3. "How much do you enjoy taking children on outings?"
4. "Do you like to play with, read or talk to children?"
5. "How much are you interested in hearing other people talk about their children?"
6. "Do you get as much "kick" from the things children say as from those grownups say?"
7. "Frequently children get so wrapped up in their play that they forget there is anyone around. Do you find it fun just to watch them then and see what they do and say?"
8. "How much did a strong liking for children encourage you to have your last child?"

A summary index of "interest" was devised, on which "Interest scores" for individuals range from 3 to 9 out of a possible range of 1 to 9. A high score represents high interest or liking. Correlations of individual items against the summary index range from +.40 to +.63. A Guttman scale was formed with these items with reproducibility of .76.

stained under control for planning status, it may be of interest to examine the relationship in more detail insofar as the findings may have implications for future work. It is possible that a closer link would be found between participation and the interest women show in their children through their actual be-

Table 1. Degree of interest in and liking for children (summary index) by extent of extra-familial participation, for all wives and by planning status.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	"INTEREST" SCORES FOR ALL WIVES AND BY FERTILITY-PLANNING STATUS ¹			
	All Wives	Number and Spacing and Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
TOTAL	6.9	7.2	6.9	6.7
"Clubs"-Long Work	7.3	7.4	6.8	7.4
"No Clubs"-Long Work	7.0	7.3	6.7	6.6
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	7.0	7.0	7.2	6.6
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	6.9	7.2	6.8	6.7
"Clubs"-No Work	7.0	7.0	6.9	6.9
"No Clubs"-No Work	6.8	7.2	6.9	6.5
Long Work	7.1	7.3	6.7	6.9
Moderate Work	6.9	7.1	7.0	6.6
No Work	6.9	7.1	6.9	6.5
"Clubs"	7.0	7.1	7.0	6.9
"No Clubs"	6.9	7.2	6.8	6.5
	NUMBER OF WIVES			
TOTAL	1,309	478	450	381
"Clubs"-Long Work	98	57	27	14
"No Clubs"-Long Work	125	73	29	23
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	178	68	63	47
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	210	81	69	60
"Clubs"-No Work	334	124	127	83
"No Clubs"-No Work	364	75	135	154
Long Work	223	130	56	37
Moderate Work	388	149	132	107
No Work	698	199	262	237
"Clubs"	610	249	217	144
"No Clubs"	699	229	233	237

¹ The difference between the average interest scores of the "Clubs"-Long Work and the "No Clubs"-No Work groups is significant at the .01 level, for all planning categories combined.

havioral relationship to them, than the idealistic notions expressed in the present questions.

Of the eight items available for measuring interest in and liking for children, four are positively related to level of extra-familial participation. They are:

- Do not tire of children's questions;
- More fun than trouble when neighbors' children visit;
- Encouraged to have children by liking for children;
- Like to watch children play.

The four remaining items show little or no relationship to social participation. Interest scores on each of the eight items are shown for the social participation groups in Appendix Table I.

The hypothesis assumes that the relationship between social participation and interest in children has a certain degree of independence from such variables as socio-economic status and family size; for these factors have not been subsumed, theoretically, under the social participation variable. In controlling the summary index of "interest" for socio-economic status it is found that the relationship is sustained in the upper and lower socio-economic groups, though not in the middle group. The difference is significant only in the lower status. Socio-economic status controls were also imposed on the individual liking item most closely related (positively) to socio-economic status. This item was "Not tire of children's questions." The relationship with social participation persisted but in a somewhat weaker form, particularly in the lower class. The relationship between participation and interest is undiminished under control for family size. (*See Appendix Tables II and III.*)

Some other factors which have been considered to be included in social participation should be found partially responsible for the relationship with interest in children. Such factors as education, the chance for self expression, and the amount of domestic help available were all suggested as reflections of certain aspects of the social participation complex. Control for edu-

cation reveals some irregularity in the college group but the relationship between participation and interest in children is

Table 2. Relationship between degree of interest in children and effectiveness of fertility planning, by extent of extra-familial participation.¹

DEGREE OF INTEREST IN CHILDREN AND EXTENT OF EXTRA- FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY FERTILITY PLANNING STATUS ¹				
		Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi- Planned	Excess Fertility
<i>"Clubs"</i> -Long Work (Significant .01)						
High	40	100	56	17	10	17
Medium	37	100	44	13	30	13
Low	21	100	33	—	57	10
<i>"No Clubs"</i> -Long Work (Significant .02)						
High	45	100	47	22	18	13
Medium	45	100	47	22	18	13
Low	35	100	26	6	37	31
<i>"Clubs"</i> -Moderate Work (Significant .10)						
High	60	100	37	12	38	13
Medium	60	100	20	8	40	32
Low	58	100	24	14	28	34
<i>"No Clubs"</i> -Moderate Work (Significant .01)						
High	58	100	17	40	24	19
Medium	80	100	19	12	39	30
Low	72	100	17	15	33	35
<i>"Clubs"</i> -No Work (Significant .10)						
High	103	100	23	15	44	18
Medium	140	100	19	22	29	30
Low	91	100	15	15	46	24
<i>"No Clubs"</i> -No Work (Significant .001)						
High	100	100	11	18	39	32
Medium	122	100	8	18	43	31
Low	142	100	8	2	31	59

¹ The level of significance for the chi square tests of the relationship between interest and planning is shown for each social participation group.

undiminished among high school graduates and non-graduates. However, among women with a good or excellent chance for self-expression, and among those with considerable domestic help, the pattern is seriously weakened, though it persists in full force among women with fair-to-poor opportunities for self-expression. That is, when good opportunities for self-expression or plentiful domestic help are present, interest in children tends to be quite high, regardless of the extent to which the woman participates in outside activities. But when the chance for self-expression is not felt to be good or domestic help is not available, the woman's interest in children is dependent upon the extent of her social participation. To a certain extent, then, two of the subsidiary factors can serve the same function as social participation. (See Appendix Tables IV, V and VI.)

3. INTEREST IN CHILDREN AS MOTIVATION FOR FERTILITY PLANNING

It was indicated in a previous article that nine out of ten of the couples who planned to be childless had little interest in children, but that among couples with children there was a tendency for strong interest in children to be accompanied by effective fertility planning.¹¹ The latter is consistent with the idea that planning tends to be employed as a means of promoting the best interests of one's children or the family as a whole. However, it was felt that this motivational pattern might not characterize women at all levels of social participation. Planning may not be closely related to liking among those whose activities are mainly restricted to the home, for these women may not have been trained to think of planning as a technique of effectuating their interest in children.

The data of Table 2 indicate that the positive relationship between liking for children and planning characterizes all participation levels. Chi squares for four of the groups are clearly significant (at .02 to .001); for two they are significant at the .10 level.

¹¹ Pratt and Whelpton, *op. cit.*

4. EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION IN RELATION TO EFFECTIVENESS OF FERTILITY PLANNING

The data indicate that the higher the level of the wife's participation in activities outside the family the greater the probability of effective fertility planning. The hypothesis is, thus, sustained. Both work and "club" activity are related to planning. The association between a long work history and effective planning is notable.¹² As seen in Table 3, 46 per cent of the women with long work history plus "club" activity planned the number and spacing of their pregnancies, while only 9 per cent of the women participating in neither system did so. The proportions of the most active group and the non-participants who were unsuccessful in planning their family size are 14 and

Table 3. Effectiveness of fertility planning by extent of extra-familial participation.¹

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY FERTILITY PLANNING STATUS				
		Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
TOTAL	1,309	100	21	15	35	29
"Clubs"-Long Work	98	100	46	12	28	14
"No Clubs"-Long Work	125	100	41	18	23	18
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	178	100	27	11	36	26
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	210	100	18	21	33	28
"Clubs"-No Work	334	100	19	18	38	25
"No Clubs"-No Work	364	100	9	12	37	42
Long Work	223	100	43	15	25	17
Moderate Work	388	100	22	16	34	28
No Work	698	100	14	15	37	34
"Clubs"	610	100	26	15	35	24
"No Clubs"	699	100	17	16	33	34

¹ The chi square is significant at the .001 level, even when reduced by .4, the amount of sample inflation.

¹² As noted earlier, combining the women who attended clubs, lodges, meetings, dances, parties, etc. "sometimes" with those who attended "often" or "very often" may have artificially reduced the importance of this type of activity compared to the importance of work, where a three-way breakdown was used.

42 per cent respectively. Women with moderate participation outside the home are intermediate in planning effectiveness.

Considering this finding that participation is positively related to fertility planning in conjunction with the finding from a previous article that liking for children is positively related

Table 4. Effectiveness of fertility planning by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for socio-economic status.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY FERTILITY PLANNING STATUS ¹				
		Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
<i>Upper Status</i>						
"Clubs"-Long Work	49	100	60	4	18	18
"No Clubs"-Long Work	20	100	70	5	15	10
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	75	100	37	16	32	15
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	53	100	21	28	32	19
"Clubs"-No Work	141	100	34	18	35	13
"No Clubs"-No Work	66	100	26	21	36	17
<i>Middle Status</i>						
"Clubs"-Long Work	16	*	*	*	*	*
"No Clubs"-Long Work	41	100	39	15	27	19
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	42	100	17	19	40	24
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	47	100	21	15	41	23
"Clubs"-No Work	76	100	12	16	50	22
"No Clubs"-No Work	69	100	7	10	47	36
<i>Lower Status</i>						
"Clubs"-Long Work	33	100	33	9	37	21
"No Clubs"-Long Work	64	100	33	23	24	20
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	61	100	21	—	36	43
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	110	100	15	20	30	35
"Clubs"-No Work	117	100	6	20	33	41
"No Clubs"-No Work	229	100	4	10	34	52

* Distributions are not shown for fewer than 20 wives.

¹ The differences between the proportions of the lowest and highest participation levels shown who were Number and Spacing Planned are significant at the .01 level for all socio-economic status groups. The differences between the lowest and highest participation levels shown with respect to the proportions who had Excess Fertility are also significant at the .01 level for the Middle and Lower Status groups but are not significant for the Upper.

to planning,¹³ one might expect a close positive relationship between participation and planning, due to a joint influence of participation and liking on planning. This has been found to be the case. Referring back to Table 2, we see that the relationship between participation and planning is accentuated within groups with differing levels of liking for children.

Some indication of the social significance of extra-familial participation for fertility behavior is found in a comparison of Table 3 with the early Indianapolis Study findings for socio-economic status. About the same proportion of the active social participants as of the top socio-economic group had excess fertility.¹⁴

Table 4 provides indications of the combined influence of the two factors and the relative independence of the two influences. The following figures are relevant:

	<i>Proportion Who Were Number and Spacing Planned:</i>
Total Sample of Couples with Children	21
High Socio-Economic Status	44
Active Participants ("Clubs" - Long Work)	46
Active Participants and High Status	60

The independence of the two factors is striking and significant

¹³ Pratt and Whelpton, *op. cit.*

¹⁴ Effectiveness of fertility planning by socio-economic status.

Socio-Economic Status	Number of Wives	Per Cent Distribution by Planning Status				
		Total	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Fertility Excess
1 (High)	201	100	44	16	27	13
2	203	100	29	21	37	13
3	291	100	18	14	42	26
4	372	100	16	12	35	37
5 (Low)	242	100	8	17	29	46

Kiser, Clyde V. and Whelpton, P. K.: Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility. ix. Fertility Planning and Fertility Rates by Socio-Economic Status. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, April, 1949, xxvii, No. 2, pp. 184-244. (Reprint pp. 359-415.)

with respect to Number and Spacing Planned behavior, but rather uncertain for unplanned fertility.

5. EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION IN RELATION TO FERTILITY

In general, a high level of participation outside the home is accompanied by small family size, and a low level of participation by larger family size, as hypothesized. This holds true for the sample as a whole and for effective planners. Considering first the total group regardless of planning status, the following is found: both work and participation in clubs, lodges, meetings, dances, parties, etc. are accompanied by low fertility, work apparently being the stronger influence.¹⁵ The greater divergence between the average fertility of workers and non-workers than between "club" and "non-club" women is accounted for by the tendency for work to be associated with a *single* child, and of "club" activity to be associated with *two* rather than three or more children. (See Table 5.)

Simultaneous consideration of work and "club" activity re-

Table 5. Fertility by extent of extra-familial participation.¹

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY SIZE					BIRTHS PER 100 WIVES
		Total	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 or More Children	
TOTAL	1,309	100	28	41	18	13	224
"Clubs"--Long Work	98	100	40	48	8	4	177
"No Clubs"--Long Work	125	100	54	31	11	4	166
"Clubs"--Moderate Work	178	100	34	44	14	8	199
"No Clubs"--Moderate Work	210	100	23	42	23	12	229
"Clubs"--No Work	334	100	26	47	16	11	218
"No Clubs"--No Work	364	100	17	36	24	23	272
Long Work	223	100	48	38	10	4	171
Moderate Work	388	100	28	43	19	10	215
No Work	698	100	21	42	20	17	246
"Clubs"	610	100	30	47	14	9	206
"No Clubs"	699	100	26	36	21	17	240

¹ The chi square is significant at the .001 level even when reduced by .4, the amount of sample inflation.

¹⁵ Had it been possible to use three levels of "club" participation, as was done with employment, the importance of "clubs" might have been found to be somewhat greater than appears in the present data.

veals a more extreme pattern, particularly at the *inactive* end of the scale: all non-working wives have an average fertility of 2.46 children, while those who neither worked nor attended "clubs" average 2.72. However, at the high activity end of the continuum there is an exception to the general pattern: women with long work histories plus "club" activity tend to have somewhat *higher* fertility than women with long work alone. Particularly notable is the greater tendency of the Long Work-"No Club" women to have a single child than is true of the Long Work-"Club" women. Furthermore, the slightly lower fertility of the Long Work-"No Club" women cannot be accounted for by later marriage, postponement of births after marriage, more effective fertility planning, a lower level of interest in children, or a lower socio-economic status.¹⁶ While the slightly lower fertility of the "No Club" working women has not been explained by these controls, the consistency of the finding has at least provided assurance that "clubs" do not have any further depressing effect on the fertility of women who worked several years after marriage. It may be that "club" activity emphasizes the importance of having a "normal" family of two children and thereby serves to *sustain* fertility against the further depressing influence of extensive employment. On the other hand, two children may serve as a greater stimulus than a single child for a working women to *enter* community or family-protective organizations.

The extent of extra-familial participation and degree of liking for children might be jointly related to fertility, since it was found in Section 2 that extra-familial participation is positively related to liking for children. However, it was found in a previous article that liking is not related to family size among women with children.¹⁷ Hence the positive association between participation and liking does not affect the mode of relationship that participation has to fertility.

¹⁶ These control tables are not shown in the present article. They are to be found in: Pratt, Lois: *The Relationship of Non-Familial Activity of Wives to Some Aspects of Family Life*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1955.

¹⁷ Pratt and Whelpton, *op. cit.*

The relationship of participation to fertility holds true for all planning status groups, as shown in Table 6. While the same general pattern of relationship prevails among effective planners as was found for all women combined, one exception is to be noted. In the entire sample, "club" women who did not work had lower fertility than "non-club" women with moderate work histories. The reverse is true for planners. That is, among those who undertake to plan their fertility, there is more limitation associated with work than with "clubs." This suggests that work may exert stronger pressure than "clubs" and that a

Table 6. Fertility by extent of extra-familial participation, for the planning status groups.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND PLANNING STATUS	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY SIZE					BIRTHS PER 100 WIVES ¹
		Total	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 or More Children	
<i>Number and Spacing and Number Planned²</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	57	100	47	49	4	—	156
"No Clubs"-Long Work	73	100	63	30	4	3	147
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	68	100	40	53	4	3	174
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	81	100	30	52	11	7	196
"Clubs"-No Work	124	100	16	64	16	4	208
"No Clubs"-No Work	75	100	27	41	21	11	221
<i>Quasi-Planned</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	27	100	37	56	7	—	170
"No Clubs"-Long Work	29	100	42	38	10	10	196
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	63	100	38	45	11	6	186
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	69	100	29	43	19	9	209
"Clubs"-No Work	127	100	41	39	10	10	190
"No Clubs"-No Work	135	100	21	50	19	10	222
<i>Excess Fertility</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	14	*	*	*	*	*	278
"No Clubs"-Long Work	23	100	43	22	35	—	191
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	47	100	21	32	30	17	251
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	60	100	7	25	45	23	296
"Clubs"-No Work	83	100	17	36	24	23	276
"No Clubs"-No Work	154	100	9	21	29	41	340

* Fewer than 20 wives.

¹ The differences between the fertility rates of the lowest and highest participation levels shown are significant at the .01 level for all planning status groups. (In testing the significance of the difference in the Quasi-Planned group, the "Clubs"-Long Work and "Clubs"-Moderate Work categories were combined.)

² The Number and Spacing Planned and the Number Planned groups were combined because the pattern is relatively the same for these two groups and the number of cases is too small to consider them separately.

woman may take more firm action to maintain work than "club" activity. The fact that the general relationship between fertility and participation persists among planners suggests that different requirements of the various roles demand certain family sizes—that fertility differences by participation are not merely due to differential knowledge of contraception. In a later section it will be shown whether different roles are also accompanied by differing desired family sizes.

The inverse relationship of fertility to social participation is not entirely due to a larger proportion of *incompleted* families

Table 7. Fertility by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for socio-economic status.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	NUMBER OF WIVES	BIRTHS PER 100 WIVES ¹
<i>Upper Status</i>	404	189
"Clubs"—Long Work	49	165
"No Clubs"—Long Work	20	145
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	75	179
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	53	196
"Clubs"—No Work	141	194
"No Clubs"—No Work	66	217
<i>Middle Status</i>	291	213
"Clubs"—Long Work	16	169*
"No Clubs"—Long Work	41	224
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	42	198
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	47	191
"Clubs"—No Work	76	204
"No Clubs"—No Work	69	245
<i>Lower Status</i>	614	252
"Clubs"—Long Work	33	200
"No Clubs"—Long Work	64	183
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	61	223
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	110	260
"Clubs"—No Work	117	254
"No Clubs"—No Work	229	282

* Note that fewer than 20 wives are involved.

¹ The differences between the fertility rates of the lowest and highest participation levels are significant at the .01 level for all socio-economic status groups. (In testing the significance of the difference in the Middle Status group, the "Clubs"—Long Work and "Clubs"—Moderate Work categories were combined.)

among active women, for if we add another birth to the family size of all women who say they intend to have another child the pattern is still sustained. However, the relationship is weakened slightly because it is a little more common for the active than the inactive to say they plan to have another child.¹⁸

Table 7 shows that the relationship of extra-familial participation to fertility persists among all socio-economic status groups. Since the relationship of socio-economic status to fertility is also inverse, it is found that women who combine both high extra-familial participation and high socio-economic status have a fertility rate of 165, which is a little lower than the 177 for all active participants or the 189 for all upper socio-economic status women.

6. EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION IN RELATION TO PLANNING-AND-FERTILITY PATTERNS

Another question of interest is the extent to which *patterns of planning-and-fertility* exist; that is, the extent to which effective planning and low fertility jointly characterize one social participation level, while ineffective planning and high fertility characterize another level. Table 8 shows the proportion of each social participation level who:

- Planned the last child and had low fertility;
- Planned the last child and had high fertility;
- Did not plan the last child and had low fertility;
- Did not plan the last child and had high fertility.

“Low fertility” is two or fewer children and “high fertility” is three or more children.

Effective planning (i.e. the successful planning of at least the

18	PER CENT INTENDING ANOTHER CHILD:	FERTILITY RATE (ACTUAL PLUS INTENDED)
“Clubs”-Long Work	14	192
“No Clubs”-Long Work	8	173
“Clubs”-Moderate Work	3	201
“No Clubs”-Moderate Work	6	231
“Clubs”-No Work	6	219
“No Clubs”-No Work	4	273

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY PLANNING-AND-FERTILITY PATTERNS ¹				
		Total	Planned-and-Low Fertility	Planned-and-High Fertility	Not Planned-and-Low Fertility	Not Planned-and-High Fertility
TOTAL	1,309	100	30	6	38	26
"Clubs"—Long Work	98	100	56	2	32	10
"No Clubs"—Long Work	125	100	55	4	30	11
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	178	100	35	3	43	19
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	210	100	31	7	33	29
"Clubs"—No Work	334	100	30	7	44	19
"No Clubs"—No Work	364	100	14	7	39	40

¹ All the differences between the proportions of high, moderate and low participation groups "planned-and-low fertility" are significant at the .01 level. The difference between the proportion of the low participation on group and other participation levels "not planned-with-high fertility" is also significant at .01.

Table 8. Planning-and-fertility patterns by extent of extra-familial participation.

last child) accompanied by low fertility is frequent in the two top participation groups, of average frequency in the next three, and infrequent in the lowest participation group. The reverse is true for ineffective planning with high fertility. We can say, then, that to a significant degree, women at different social participation levels are characterized by different reproductive patterns, including both planning and family size aspects.

7. EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION IN RELATION TO DESIRED FAMILY SIZE

Desired family size is represented by women's answers to the question, "If you could begin your married life over again, and the size of your family could be determined by your liking for children, how many would you have?" Answers to this question reflect the number of children women desire *based on liking* rather than on the basis of all factors. For present purposes it would have been better if this question had read, "If you could relive your married life how many children would you want to have?"

The average size of family desired on the basis of liking for children is smaller for active social participants than for women with a low level of extra-familial participation. However, *all* groups express a desire for larger families than they have. Consequently, the differential among the social participation levels is not as great for desired as for actual family size.

Both work and "club" activity during marriage are slightly associated with small desired family size. Combining work and "club" activity into participation levels augments and clarifies

Table 9. Desired fertility and actual fertility by extent of extra-familial participation.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY DESIRED FAMILY SIZE					FERTILITY RATE ¹
		Total	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 or More Children	
TOTAL	1,309	100	2	39	22	37	316
"Clubs"—Long Work	98	100	2	41	24	33	313
"No Clubs"—Long Work	125	100	3	43	24	30	287
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	178	100	1	40	23	36	310
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	210	100	—	41	25	34	323
"Clubs"—No Work	334	100	4	40	19	37	307
"No Clubs"—No Work	364	100	1	33	23	43	333
Long Work	223	100	3	42	24	31	300
Moderate Work	388	100	1	40	24	35	317
No Work	698	100	2	37	21	40	322
"Clubs"	610	100	3	40	21	36	309
"No Clubs"	699	100	2	36	24	38	323
	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY ACTUAL FAMILY SIZE					FERTILITY RATE
		Total	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 or More Children	
TOTAL	1,309	100	28	41	18	13	224
"Clubs"—Long Work	98	100	40	48	8	4	177
"No Clubs"—Long Work	125	100	54	31	11	4	166
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	178	100	34	44	14	8	199
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	210	100	23	42	23	12	229
"Clubs"—No Work	334	100	26	47	16	11	218
"No Clubs"—No Work	364	100	17	36	24	23	272

¹ The differences between the average desired size for the "No Clubs"—Long Work group and the "No Clubs"—No Work group is significant at the .01 level.

the nature of the relationship to desired family size. (See Table 9.) Only the women who participate in neither business nor "clubs" are distinguishable from other social participation groups in terms of family size preferences. The "No Club"-No Work women show a greater tendency to desire four or more children and a lesser tendency to desire two children than is true of all other participation levels, though the per cent differences are not statistically significant. The modal size preference for the non-participants is four or more children and for all other levels is two children. There are some other differences between participation levels in *average* fertility, but these differences are not reflected in a significantly greater tendency to prefer one particular family size rather than another. In terms of average desired fertility, the non-participants are highest; "club" women, regardless of work history, are intermediate, while women who worked several years but did not attend "clubs" are lowest. Taking the women's answers at face value, it may be that "club" activity reduces a woman's family size desires to a certain extent, but that it also serves to ward off the depressive influence of other forces, such as long employment. On the other hand, women who participate in "clubs" may simply be more likely to verbalize a high ideal family size, even when it is an unrealistic size for them.

Two other measures of family size values display the same inverse relationship with extra-familial participation level:

Table B

	FERTILITY RATE BASED ON:	
	Ideal Number of Children for a Couple in Moderate Circumstances	Number of Children Wanted at Marriage
"Clubs"-Long Work	225	230
"No Clubs"-Long Work	230	220
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	246	244
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	261	255
"Clubs"-No Work	257	238
"No Clubs"-No Work	274	251

Examination of the relationship of participation to desired family size for the various planning status groups (Table 10) reveals that the pattern persists to a moderate degree among the Number Planned and among the Quasi-Planned. It is not

Table 10. Desired family size by extent of extra-familial participation for the planning status groups.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND PLANNING STATUS	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY DESIRED FAMILY SIZE ¹					FERTILITY RATE
		Total	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 or More Children	
<i>Number and Spacing Planned</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	45	100	-	40	31	29	311
"No Clubs"-Long Work	51	100	4	49	29	18	261
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	48	100	-	42	37	21	283
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	37	100	-	56	22	22	267
"Clubs"-No Work	64	100	6	36	19	39	325
"No Clubs"-No Work	32	100	-	40	38	22	287
<i>Number Planned</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	12	*	*	*	*	*	400*
"No Clubs"-Long Work	22	100	-	41	18	41	304
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	20	100	-	30	10	60	335
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	44	100	-	9	32	59	434
"Clubs"-No Work	60	100	-	32	20	48	332
"No Clubs"-No Work	43	100	-	9	26	65	379
<i>Quasi-Planned</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	27	100	7	52	19	22	255
"No Clubs"-Long Work	29	100	-	48	7	45	310
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	63	100	3	45	13	39	319
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	69	100	-	56	16	28	299
"Clubs"-No Work	127	100	2	53	19	26	289
"No Clubs"-No Work	135	100	2	37	18	43	310
<i>Excess Fertility</i>							
"Clubs"-Long Work	14	*	*	*	*	*	372*
"No Clubs"-Long Work	23	100	9	26	39	26	300
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	47	100	-	36	28	36	313
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	60	100	-	37	33	30	303
"Clubs"-No Work	83	100	8	29	19	44	304
"No Clubs"-No Work	153	100	1	35	24	40	333

* Fewer than 20 wives.

¹ Combining the Number and Spacing and Number Planned groups, the difference between the fertility rates of the "No Clubs"-Long Work and the "No Clubs"-No Work women is significant at the .01 level. Neither this difference nor the difference between the fertility rates of the "Clubs"-Long Work and the "No Clubs"-No Work women is significant for the Quasi-Planned or Excess Fertility groups. For the combined Number and Spacing and Number Planned group, the differences in the proportions of the lowest and highest participation levels who have one child and in the proportions who have four or more children are significant at .01. For the Quasi-Planned, the corresponding differences are significant at .10 when the "Clubs"-Long Work and "Clubs"-Moderate Work categories are combined.

present among the Number and Spacing Planned and Excess Fertility groups.

The general relationship between average desired size and social participation level persists, by and large, in the middle and lower socio-economic status groups, but not in the upper status. (Appendix Table VII.)

Average desired family size is larger than average actual size for all social participation levels. If family size were determined only by liking for children, as reported by the respondents, there would be just over three instead of two children per couple in the sample. The difference is largely due to a smaller proportion of women desiring one child than actually having this number, and a larger proportion wanting four or more than actually having this family size. Fifty-eight per cent of the sample report that on the basis of liking they would have a larger family than they actually had.

That desired size is decidedly larger than actual size for every social participation level is clearly shown by the fact that the group with the highest actual fertility has a lower actual rate (272) than the lowest desired rate (287) of any of the groups in question. It is also indicated by the fact that the most com-

Table 11. Proportion who would have fewer, the same, or more children on the basis of liking than they actually have if they could relive married life, by extent of extra-familial participation.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT WHO WOULD LIKE TO HAVE: ¹			
		Total	Fewer	The Same	More
TOTAL	1,309	100	10	32	58
"Clubs"—Long Work	98	100	2	27	71
"No Clubs"—Long Work	125	100	6	26	68
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	178	100	6	28	66
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	210	100	10	32	58
"Clubs"—No Work	334	100	8	35	57
"No Clubs"—No Work	364	100	16	35	49

¹ The difference between the proportion of the highest and lowest participation levels wanting more children than they have is significant at the .01 level.

mon tendency of the women in every group is to state that they would like a family size larger than their own. (Table 11.)

But the participation levels differ in two ways: in the proportion who would like more children than they have, and (tentatively) in how great a discrepancy there is between the woman's actual and desired family size. Table 11 shows that the higher the participation level the larger the proportion who would like a family size larger than they actually have, and the smaller the proportion desiring a smaller family than their own. The question arises as to whether this greater interest of the high participation groups in a larger family than they have represents any real dissatisfaction with their fertility accomplishments, or whether it is only a difference between an ideal pattern and real life. Apparently a real desire to have a larger family is represented, for the higher the participation level the larger the proportion who would actually like to have another child.¹⁹ This may indicate that participation has to a greater extent restrained the two most active groups from having their desired number of children than is true of less active groups. This finding is consistent with the notion that participation exerts an influence over fertility.

From the data at hand, it is not possible to conclude whether the difference among the participation levels in the proportion desiring a larger family is due only to the larger proportion of small families among the active participants, or whether, given a particular family size, the active participants are more likely

19

Desire to Have Another Child

"Clubs"—Long Work	6.0
"No Clubs"—Long Work	5.9
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	4.9
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	4.8
"Clubs"—No Work	4.7
"No Clubs"—No Work	4.5

Desire to have another child is expressed as an average score for each group and is based on the following weighted response categories of the question, "How much do you want another child sometime?"

Want very much	9
Rather want	7
Don't want but wouldn't object	5
Rather object	3
Very much against	1

Table 12. Desired by actual fertility for the extra-familial participation levels.¹

ACTUAL FAMILY SIZE AND EXTENT OF EXTRA- FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	PER CENT DISTRIBUTION BY DESIRED FAMILY SIZE					FERTILITY RATE
		Total	1 Child	2 Children	3 Children	4 or More Children	
<i>"Clubs"</i> --Long Work							
1 Child	39	100	5	51	26	18	257
2	47	100	-	41	21	38	345
3	8	*	*	*	*	*	412
4 or More	4	*	*	*	*	*	350
<i>"No Clubs"</i> --Long Work							
1 Child	68	100	6	40	27	27	371
2	38	100	-	50	13	37	287
3	14	*	*	*	*	*	286
4 or More	5	*	*	*	*	*	320
<i>"Clubs"</i> --Moderate Work							
1 Child	61	100	3	53	23	21	282
2	79	100	-	40	23	37	299
3	24	100	-	25	33	42	286
4 or More	14	*	*	*	*	*	378
<i>"No Clubs"</i> --Moderate Work							
1 Child	48	100	-	77	13	10	233
2	87	100	-	37	24	39	323
3	49	100	-	20	49	31	374
4 or More	26	100	-	27	8	65	392
<i>"Clubs"</i> --No Work							
1 Child	86	100	13	54	10	23	250
2	159	100	1	45	22	32	298
3	53	100	-	23	32	45	246
4 or More	36	100	-	11	8	81	480
<i>"No Clubs"</i> --No Work							
1 Child	63	100	6	45	19	30	306
2	130	100	-	44	21	35	297
3	85	100	-	23	38	39	332
4 or More	86	100	-	19	16	65	413
<i>Long Work</i>							
1 Child	107	100	6	45	26	23	275
2	85	100	-	45	18	37	319
3	22	100	-	23	50	27	332
4 or More	9	*	*	*	*	*	333
<i>Moderate Work</i>							
1 Child	109	100	2	63	18	17	261
2	166	100	-	39	23	38	311
3	73	100	-	22	44	34	366
4 or More	40	100	-	20	7	73	403
<i>No Work</i>							
1 Child	149	100	10	50	14	26	274
2	289	100	1	45	21	33	297
3	138	100	-	23	36	41	337
4 or More	122	100	-	17	13	70	418
<i>"Clubs"</i>							
1 Child	186	100	8	53	18	21	261
2	285	100	1	43	22	34	306
3	85	100	-	21	34	45	353
4 or More	54	100	-	11	7	82	422
<i>"No Clubs"</i>							
1 Child	179	100	4	52	20	24	279
2	255	100	-	42	21	37	304
3	148	100	-	23	43	34	341
4 or More	117	100	-	22	13	65	397

* Fewer than 20 wives.

¹ The chi squares are significant at .01 for the extra-familial participation groups 3, 4, 5 and 6.

to be dissatisfied than are the non-participants. From the data of Table 12 it can be stated that among women with three or more children, a larger proportion of "club" than of "non-club" women would like a larger family than they have. Among those with one or two children, however, the reverse is true, with a smaller proportion of "club" women wanting more than they have. Women with long work histories who have two children tend to want larger families on the average than non-working women who have this same number of children. None of the above differences is significant, however. Combining "club" and work activity into extra-familial participation levels practically eliminates these differences. However, on the basis of the question about whether the woman wants another child, among those with one, two or three children, the higher the participation level the more likely a woman is to want another child. (See Appendix Table VIII.) There is, therefore, only limited evidence to suggest that, given a group of women *with a particular family size*, the proportion desiring more children than they have will be larger for those who participate in activities outside the home than for the non-participants.

In addition to the larger proportion of active participants who would like a bigger family than they now have, there is a suggestion that the discrepancy between desired and actual family size tends to be greater for an active non-family participant than for a less active woman. It can be shown from the figures in Table 12 that among women with *one* child, group 2 (active women) and group 6 (inactive women) are apt to desire three or more children, while groups 4, 5 and 3 (the moderately active) would like two children. The greater discrepancy between actuality and aspiration for women in the extreme participation levels may occur for somewhat different reasons. Women who work may wish they were not seriously curbed in family activities by the requirements of their role. The non-participant role, on the other hand, is adaptable to the care of several children. In fact, such a role may demand several children. If the children are not forthcoming—either

because fertility was restricted for financial or health reasons or because of sterility—the woman may feel pressures to fulfill the requirements of the role. Among women with *two* children, however, the discrepancy between desired and actual size tends to be no greater for a woman in one participation level than for one in another. That is, the proportion aspiring to four or more children is about the same for all groups. Both the contradiction between the findings for one and for two child women and the small number of cases involved suggest extreme caution in drawing any conclusions about the size of discrepancy between desired and actual family size for the participation levels.

It has been found, then, that the differential among the social participation levels is not as great for desired as for actual size. The difference between the average actual size of family of the high and low participation levels is 1.1 children, while the corresponding difference in desired size is only 0.5 children per couple. In actual size, there is a wide divergence among the participation groups in the proportion with an only child—from 54 to 17 per cent; in desired size, almost the same proportion of all groups report wanting only one child (no more than four per cent). And the groups are much more similar with respect to the proportion who would like to have three or more children than in the proportion who actually have this family size. (These comparisons can be made from Table 9.)

8. CONCLUSIONS

The extent of a wife's participation in activities outside the home is directly related to her interest in and liking for children and the effectiveness of her fertility planning, and inversely related to her fertility and desired family size, all as hypothesized. These relationships are independent of socio-economic status.

The relationship of the wife's social participation to interest in children does not persist under control for fertility planning status. It may be that while the active modern woman's actual behavioral relationship to her children has altered in accordance with her role, she has not yet been so fully trained to it that her

ideal patterns have also altered. The questions used here to measure interest in children do not reflect very well the concrete relationships between the mother and her child. They may reflect instead the vague and idealistic notions which she may hold somewhat apart from her actual behavior with her children. While there has been found to be some adjustment between attitude toward children and the role, it is possible that if more specifically behavioral measures of the mother-child relationship had been used, a closer tie between role and attitude would have been found.

The close relationship found between extra-familial participation and fertility planning may come about because of the joint influence of participation and liking on planning. In a previous article it was shown that liking for children is positively related to planning.

Actual fertility behavior is more closely bound up with the woman's role outside the family than are her values regarding fertility. This finding suggests that it has been necessary for the active modern woman drastically to scale down her fertility to meet the requirements of her role, but that she has not yet accommodated her fertility desires to quite as great an extent. Or it may be that the discrepancy between desired and actual size is due to the tendency to answer the question about desired size in terms of an unrealistic and stereotyped "ideal." The general American normative pattern portraying a family of several children apparently still has some influence on active modern women, though not to quite as great an extent as on women whose activities are restricted mainly to the home, as in the traditional role pattern. The most "modern" women in the sample have not, then, completed the transition to a thoroughly "modern" pattern of life, for their values have not caught up with their behavior.²⁰ On the other hand, our most "traditional" women may be in the process of change also, for their fertility has been reduced somewhat below the desired

²⁰ It is also conceivable that actual fertility has been reduced to an extent that is incompatible with the norms of family size; and that henceforth, families will tend to be larger—more in accordance with the norm.

family size. It would be of interest to discover whether a sample of women studied at the present time would reveal the same differences in desired family size based on level of extra-familial participation as was found in the Indianapolis sample, or whether ideal size of family has increased more among one participation level than another.

Appendix Table I. Types of interest in children¹ by extent of extra-familial participation.

	LONG WORK		MODERATE WORK		NO WORK	
	"Clubs"	"No Clubs"	"Clubs"	"No Clubs"	"Clubs"	"No Clubs"
Tire of Hearing Constant Questions Children Ask	7.1	7.5	6.9	6.8	6.9	6.1
Fun vs. Trouble when Neighbors' or Friends' Children Visit	6.8	6.3	6.3	6.2	6.3	6.0
Encouraged to Have Children by Strong Liking for Children	7.0	6.2	6.6	6.5	8.0	6.4
Interest in Hearing Others Talk about Their Children	6.5	6.9	6.7	6.9	6.3	6.3
Like to Watch Children Play	8.8	8.8	8.4	8.4	8.6	8.2
Like to Play with, Read or Talk to Children	7.3	6.9	7.1	6.8	6.9	7.1
Get As Much Kick from Things Children Say As From Those Grownups Say	7.7	7.8	7.4	7.7	7.5	7.6
Enjoy Taking Children on Outings	7.9	7.6	8.0	7.9	7.7	7.7

¹ The interest scores shown here represent the average response score on the given question. Responses to each question were coded 1, 3, 5, 7 or 9, with a high score signifying strong interest in children.

Appendix Table II. Degree of interest in children as determined by summary index and by replies to question "Do you get tired of hearing the constant questions children ask?" by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for socio-economic status.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	NUMBER OF WIVES ¹	INTEREST IN CHILDREN: AS DETERMINED BY	
		Summary Index Score	Replies To Question "Do You Get Tired of Hearing the Constant Questions Children Ask?"
<i>Upper Status</i>			
"Clubs"-Long Work	49	7.3	7.4
"No Clubs"-Long Work	20	7.5	8.0
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	75	7.1	7.3
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	53	6.9	6.8
"Clubs"-No Work	141	7.0	7.0
"No Clubs"-No Work	66	7.0	7.0
<i>Middle Status</i>			
"Clubs"-Long Work	16	7.0*	7.3*
"No Clubs"-Long Work	41	6.9	7.3
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	42	6.8	6.9
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	47	6.9	6.8
"Clubs"-No Work	76	7.0	6.8
"No Clubs"-No Work	69	7.0	7.2
<i>Lower Status</i>			
"Clubs"-Long Work	33	7.3	6.7
"No Clubs"-Long Work	64	6.9	7.4
"Clubs"-Moderate Work	61 ¹	7.0	6.5
"No Clubs"-Moderate Work	110	6.9	6.8
"Clubs"-No Work	117	7.0	6.7
"No Clubs"-No Work	229	6.6	6.6

* Note that fewer than 20 wives are involved.

¹ The column showing number of wives applies to both types of scores, with the exception that two of the 61 wives in the "Clubs"-Moderate Work group of the Lower Status did not answer the question about "Tire of children's questions."

Appendix Table III. Degree of interest in children (summary index) by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for family size.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND FAMILY SIZE	NUMBER OF WIVES	INTEREST SCORE
<i>One Child</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	39	7.3
"No Clubs"—Long Work	68	6.9
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	61	7.1
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	48	7.0
"Clubs"—No Work	86	7.0
"No Clubs"—No Work	63	7.0
<i>Two Children</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	47	7.2
"No Clubs"—Long Work	38	7.2
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	79	7.0
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	87	6.9
"Clubs"—No Work	159	6.9
"No Clubs"—No Work	130	6.6
<i>Three or More Children</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	12	7.5*
"No Clubs"—Long Work	19	7.1*
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	38	6.8
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	75	6.8
"Clubs"—No Work	89	7.0
"No Clubs"—No Work	171	6.8

* Note that fewer than 20 wives are involved.

Appendix Table iv. Degree of interest in children (summary index) by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for education.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION	NUMBER OF WIVES	INTEREST SCORE
<i>College</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	23	6.9
"No Clubs"—Long Work	16	7.4*
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	40	7.0
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	21	7.5
"Clubs"—No Work	69	7.0
"No Clubs"—No Work	41	6.9
<i>High School Graduate</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	33	7.5
"No Clubs"—Long Work	53	7.1
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	58	7.1
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	85	6.8
"Clubs"—No Work	112	6.9
"No Clubs"—No Work	94	6.9
<i>Less Than High School Graduate</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	42	7.3
"No Clubs"—Long Work	56	6.8
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	80	6.8
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	104	6.8
"Clubs"—No Work	153	7.0
"No Clubs"—No Work	229	6.3

* Note that fewer than 20 wives are involved.

Appendix Table v. Degree of interest in children (summary index) by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for chance for self-expression.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND CHANCE FOR SELF EXPRESSION	NUMBER OF WIVES	INTEREST SCORE
<i>Good or Excellent Chance for Self Expression</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	65	7.3
"No Clubs"—Long Work	78	7.1
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	109	7.1
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	99	7.2
"Clubs"—No Work	204	7.2
"No Clubs"—No Work	142	7.1
<i>Fair or Poor Chance for Self Expression</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	33	7.1
"No Clubs"—Long Work	47	6.8
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	69	6.7
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	111	6.7
"Clubs"—No Work	130	6.7
"No Clubs"—No Work	222	6.6

Appendix Table vi. Degree of interest in children (summary index) by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for amount of domestic help.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND AMOUNT OF DOMESTIC HELP	NUMBER OF WIVES ¹	INTEREST SCORE
<i>Domestic Help Most of the Time</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	35	7.3
"No Clubs"—Long Work	38	7.0
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	49	7.1
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	37	6.9
"Clubs"—No Work	82	6.8
"No Clubs"—No Work	50	7.0
<i>Seldom or Never Any Domestic Help or By Day Only</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	62	7.2
"No Clubs"—Long Work	84	7.0
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	127	6.9
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	172	6.9
"Clubs"—No Work	249	7.0
"No Clubs"—No Work	314	6.7

¹ Ten wives did not report the amount of help they had had.

Appendix Table VII. Desired family size by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for socio-economic status.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	NUMBER OF WIVES	FERTILITY RATE BASED ON NUMBER OF CHILDREN DESIRED ¹
<i>Upper Status</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	49	347
"No Clubs"—Long Work	20	310
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	75	301
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	53	315
"Clubs"—No Work	141	306
"No Clubs"—No Work	66	308
<i>Middle Status</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	16	231*
"No Clubs"—Long Work	41	317
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	42	305
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	47	392
"Clubs"—No Work	76	308
"No Clubs"—No Work	69	310
<i>Lower Status</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	33	309
"No Clubs"—Long Work	64	261
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	61	323
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	110	340
"Clubs"—No Work	117	308
"No Clubs"—No Work	229	349

* Note that fewer than 20 wives are involved.

¹ Based on the question about the number of children the respondent would have on the basis of liking if married life could be relived.

Appendix Table VIII. Desire to have another child by extent of extra-familial participation, controlled for actual family size.

EXTENT OF EXTRA-FAMILIAL PARTICIPATION AND ACTUAL FAMILY SIZE	NUMBER OF WIVES	DESIRE TO HAVE ANOTHER CHILD ¹
<i>Women with One Child</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	39	6.2
"No Clubs"—Long Work	68	6.4
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	61	5.7
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	48	6.0
"Clubs"—No Work	86	5.5
"No Clubs"—No Work	63	5.6
<i>Women with Two Children</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	47	6.2
"No Clubs"—Long Work	38	5.8
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	79	4.7
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	87	4.8
"Clubs"—No Work	159	4.5
"No Clubs"—No Work	130	4.8
<i>Women with Three Children</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	8	5.3*
"No Clubs"—Long Work	14	4.4*
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	24	4.2
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	49	4.6
"Clubs"—No Work	53	4.3
"No Clubs"—No Work	86	4.1
<i>Women with Four or More Children</i>		
"Clubs"—Long Work	4	4.5*
"No Clubs"—Long Work	5	3.0*
"Clubs"—Moderate Work	14	3.9*
"No Clubs"—Moderate Work	26	3.6
"Clubs"—No Work	36	4.0
"No Clubs"—No Work	85	3.6

* Note that fewer than 20 wives are involved.

¹ Desire to have another child is expressed as an average score for each group and is based on the following weighted response categories of the question "How much do you want another child sometime?"

Want very much	9
Rather want	7
Don't want but wouldn't object	5
Rather object	3
Very much against	1