NUMBER OF CHILDREN EXPECTED IN RELATION TO NON-FAMILIAL ACTIVITIES OF THE WIFE[1]

JEANNE CLARE RIDLEY[2]

UNTIL recently the studies in differential fertility have been largely descriptions of variations in fertility among significant groups in the population. More recently the emphasis has been upon the quest for predictively useful social and psychological factors affecting family size. To date only socio-economic factors such as education, occupation, income and religion have proved useful predictors.[3] At present however, it is being noted that changes are taking place in the traditionally observed inverse relationship of these socio-economic variables and fertility. These recent findings emphasize the importance of understanding not only the dynamics of this relationship but of discovering other variables that in the future may be more crucial in the prediction of fertility behavior. Thus emphasis has shifted toward the development of more inclusive hypotheses that may lead to a better understanding of fertility differentials.

This paper reports on an attempt to test one of these more inclusive hypotheses as suggested by Ronald Freedman. The general hypothesis is that "fertility differences are related to differences in the division of labor between the family and other social institutions."[4] This hypothesis is based upon

Ogburn's "family function" theory of the fertility declines in the West.[5] Ogburn related the increasing complexity of society with more and more functions centered outside the home to the decrease in family size. Freedman has pointed out that according to this general explanation of fertility declines, the family as a social unit may be understood in terms of its relation to other social units in the society. Thus the extent of the division of labor between the family and other social groups in a society may broadly explain the differentials in fertility behavior.

Following this general approach, one may infer that the degree of involvement of members of a family in other social groups in the society must have a differential impact upon life within the family. The role of the wife in non-familial social systems under present conditions of family organization appears to be crucial in any investigation of family size. Two reasons underlie this assumption, namely: (1) participation in non-familial groups is more highly variable for women than for men, and (2) the mother role is particularly resistant to any expansion of activities outside the family. Not only is the performance of the mother role time consuming but the nature of the role itself is believed to be particularly important.

In the first place, in industrial societies practically all adult men participate in non-familial roles in the pursuit of their occupations. However, the great majority of married women are not in the labor force. While a woman's place is no longer conceived as being solely in the home, work outside the home has not as yet become the general norm, at least for married women. Secondly, the variations of participation in other non-familial systems such as formal organizations appear to be greater for women than for men.[6]

---

[5] Ogburn, William F.: The Family and its Functions. Chapter xiii, *Recent Social Trends in the United States,* Report of President's Research Committee on Social Trends, 1933.

[6] Komarovsky, Mirra: The Voluntary Association of Urban Dwellers. *American Sociological Review,* December, 1946, XI, pp. 686–698 and Wright, Charles R.: and Hyman, Herbert H.: Voluntary Association Memberships of American Adults: Evi-

To appreciate the reasons why the mother role is regarded as incompatible with any expansion of activities outside the home, the role may be viewed first in its historical setting, and then in its modern setting. The role of the woman has been perhaps more deeply affected by the Industrial Revolution than that of the man. In the subsistence economy the woman was part of the economic system. She possibly contributed as much as did her husband to the earning of a livelihood of the family. Her economic role and mother role complemented each other since they both were confined to the home. With the shift of work from the home, woman's economic role tended to disappear and the mother role tended to become predominant.

More recently other factors have contributed to the woman resuming her economic role in society, at least partially. One significant factor has been the increasing life expectancy which has meant that a smaller proportion of the woman's life after marriage is devoted to the child-rearing function. Also, the increased educational and employment opportunities for women and their general "emancipation" have enabled more and more women to spend at least some time in the occupational world before marriage. Thus when a woman enters marriage she is likely to have had a taste of what gainful employment is like and, more important, a feeling of financial independence and responsibility.

Further, the introduction of labor saving devices has been significant in that housekeeping is no longer the time consuming and arduous task that it once was. The amount of time required for "keeping house" is much less for the average woman today than it was for her grandmother, or even her mother. Thus the amount of leisure time available for non-familial activities has increased.

However, the shift of functions away from the family may act in the opposite direction in its effect upon the wife's time.

According to Parsons and Bales, the family has become "a more specialized agency than before."[7] The family now specializes in what are still vital functions for society, namely "the socialization of children" and "the stabilization of the adult personalities" of the society. The impact of this specialization upon the role of the wife, Parsons and Bales argue, has been great. It has meant that with the shift to the nuclear family from the larger extended family system of preindustrial days, the child-rearing function has shifted more sharply to the wife. There no longer remains the larger extended family upon which she can rely for help. The emphasis of the husband's role in the occupational world has meant that the wife's responsibility for child care has been increased. It is obvious, then, that the requirements of time of the additional roles subtract from the time available for household and child-rearing functions. Two studies support this view.[8] The first study, by Leevy, has indicated that among rural and urban families in the United States the amount of leisure time varies inversely with the size of family. The second study, by Stoetzel, has indicated that among French urban families the total number of hours per week devoted to household work increased with the number of children.

Even with the large number of labor saving devices in the home the nature of the mother role is not compatible with the expansion of activities outside the home. Child-care cannot easily be compressed into a few hours a day as many household tasks may be. There is a growing emphasis that it is not solely the amount of time that the mother contributes, but rather the type of *mother-child relationship* that is important to the healthy physical and mental development of children. It would seem that the mother's attempt to provide a warm, stable environment for her child is hindered if other

[7] Parsons, Talcott; and Bales, Robert F.: FAMILY SOCIALIZATION AND INTERACTION PROCESS. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1955.

[8] Leevy, J. Roy: Leisure Time of the American Housewife. *Sociology and Social Research*, November, 1950, xxx, pp. 97–105; and Stoetzel, Jean: Une Étude Du Budget-Temps de la Femme dans les Agglomérations Urbaines. *Population*, 1948, No. 1, pp. 47–62.

constant demands are made upon her time and energy. Thus, it would seem that participation in activities outside the home by the woman would tend to necessitate a fairly small family.

In fact census data for the United States and Western European countries have long indicated that among married women an inverse relationship exists between labor force participation and family size.[9] All these analyses tend to have one common limitation. Although all of them point to an inverse relationship between size of family and labor force participation, it is impossible to come to any conclusion as to the direction of causality. In the first place, it is difficult to decide whether the high incidence of childlessness is due to the tendency for wives to work if they cannot bear children or to the deliberate avoidance of having children by wives who prefer to work. Nor, likewise, is it possible to decide whether families are smaller because wives desire to be employed or whether they are employed because their families are smaller. Doubtless the cause-effect relationships run in both directions.

However, one study by Lois V. Pratt based upon data collected in the STUDY OF SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING FERTILITY indicated that even for wives whose ability to bear children could not be seriously questioned (i.e. fecund) the relationship between working and family size was observed.[10] Further, her study dealt not only with the participation of wives in the labor force but with their participation in formal organizations and thus offered a more extensive test

[9] For a summary of data bearing on this point see United Nations, Department of Social Affairs, Population Division, THE DETERMINANTS AND CONSEQUENCES OF POPULATION TRENDS, *Population Studies,* No. 17 (ST/SOA/Ser. A 17) New York, 1953, pp. 88–89. Also pertinent is the discussion of this relationship in Myrdal, Alva and Klein, Viola: WOMEN's TWO ROLES. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1956, pp. 118–120.

[10] Pratt, Lois V.: The Relationship of Non-Familial Activity of Wives to Some Aspects of Family Life. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 1955, (microfilm). Some of the results of this study are found in
Pratt, Lois and Whelpton, P. K.: 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 Size. A paper in Whelpton, P. K. and Kiser, C. V. (Editors): SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS AFFECTING FERTILITY. Vol. Five, 1958, pp. 1245–1280.

of the non-familial hypothesis. In addition, she was able to utilize data on desired family size as well as actual family size. Generally she found an inverse relationship between the extent of nonfamilial activities and actual and desired family size. Investigating separately the relationship of work and club membership she found that they bore a different relationship to fertility. The tendency was for working wives to have only one child while wives belonging to clubs tended to have two children.

Even this study does not definitely establish the direction of the relationship. Its major limitation is its ex-post-facto nature inherent in the type of the sample-wives interviewed 12–15 years after marriage and hence nearing the end of their child-bearing period. Thus, even with the measure of desired family size it is not possible to decide whether wives with non-familial activities really desired smaller families than the others or whether the "recalled" desires simply reflected the numbers of children the couples actually had.

It is hoped that the present report on one aspect of this study will overcome to some extent some of the limitations associated with previous analyses. However, the basic problem of establishing the direction of the relationship is not completely overcome.

DATA AND METHOD

The data for this study are drawn from the "Growth of American Families" Study. Interviews of approximately one hour in length were carried out with a cross-section sample of white married women selected by the area probability method. The total sample consisted of 2713 wives, 18 to 39 years of age, with husband present in the home or temporarily away in military service.[11] This study is confined to the 1794 wives classified as fecund.[12] Thus it rules out the possibility in the

---

[11] For a detailed description of the sampling methods see Freedman, R.; Whelpton, P. K. and Campbell, A. A.: FAMILY PLANNING, STERILITY, AND POPULATION GROWTH. New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1959.

[12] Wives were classified into five fecundity categories as follows: Definitely

analysis that a relationship between non-familial activities and small size of family is due to group differences in subfecundity. Furthermore, some of the deficiencies of the Pratt study should be overcome in that the present sample is confined to wives who have not completed their childbearing period.

Theoretically, non-familial activities should include all activities that are clearly not family centered. Furthermore, an all inclusive measure should be based upon such data as a complete history of non-familial activities of wives since marriage and a complete accounting of time spent in such activities.

The measurement of non-familial activities was limited in this study to two main areas; namely, labor force participation and membership in formal organizations. The particular measure of labor force participation reported on in this paper is "number of years worked since marriage."[13] This measure of labor force participation was based upon the responses to the following question:

> About how many years have you worked altogether, since you were (first) married?

This measure, it should be noted, is somewhat deficient for this sample of wives in that all have not had the opportunity to work the same number of years because of varying marital durations. However, by introducing controls for age and marital duration, this deficiency is overcome to some extent. More important, perhaps, is the fact that this measure does not indicate the periods in a woman's married life that she has worked. The particular period of a woman's married life in relation to the particular stage of family building may be significant to

Sterile, Probably Sterile, Semifecund, Fecundity Indeterminate and Fecund. The Fecund group is essentially a residual group in that they are wives about whom (on the basis of information reported by them) no serious question exists as to their ability to bear children. For a detailed description of the fecundity classification see *Ibid.*

[13] Not discussed in this paper is the analysis for two other measures of labor force participation: current membership in the labor force and expectation of working in the future. Essentially similar results for these measures were obtained as reported here for number of years worked since marriage. See Clare, *op. cit.*

the full understanding of the relationship of work to family size.

The measure of membership in formal organizations was derived from responses to the following question:

> Apart from a church membership, do you belong to any clubs or organizations, for example a charitable or church group, a P.T.A., a women's auxiliary or club, a social club, a sports team, a civic organization, a labor union or any other organizations?

In addition, the following two questions were asked of club members to obtain some measure of the extent of club activity:

> Have you attended a meeting of any clubs or organizations in the last three months?
> Have you been an officer or active in any other way in the last three months?

The replies to these questions were classified to yield four levels of club activity. They were defined as follows: non-member —does not belong to any clubs; not active—belongs to at least one club but did not attend a meeting and was not active in the last three months; moderately active—belongs to at least one club and either attended or was active in the last three months; very active—belongs to at least one club, attended a meeting in the last three months and has been an officer or active in the last three months. This particular index was constructed as a measure of one aspect of non-familial activity on the grounds that it is the amount of time and the extent of the responsibility accompanying club membership that approaches an adequate measure of non-familial activity.

The dependent variable utilized in this study is "expected number of children." This measure of fertility is based upon a series of questions asked of the wives as to the number of children they expect to have when their family is completed. The particular measure utilized is an estimate of "the most likely expected number" for the analysis of the data in the

"Growth of American Families" Study generally. It is believed that this measure, essentially a medium estimate, is fairly reliable in that it takes into account the woman's fecundity status, past fertility behavior, and attempts to make some correction for indefinite answers that give a range of possibilities.[14]

Generally, completed family size has been recognized as the best measure of fertility. However, in testing an hypothesis such as the one under consideration where there are certain implications of a causal relationship, reliance upon completed family size allows only ex-post-facto analysis. The data on expectations utilized in this study allow the analysis of the independent variables, labor force participation and level of club activity prior to the occurrence of the dependent variable, completed family size.

In addition to the above, several variables were introduced as controls. As suggested previously, the type of sample, wives at various stages of their married lives, demanded that controls be introduced for age and marital duration. Important also for an adequate testing of the hypothesis was a consideration of current size of family, i.e. parity. Thus it is recognized that the dependent variable, expected family size, is dependent to some extent on the current size of family. Simply stated, women cannot expect fewer children than they already have. Finally, because of the long-observed relationship between socio-economic status and fertility, an adequate testing of the hypothesis also demanded that socio-economic status be taken into consideration. Thus controls have been introduced for such important variables as wife's education, husband's income, and wife's religion.

FINDINGS

More specifically, the hypothesis under consideration may be stated as follows: "the degree to which the activities of a woman are centered outside the family is inversely related to her expected size of family." For only one measure of non-

---

[14] For a discussion of the methodology of this estimate and of reasons for believing it is fairly reliable see Freedman, Whelpton and Campbell, *op. cit.*

YEARS WORKED SINCE MARRIAGE	ALL WIVES	AGE OF WIFE			
		18–24	25–29	30–34	35–39
		MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]			
Never Worked	3.7	3.3	4.0	3.8	4.1
Less Than 1 Year	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.6	3.7
1–4.9 Years	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.1
5+ Years	2.6	*	2.7	2.5	2.5
TOTAL	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
		NUMBER OF WIVES			
Never Worked	556	163	151	126	116
Less Than 1 Year	371	161	101	78	31
1–4.9 Years	652	169	220	162	101
5+ Years	188	5	40	75	68
TOTAL[2]	1,782	502	518	445	319

* Base less than 15 cases.
[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .001.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 15 cases unknown years worked.

Table 1. Mean expected number of children by age of wife and years worked since marriage.

familial activities, labor force participation, does the hypothesis receive support.

The longer the work experience of wives since marriage, the smaller the size of family these women are likely to expect. For the total sample, wives who have worked five or more years expect on the average approximately one child less than wives who have never worked. (Table 1)[15] Furthermore, this pattern persists for each age group, although for the youngest age

[15] As will become clear in the discussion that follows because of the small range of variation in family size and the fact that in the course of the analysis it was necessary to deal with a number of small subgroups in the sample, many of the observed differences are not statistically significant. The sampling error for these subgroups is correspondingly large. For these reasons more weight has been attached to the direction of the observed differences. In determining whether the observed pattern of differences is significant the binomial test has been relied upon. For each table the probability of obtaining the observed number of differences or numbers of differences even more extreme was computed. The probability for each table is reported in a footnote. The 5 per cent level of significance was chosen. In performing the binomial test the pattern of differences for the total fecund sample was excluded from N. Moreover, all cases of ties also were excluded from N. For a description of the binomial test see Siegel, Sidney: NONPARAMETRIC STATISTICS FOR THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956, pp. 36–42.

group the differences in family size are negligible. It is possible that for the youngest wives, a majority of whom have been married a short time, expectations are less reliable. For each of the other age groups the difference in expected family size between wives who have worked five or more years and wives who have never worked is over one child on the average and increases to a difference of 1.6 children for the oldest age group.[16]

It should be noted that for the total sample we do not find a large variation in expected family size. At the time of interview 85 per cent of the wives had three or fewer children and approximately 78 per cent expected completed families of two to four children. These data tend to support the view that an overall norm of a relatively small to medium size family of two, three or four children exists among all segments of the population under consideration. In light of this the differences in family size observed in Table 1 between wives by length of work experience are extremely striking.[17]

It is not possible to account for the relationship between length of time worked and expected size of family by such important variables as duration of marriage, parity, educational attainment, husband's income or wife's religion. It was found that length of work experience is consistently related to lower fertility expectations when the wives were classified by such variables.

As seen in Table 2 when parity is controlled wives at the same stage of building their families tend to expect fewer children if they have had labor force experience. Thus, the smaller expected family size of wives with work experience cannot be

[16] In Table 1 the differences observed in family size for the total sample between each of the work experience groups are well beyond the sampling errors and are statistically significant at the 5 per cent level.

[17] It should be noted that there is every indication that the means of achieving a small family size are known to most American wives. Among the fecund wives 83 per cent have used some method of family limitation and an additional 8 per cent indicated that they intend to use some method in the future. Other analysis carried out giving support to the general hypothesis under consideration indicated that wives with work experience are more likely to be users of contraceptive methods and more effective in their fertility planning. See Clare, *op. cit.* or Freedman, Whelpton and Campbell, *op. cit.* for a summary of the results of this analysis.

accounted for by the sole achievement of smaller families at the time of interview. In Table 3 when marital duration is controlled, the differences in expected size of family by length of work experience are not only in the predicted direction but are somewhat larger than the differences observed in Table 1. Only for women married less than five years is the difference in the expected number of children between women with no work experience and long work experience (i.e., five or more years) less than one child on the average. For all of the other marital duration groups the differences between women with no work experience and those with five or more years working experience are more than one child.

When wife's educational attainment and husband's income respectively are controlled (Tables 4 and 5), the familiar inverse relationship between expected fertility and education or income is found. However, expected size of family is consistently related to length of work experience regardless of educational attainment or husband's income. In fact there appears

Table 2. Mean expected number of children by number of children ever born and years worked since marriage.

YEARS WORKED SINCE MARRIAGE	ALL WIVES	NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN				
		0	1	2	3	4
		MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]				
Never Worked	3.7	2.8	2.6	3.0	3.7	6.2
Less Than 1 Year	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.5	5.5
1–4.9 Years	3.2	2.6	2.6	2.9	3.6	5.4
5+ Years	2.6	1.3	1.8	2.3	3.4	5.2
TOTAL	3.4	2.7	2.6	2.9	3.6	5.8
		NUMBER OF WIVES				
Never Worked	556	37	98	190	121	110
Less Than 1 Year	371	80	80	111	57	43
1–4.9 Years	652	78	173	207	111	83
5+ Years	188	20	52	65	29	22
TOTAL[2]	1,782	216	404	577	322	263

[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .029.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 15 cases unknown years worked.

Table 3. Mean expected number of children by age of wife, years worked since marriage and duration of marriage.

Duration of Marriage and Years Worked Since Marriage	All Wives	Age of Wife			
		18–24	25–29	30–34	35–39
MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]					
Married Under 5 Years					
Never Worked	3.3	3.2	3.9	*	*
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.2	3.3	3.4	*	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.0	3.1	3.0	*	*
Married 5–9 Years					
Never Worked	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.5	*
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.6	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.2	3.4	3.3	2.9	*
Worked 5+ Years	2.3	*	2.5	2.1	*
Married 10–14 Years					
Never Worked	4.0		4.7	3.9	3.6
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.9		*	3.8	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.4		3.7	3.6	2.6
Worked 5+ Years	2.7		*	2.7	2.3
Married 15+ Years					
Never Worked	4.6			4.3	4.6
Worked Less Than 1 Year	*			*	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.6			*	3.6
Worked 5+ Years	2.8			*	2.8
TOTAL	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
NUMBER OF WIVES					
Married Under 5 Years					
Never Worked	173	128	31	7	7
Worked Less Than 1 Year	193	141	35	14	3
Worked 1–4.9 Years	214	128	70	11	5
Married 5–9 Years					
Never Worked	182	35	95	45	7
Worked Less Than 1 Year	113	20	60	28	5
Worked 1–4.9 Years	237	41	127	57	12
Worked 5+ Years	60	5	30	21	4
Married 10–14 Years					
Never Worked	123	0	25	59	39
Worked Less Than 1 Year	53	0	6	33	14
Worked 1–4.9 Years	140	0	23	80	37
Worked 5+ Years	70	0	10	40	20
Married 15+ Years					
Never Worked	78	0	0	15	63
Worked Less Than 1 Year	12	0	0	3	9
Worked 1–4.9 Years	61	0	0	14	47
Worked 5+ Years	58	0	0	14	44
TOTAL[2]	1,782	500	518	445	319

* Base less than 15 cases.
[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .001.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 15 cases unknown years worked.

Table 4. Mean expected number of children by age of wife, years worked since marriage and wife's education.

WIFE'S EDUCATION AND YEARS WORKED SINCE MARRIAGE	ALL WIVES	AGE OF WIFE			
		18–24	25–29	30–34	35–39
	MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]				
Grammar School					
Never Worked	4.9	*	4.8	5.2	5.8
Worked Less Than 1 Year	4.3	*	*	*	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.9	*	*	*	3.4
Worked 5+ Years	3.8		*	*	*
High School, 1–3 Years					
Never Worked	3.6	3.3	4.2	3.3	3.7
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.4	3.1	3.7	3.4	3.3
Worked 5+ Years	2.7	*	*	2.6	2.2
High School, 4 Years					
Never Worked	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.3
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.8
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.3	2.9
Worked 5+ Years	2.4	*	2.3	2.5	2.3
College					
Never Worked	3.4	3.1	3.7	3.5	3.4
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.5	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.1	3.8	2.9	3.0	3.0
Worked 5+ Years	2.2		*	*	2.4
TOTAL	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
	NUMBER OF WIVES				
Grammar School					
Never Worked	87	16	20	20	31
Worked Less Than 1 Year	34	10	8	10	6
Worked 1–4.9 Years	53	9	14	13	17
Worked 5+ Years	17	0	2	5	10
High School, 1–3 Years					
Never Worked	157	62	41	35	19
Worked Less Than 1 Year	74	39	17	14	4
Worked 1–4.9 Years	145	44	46	32	23
Worked 5+ Years	49	2	11	21	15
High School, 4 Years					
Never Worked	227	62	67	57	41
Worked Less Than 1 Year	194	86	53	42	13
Worked 1–4.9 Years	335	94	120	81	40
Worked 5+ Years	87	3	20	37	27
College					
Never Worked	85	23	23	14	25
Worked Less Than 1 Year	69	26	23	12	8
Worked 1–4.9 Years	119	22	40	36	21
Worked 5+ Years	35	0	7	12	16
TOTAL[2]	1,782	500	518	445	319

* Base less than 15 cases.
[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .005.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 15 cases unknown years worked.

Table 5. Mean expected number of children by age of wife, years worked since marriage and husband's income.

Husband's Income and Years Wife Worked Since Marriage	All Wives	Age of Wife			
		18–24	25–29	30–34	35–39
		MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]				
Under $3000					
Never Worked	3.9	3.2	4.7	4.0	4.7
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.6	3.3	*	3.8	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.6	*
Worked 5+ Years	3.2		*	*	*
$3000–$3999					
Never Worked	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.6	3.9
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.4	3.3	3.4	*	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.2	3.1	3.7	3.1	3.0
Worked 5+ Years	2.3			2.2	*
$4000–$4999					
Never Worked	3.9	3.2	4.1	3.6	4.9
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.7	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.4	3.2
Worked 5+ Years	2.6	*	*	3.5	2.7
$5000+					
Never Worked	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.7	3.3
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.6
Worked 1–4.9 Years	2.6	2.8	3.1	3.3	3.2
Worked 5+ Years	2.4	*	*	2.6	1.9
TOTAL	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
		NUMBER OF WIVES				
Under $3000					
Never Worked	128	59	22	22	25
Worked Less Than 1 Year	99	67	13	15	4
Worked 1–4.9 Years	123	58	28	29	8
Worked 5+ Years	29	0	10	8	11
$3000–$3999					
Never Worked	120	37	47	20	16
Worked Less Than 1 Year	92	44	28	13	7
Worked 1–4.9 Years	160	54	54	26	6
Worked 5+ Years	40	0	10	20	26
$4000–$4999					
Never Worked	116	30	31	33	9
Worked Less Than 1 Year	75	24	25	22	22
Worked 1–4.9 Years	139	29	62	30	4
Worked 5+ Years	51	2	5	21	18
$5000+					
Never Worked	169	29	44	46	50
Worked Less Than 1 Year	96	22	33	25	16
Worked 1–4.9 Years	206	21	70	64	46
Worked 5+ Years	56	1	13	24	18
TOTAL[2]	1,782	500	518	445	319

* Base less than 15 cases.
[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .001.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 14 cases unknown years worked, 68 cases unknown income and 1 case unknown years worked and income.

to be a tendency for differences in expected number of children by education or income to be smaller among women with long work experience than among nonworking wives.

This convergence of family size expectations among wives with work experience is especially notable when religion is controlled (Table 6). The similarity in expected size of family for working wives is particularly evident for the two oldest age groups. Catholic and Protestant wives with 5 or more years of work tend to expect families of approximately the same size.

Table 6. Mean expected number of children by age of wife, years worked since marriage and wife's religion.

WIFE'S RELIGION AND YEARS WORKED SINCE MARRIAGE	ALL WIVES	AGE OF WIFE			
		18–24	25–29	30–34	35–39
	MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]				
Protestant					
Never Worked	3.5	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.8
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.2	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.4
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.9
Worked 5+ Years	2.5	*	2.6	2.5	2.6
Catholic					
Never Worked	4.4	3.8	4.6	4.5	5.1
Worked Less Than 1 Year	3.9	4.1	3.5	4.1	*
Worked 1–4.9 Years	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.6
Worked 5+ Years	2.7	*	*	2.5	2.5
TOTAL	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
	NUMBER OF WIVES				
Protestant					
Never Worked	377	112	101	83	81
Worked Less Than 1 Year	223	106	57	43	17
Worked 1–4.9 Years	449	127	145	115	62
Worked 5+ Years	132	4	31	56	41
Catholic					
Never Worked	160	45	47	38	30
Worked Less Than 1 Year	134	52	38	31	13
Worked 1–4.9 Years	168	35	62	36	35
Worked 5+ Years	47	1	7	17	22
TOTAL[2]	1,782	500	518	445	319

* Base less than 15 cases.
[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .002.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 14 cases unknown years worked, 76 cases "other" religion, 1 case unknown religion and years worked and 1 case unknown religion.

Long work experience tends to eliminate the effect of religious differences for given age groups. For instance, among 30–34 year-old women, we find that both Catholics and Protestants who have worked five or more years expect on the average 2.5 children. Other analysis not reported here indicates that in terms of other measures of fertility behavior such as use of a contraceptive method and effectiveness in use of such methods, Catholic wives with work experience are very similar to Protestant wives who also have had similar work experience.[18] This suggests that the impact of work experience, particularly if it is long, upon Catholic wives results in behavior similar to Protestants with respect to fertility. It may be that work experience results in giving Catholic wives the information and the motivation to restrict their family size. As already pointed out there is a certain incompatibility of the mother role with a role outside the family. These data on expected family size indicate that the mother role is reduced if participation outside the home is extensive.

The preceding analysis points up quite clearly that length of work experience is related to expected size of family. It is not possible on the basis of these data to know whether this relationship is due to the fact that wives want small families in order to be able to work or they want and expect small families for other reasons which nevertheless frees them for work. It would appear though that the consistently smaller expectations of completed family size among wives with work experience reveals a recognition of the incompatibility of the two roles.

While a consideration of work experience as a measure of non-familial activities affords support to the general hypothesis regarding family size, the analysis of data pertaining to wives' club membership does not offer such support, (Table 7). Club members tend to expect about the same size family as non-members—3.3 children on the average as compared with 3.4 children.[19] Only for wives in the oldest age group, 30–34 and

---

[18] See Clare, *op. cit.*, or Freedman, Whelpton and Campbell, *op. cit.*, for a summary of the results of this analysis.

[19] This difference is well within sampling error and not statistically significant.

CLUB ACTIVITY	ALL WIVES	AGE OF WIFE			
		18–24	25–29	30–34	35–39
		MEAN EXPECTED NUMBER OF CHILDREN[1]			
Non Member	3.4	3.2	3.5	3.6	3.7
Not Active	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3
Moderately Active	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.3
Very Active	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.1
TOTAL	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
		NUMBER OF WIVES			
Non Member	938	362	255	201	120
Not Active	168	30	49	60	29
Moderately Active	344	53	124	100	67
Very Active	330	54	89	84	103
TOTAL[2]	1,782	500	518	445	319

[1] Probability of pattern of differences between means is .500.
[2] Totals exclude 12 cases unknown number of expected children and include 2 cases unknown club activity.

Table 7. Mean expected number of children by age of wife and club activity.

35–39 years, is there any evidence that club activity is associated with a smaller expected family size. Even among such wives these differences are negligible and they are reduced with the introduction of controls.[20]

Thus, there exists no consistent relationship between club membership and activity and expected family size. It is believed that any influence club activity may have upon reducing family size is countered by other factors. Club activity for many women is family linked. Women are pulled into many club activities by the fact that they have or have had children. The particular measure relied upon here is believed to be defective in that it does not distinguish between club activities that are family linked and those that are not so linked. In effect, any relationship that may exist between club member-

[20] When controls were introduced for length of work experience, parity, marital duration, and socio-economic status there was found little evidence that club membership and activity was associated with a small expected family size. The patterns of differences associated with each of these controls were not statistically significant at the 5 per cent level. These control tables are not shown because of space limitations and the purely negative findings. However, for the interested reader they are available in Clare, *op. cit.*

ship that is clearly non-familial in character and expected family size is obscured by the familial character of many of the clubs these wives belong to. While, as suggested previously, an increase in contacts outside the home may lead to information concerning the means of restricting family size[21] and the motivation to do so, there exists for club women the counter pressure not to restrict their family size below what is held as the norm for the "average" family. The similarity of expectations of club members and non-club members particularly suggests the presence of an overall norm.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to test the general non-familial hypothesis namely, that "fertility differences are related to differences in the division of labor between the family and other social institutions." In this study the activities of the wife have been focused upon as one important aspect of this division of labor. Two measures, years worked since marriage and club activity, of non-familial activities were utilized. This study, in utilizing data on expected completed family size, has attempted to circumvent some of the limitations of previous studies in this area.

The hypothesis is sustained for the measure of labor force participation but is not for club activity. However, the fact that club activity does not support the hypothesis is not believed to detract from the tentative acceptance of the non-familial hypothesis. In the first place the particular measure of club activity may be defective as a pure measure of non-familial activity and, secondly, the measure of labor force participation is a more extensive measure of non-familial activities.

While on the basis of these data it is not possible to come to any definite conclusion as to the direction of the relationship between non-familial activities and fertility, it is felt that ex-

[21] Other analysis carried out for two other measures of fertility behavior, use of some contraceptive method and effectiveness in fertility planning indicated that club members were more likely to have used some contraceptive method and to be more effective in their fertility planning than non-members. For these data see Clare, *op. cit.*

pected size of family allows some tentative conclusions. Perhaps most important in this connection is the fact that wives at the same stage of their married life with the same size of family tend to expect smaller completed families if they have worked since marriage. Thus tentatively it would appear that labor force participation has a depressing effect upon family size.

These data suggest that long work experience is associated with low fertility even among groups usually characterized by relatively high fertility. The findings for Catholic wives appear to be particularly significant in this connection. Again, however, it is emphasized the labor force may tend to attract women who do not want large families.

In a population having little variation in family size, differences of one-half to one child on the average are relatively large. When fertility control is being widely practiced in a population and most married couples are attempting to achieve a family of two to four children, the place an individual family occupies in this small range depends upon a large number of factors. These factors are both personal and social and operate through a period of about 20 years of married life and presumably also in the earlier formative years. In dealing with such a complex historical event as the building of a family, it is likely that any individual factor can have only small importance. Thus any factor, such as length of work experience, which maintains consistently a relationship under a variety of significant controls must be considered as important. At the minimum this suggests that if the pattern of increased participation in the labor force continues it is likely that whether a wife works or not will become a more important factor in determining her completed family size.