



8-1976

A Descriptive Study of Child-Bearing Attitudes of Harried College Students, 1950 to the Present

Geraldine B. Flowers
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Sociology Commons

Recommended Citation

Flowers, Geraldine B., "A Descriptive Study of Child-Bearing Attitudes of Harried College Students, 1950 to the Present" (1976). *Masters Theses*. 2321.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2321

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF
CHILD-BEARING ATTITUDES OF
MARRIED COLLEGE STUDENTS,
1950 TO THE PRESENT

by

Geraldine B. Flowers

A Thesis
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Masters of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
August 1976

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to members of the thesis committee whose ready cooperation and continuing encouragement have made the completion of this educational pursuit a reality.

Special appreciation is extended to Dr. Dorothy Bladt, Chairman, without whose constant support and understanding, this endeavor would have faltered on many occasions.

To the other members of the committee; Dr. Sara Swickard and Dr. Herbert Smith, a heartfelt expression of gratitude is offered for the interest and guidance which have been given to the candidate.

Special consideration must also be given to the author's parents whose continuing faith and help have made the accomplishment of this goal possible.

Finally, to my husband Jerry and son Fañon, a loving "thank you" for having the forbearance and good faith to see your wife and mother through this demanding year of early childhood education.

Geraldine B. Flowers

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

MASTERS THESIS

M-8892

FLOWERS, Geraldine Blythe
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CHILD-BEARING
ATTITUDES OF MARRIED COLLEGE STUDENTS,
1950 TO THE PRESENT.

Western Michigan University, M.A., 1976
Sociology, individual and family studies

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PURPOSE AND ITS BACKGROUND.	1
The Purpose.	1
Background of Child-bearing Attitudes.	2
Background of the Married College Student.	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	13
Difference in Family Size.	13
Education Level.	15
Independence of the Female.	17
Marital Satisfaction.	20
Equalitarian Marriages.	21
Economic Status and Social Mobility.	23
Religious Ideologies.	26
Contraceptives and Childbearing.	28
III. CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY.	32
IV. TABLES.	37
V. BIBLIOGRAPHY.	50

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Breakdown of Average Number of Children of Married Women by Education During the 1930's.	7
II. Marriages and Birth Rates in the United States.	37
III. World Population Growth.	40
IV. Ideal Family Size.	41
V. Preferred Number of Children of Couples in Detroit by Education of Wife, (1955).	42
VI. Average Number of Children Expected and Wanted by Married Women, by Wife's Education and Family Income, 1965.	43
VII. Average Number of Children Ever Born Per Women, Aged 45 and Over, Who Had Ever Been Married, by Husbands Occupation, 1964.	44
VIII. Childbearing Preferences, Performance, Expectations Discrepancies, by Wife's Church Preference.	45
IX. Average Number of Children Per Women, Aged 45 and Over, Who Had Ever Been Married, by Religious Affiliation.	46
X. Percentages of Increasing or Decreasing Influences that Religion has on American Life.	47
XI. Average Number of Children Expected and Wanted by White Catholic and Non-Catholic Married Women.	48
XII. Common Contraceptive Methods.	49

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE AND ITS BACKGROUND

I. The Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into the differences in child-bearing attitudes over a twenty-six year span. Specifically, the investigation is concerned with answering the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in family size?
2. Is the environment for children developing in quality?
3. Does the education level of the parents relate to the number of children wanted in the home?
4. Has the new found independence of the female made any change in the family structure?
5. Does the number of children relate to marital satisfaction?
6. Do equalitarian marriages still reach comparative success in child-bearing goals?
7. Have the changes in economic status resulted in differences in family size expectations?
8. Do social status and or social mobility appear to be a factor in any differences in parental attitudes?
9. Do religious ideologies carry any significant importance?
10. Have contraceptives separated sex from childbearing, which may have an effect on marital satisfaction?

II. Background of Child-bearing Attitudes

The English term 'family' is a polysemic word used to describe a conjugal pair and their young. Burgess and Locke, research specialists in the field of the family, use an inclusive definition of the family which includes the following characteristics:

1. The family consists of persons united by the bonds of marriage (husband and wife), or blood or adoption (parents and children).
2. The members of the family typically live together as one household. The size of the household may vary from the extended family to the marital group of husband and wife.
3. The family members enact roles socially prescribed and endorsed by the individuals. Interaction in terms of these roles gives a unity to the family; and
4. The family maintains a common culture derived mainly from the general culture,¹ as brought to the family by husband and wife.

Over the years, the American family has undergone a variety of changes, for example, more and earlier marriages, greater family disorganization, acceptance of remarriage, declining birth rate, partial loss of family functions, changing sex roles, and increasing individualism.²

¹Ernest W. Burgess and Harvey J. Locke, The Family, (New York: American Book Company, 1950), pp. 7-8.

²E. E. LeMasters, Parents in Modern America, (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1970), p. 23.

Cavan found:

The family in the United States is a blend of traditional forms brought to this country by the varied migrating people that have formed American Society. This ever-changing blend has been modified by the impact of, first, settling in a wild country, and second, bringing that country to a high state of industrialized urbanism. The basic biological factors and the minimum functions have been overlaid many times by cultural veneers and the total family form twisted and molded to fit the needs of people and of the changing society.³

In agricultural societies,

. . . deriving their wealth from the land, the family plot acquires almost sacred value from the family's dependence upon it. One reason for having children is to pass this treasure on from generation to generation, unsullied by strangers who may not appreciate it.

Thus the conjugal pair and their young were kept pretty much intact.

If such a society is illiterate, immortality tends to be centered in the family line. Where neither books nor diaries nor birth certificates record one's existence, oblivion ensues unless there are progeny to keep one's memory alive. If ancestor worship is the obligation of the living, children provide spiritual social security.⁵

During Colonial times the pioneer conditions permitted young men and women to associate with one another rather freely. Their usual form of courtship was "Bundling." This was introduced from Europe by the Dutch and English and practiced

³Ruth Shonle Cavan, The American Family (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969), p. 4.

⁴Robert O. Blood, Jr. and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p. 115.

⁵ibid.

mainly by lower social classes in New England. This custom permitted the lovers to court in bed, at least partially dressed, and often in the presence of other family members.

Washington Irving observed:

Whenever the practice of bundling prevailed, there was an amazing number of sturdy brats annually born . . . without the license of the law, or the benefit of the clergy.⁶

Later bundling declined due to the increase of wealth for the purchase of larger homes.

Families of 10 or 12 were quite common; twenty or twenty-five children in one family were not rare enough to occasion comment.⁷

Cavan describes the pioneer and rural family:

The pioneer and later the rural family had few resources except within its own circle for the production and preparation of food and clothing, education of children, care of sick and old, recreation, religious observances, and many other functions now performed by other institutions.⁸

Each member of the family felt a responsible need to up-hold and sustain the family unit as long as he possibly could.

Smith reviews the family unit in pioneer life:

No one contests the fact that the family in America has undergone tremendous changes in recent years. If we go back far enough we come to a pioneer phase of American life, where individualism was penalized through

⁶Washington Irving, Diedrich Knickerbocker's a History of New York, (New York: Putnam, 1880), p. 210.

⁷J.H.S. Bossard, The Sociology of Child Development, Rev. ed., (New York: Harper, 1954), p. 623.

⁸op. cit., p. 11.

bachelor taxes, and belonging to a family unit was a matter of sheer physical necessity. Husbands, wives, and children worked together in the fields, or separately in woods, and cabin, to eke out an often bare subsistence. The husband protected the wife and children from Indians, and wife animals. Churches and schools were rare, leaving most religious and educational activity in the home. The family was a strict economic and social necessity in such a precarious world. Nobody questioned the role of women-which was to be a wife, a cook, a seamstress, and a bearer of children. In turn, the husband was to protect her and provide sustenance. His authority was unquestioned.

Limited knowledge of birth control and the importance of children as potential workers, tended to reinforce the family member's security. Table II (page 37), traces the United States birth rates as far back as 1876.

With the onset of industrialization and urbanization, the family patterns began to change.

The first real change in the character of the U.S. became noticeable after the Civil War, as the manufacturing cities of the Northeast began to expand and develop.¹⁰

By 1870, a quarter of the American population lived in cities.

By 1920, the percentage had climbed to one-half.

During the years when the population of the United States was growing mostly by immigration and cities were growing primarily through either immigration or migration from rural areas, the isolated nuclear family was a very common type. During this same period-an extended one-lack of means of travel and communication made a close tie impossible. The isolation was not

⁹Herbert L. Smith, "Family Structure and Social Change" (May, 1962), p. 5.

¹⁰Calvin L. Beale, "Leaving the Farm" Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 70.

physical but psychological and social. Identification with the parental family was weakened or disappeared entirely, and social contacts were possible only at long intervals if at all. The nuclear family, especially when isolated from kinfolk, was an event of a particular historical stage in the development of the U.S.¹¹

Table III (page 40), shows the world population growth by countries from 1650 to 1960. Notice the North American increase from 1850 to 1900 which shows the results of immigration and migration on population growth.

Due to the Great Depression of the thirties, a new trend was seen in family planning. Some researchers felt that because of the strain in the economy, social and religious status became determiners of child bearing attitudes.

When Professor Andrew Parker and his wife Margaret, first came to the campus as newlyweds in 1928-he at the age of 30, she at the age of 26-they were actually the youngest members in their academic circle. They were soon made to realize that if they produced a child during their first four or five years of marriage, their colleagues would take it for granted that they just did not know any better. "Three's a crowd" or "children in small doses" seemed to express the local norms of this predominately Protestant, upper middle-class community in those days.¹²

Westoff and Westoff had an opposing view.

The Depression should not be invoked as the cause of low fertility-though it no doubt precipitated some postponement of births-since the downward trend had been in process for a long time in U.S. history.¹³

¹¹Cavan, op. cit., p.12.

¹²Arthur A. Campbell; also Robert H. Weller, "The Beginning and the End of the Baby Boom" Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 32-34.

¹³Leslie A. Westoff and Charles F. Westoff, From Now to Zero (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1971), p. 209.

Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell found that some population groups felt the need to practice family limitation at an earlier period than others, because they were involved earlier in activities that were not centered in the family. (Example-higher aspirations for educational levels of both husband and wife).¹⁴

Statistics note that those women at the peak ages of child-bearing in the 1930s had an average of 1.4 children by the time they completed their families.¹⁵ These changes in childbearing patterns were greatest among better-educated couples, but other couples played a part in the trend too. The breakdown is as follows:

Table I

Married women by education	Year	Number of children
High School Graduates	1930	1.8
Less than 8th Grade	"	3.4

Thus, average family size stabilized for all types of couples.

This trend stayed constant until after World War II.

The groups in our population whose birth rates were low in the Depression years are usually those whose birth rates rose more after the war, namely, the better-educated, the white-collar workers, the urban population, and the higher income groups. These are the groups known to use family limitation methods most extensively. Apparently, the groups who effectively

¹⁴Ronald Freedman, Pascal K. Whelpton, and Arthur A. Campbell, Family Planning Sterility and Population Growth, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), p. 101.

¹⁵Campbell, op. cit., p. 34.

planned to have fewer births in the depression also planned to have more birth in the favorable postwar years.¹⁶

Here we moved into the era of the "baby boom." Due to the postponement of children by couples in the Depression decade, a bumper crop of babies occurred during the postwar years. Large families came into vogue. Table II (page 38), shows the increase in the number of births per 1,000 population from 1942 through 1958.

The modern transition from large to small families occurred at different rates in the various socio-economic and religious groups. The small family pattern probably was adopted first by the better educated, those in higher status white-collar occupations, those with higher incomes, some of the Protestant and¹⁷ Jewish groups, and people in large urban cities.

The "baby boom" was also a result of millions of couples having their children in a short period of time while economic conditions were favorable. Another trend in the "baby boom" was toward earlier childbearing. Westoff and Westoff found that women were marrying at younger ages and having their children sooner and closer together.¹⁸

Married couples from college who reached the peak ages of reproductions during the 1950's, had an average of nearly 3 children, or over twice as many as the college couples of the 1920's.¹⁹

¹⁶Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell, op. cit., p.7.

¹⁷Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell, op. cit., p.100.

¹⁸op. cit., p. 213.

¹⁹Campbell and Weller, op. cit., p. 34.

LeMasters added:

Most American parents are no longer immigrants reared in a society quite different from the one in which they are trying to rear their children. Most of the fathers and mothers today have another advantage in that they grew up in an urban community: they are not migrants from the farm trying to rear their²⁰ sons and daughters in the strange world of the city.

This progression now evolves into the sixties, where we begin to deal with the "hippie movement" or the counter culture where child-bearing attitudes shift once more. Over-population of the world was an extreme concern along with the new "personal freedoms" of more "equal" marriages or satisfaction of the "group" by inner fulfillment of each individual member. Modern contraceptive methods were developed and choices were offered. But what about the present? Is the population trend about to shift once more or will it remain constant? What groups or group can be studied to get a general feel for the current child-bearing attitudes? Society is offering new choices in family structure and married college students should be in the main stream of societies' opportunities. It would seem logical that this specific group could mirror most of the important changes in attitudes because they are quite near the pulse of the ever-changing American life-style. The Gallup Poll of 1965 found that college persons were among those who had heard or read about population explosion and tended to be more

²⁰op. cit., p. 13.

concerned than those with less than college training. The differences that were previously mentioned will be discussed further and then some qualitative conclusions will be drawn.

III. Background of the Married College Student

Before World War II, married college students were scarce. They were not socially acceptable on the campus, and if married couples were found they might be asked to leave. Indeed, on some campuses students who married were immediately dismissed.²² Probably the most important factor for the increase in the number of married undergraduate students after World War II was the G.I. Bill for veterans.²³ In 1947 alone, twenty-four percent of the students enrolled in state universities or colleges were married. Veterans and students were allowed to stay due to the swelling student ranks as well as the school treasuries, and as a patriotic gesture. Here is a description of the special conditions that facilitated the student marriages.

A high level of prosperity permitted marriages upon meager economic reserve, but substantial future economic potential, along with, the availability of part-time work for one or both members of the student marriages.²⁴

²¹Dr. George H. Gallup, The Gallup Poll-Public Opinion, 1935-1971, (New York: Randon House, 1972), p. 1936.

²²"Fertile Valley," Time, (April 14, 1947), p. 96.

²³David B. Cohen, F.J. King, and Willard H. Nelson, "Academic Achievement of College Students Before and After Marriage," Marriage and Family Living, XXV, (February 1963), p. 98.

²⁴Victor Christopherson, Joseph S. Vandiver, and Marie N. Krueger, "The Married College Student, 1959," Marriage and Family Living, XXII, (May 1960), p. 123.

Another condition that helped to sustain the marriages is also described.

An introduction of a new pattern of living by a special group for whom institutional expectations were still in obedience, and this in a time characterized by a kind of generalized "war psychology" when certain traditional behaviors, patterns, and values were in a relative state of flux.²⁵

In one case, McDonagh reported that in 1947, one-third of the 54 percent of veterans at the University of Oklahoma were married.²⁶

Through the years much has been written about the conflicts of the married college student. Kirkendall not only found that married college students had some adjustment problems, but at times, the adjustment problems were too many and too great.²⁷ Landis and Landis seemed to hold the opposite view. They reported that college students recognized and accepted the problems of their unique situations and viewed their marriage as a stabilizing force for themselves.²⁸ Other researchers (Barash 1949; Falk 1964; Lantagne 1959; and Thorpe 1951), have studied college couples to discover

²⁵loc. cit., p. 123.

²⁶Edward McDonagh, "Adjustment Problems and Characteristics of University Veterans", Sociology and Social Resources, XXXI (January 1947), p.222.

²⁷Lester A. Kirkendall, "Married Undergraduates on the Campus, An Appraisal," Marriage and the Family in the Modern World, Ruth Cavan ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1963), pp. 261&8.

²⁸Judson T. Landis and Mary G. Landis, Building a Successful Marriage, 3rd. ed., (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958), p. 83.

their problems and successes with the emphasis being placed on the problems (those being housing, campus social activities, economic stability, child care, and adequate contraceptive methods.)²⁹

As time went on the Korean War veterans duplicated the performance of the World War II veterans. By 1961, almost one-fourth of the students in the nations colleges and professional schools were married. Interestingly, when the numbers of veterans of the two wars began to diminish, the new culture pattern they had established-college marriages-remained.³⁰

The following discussion will aim specifically at the various childbearing attitudes that married college students have had during this twenty-six year span.

²⁹Charles F. Petranek, "Marital Integration and Orderly Replacement Activities of College Married Students," Unpublished master's thesis, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, September 1967. p. 3.

³⁰Current Population Report Series P-20, No. 80, (February 1959), p. 1.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. Difference in Family Size

Differences in family size has ranged from 3.0 children per family in 1955, to 1.4 in 1974. The Gallup Poll from 1953 to 1974 shows a definite decrease in the number of family size preferences, (see Table IV, page 41.) They also found that attitudes toward the ideal family size were closely related to such factors as race, income, and religion.

50 per cent of all Catholic adults said that the ideal number of children was four or more; 37 per cent of the Protestants held the same view; a far larger proportion of those whose income was under \$5,000, rather than over, said that the ideal number of children was at least four.³¹

A study done in the Detroit area in the 60's found that marriages which were childless by choice were practically nonexistent. They also found that wanting one child was just as rare as wanting none.

Young people are gradually rejecting the myth of "parenthood is fun," realizing that parenthood is a very serious business and one which ought to be undertaken only when people are ready to plunge in and do a good job.³²

Parents are much more concerned with developing a better quality of environment for their children than the production of children for the maintenance of the family's security.

³¹Gallup, op. cit., p. 2168.

³²Dauids, Leo, "North American Marriages: 1990," Futurist, V (October 1971), p. 190.

Having fewer children may not guarantee a better life, but other things being equal, parental resources don't have to be spread so thin.³³

Hendershott found that as the size of the respondents childhood family increased, so too did the number of children they desired. The greatest per cent came from all the sizes of childhood families desiring two children. In other words, the number in a respondent's childhood family could be correlated with the side of the mean on which the deviation fell. Even so, the majority of respondents in each category still desired 2 children, no matter what the size of their family of orientation.³⁴

LeMasters also found:

The truth is-as every parent knows-that rearing children is probably the hardest, and most thankless job in the world. No intelligent father or mother would deny that it is exciting, as well as interesting, but to call it "fun" is a serious error. The idea of something being fun implies that you can take it or leave it, whereas parents do not have this choice. Fathers and Mothers must stay with the child and keep trying, whether they are enjoying it or not. Any comparison to bowling or listening to jazz records is strictly coincidental.³⁵

Goldscheider and Uhlenberg found that undertaking the heavy burden of a big family would hinder social mobility.³⁶

Our present life styles adhere to more freedom and leisure time. Having fewer children will guarantee the opportunity

³³Blood and Wolf, op. cit., p. 121.

³⁴Gerry E. Hendershott, "Family Satisfaction, Birth Control, and Fertility Values," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI, (1969), p. 28.

³⁵LeMasters, op. cit., p. 18

of fulfilling some of our personal goals and desires.

More time can be spent on developing individual abilities.

Many young people will attempt to interact with and socialize their children in ways different from those in which they themselves were reared.³⁷

Furthermore:

The nation-state and various social institutions which have provided a source of identification and association in the past seem less satisfying and fulfilling now. Finally, the experience of seeing the relative ineffectiveness of the efforts of young people who have sought to influence the policies of the college and the nation is yet another factor contributing to the emphasis upon privatism and concern with the family and the family relations.³⁸

II. Education Level

The education level of the parents is certainly related to the number of children wanted in the home.

Income and education are related to fertility planning status in much the same way as the adoption of family limitation. The variation with education is more pronounced by far than with income. Again, it is true that the combination of low education and low income is especially distinctive.³⁹

Table V (page 42) shows the preferred number of children, by the education of the wife, in the 1955 Detroit study. They found that as women got more education, their family size preferences became more standardized.

³⁶ Calvin Goldscheider and Peter R. Uhlenberg, "The Fertility of Minorities," Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes, ed., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 58.

³⁷ David Gottlieb, "Great Expectations for College Students," Journal of Higher Education, IX, (October, 1974), p. 540.

³⁸ *ibid.*

³⁹ Freedman, et. al., *op. cit.*, p. 129.

Better educated women less often want either no children at all or usually large families. Education provides women with husbands sufficiently prosperous to release the more or less universal American desire to have one child for the sake of the parents and at least one more for the sake of the first.⁴⁰

Table VI, (page 43) shows the average number of children expected and wanted by married women, by the wife's education and family income as of 1965. It brings out the fact that married women with 1 to 3 years of college or more, wanted no more than 2.7 children which is somewhat lower than the highest percentage of college women in 1955, who wanted 3 children.

In 1969, President Nixon appointed a special committee on Population Growth and the American Future, which was to make recommendations on the official population policy to be followed by the U.S. They suggested the following:

Parenthood is perhaps not essential to happiness. We tend to overlook the fact that we are not all equally suited for parenthood anymore than we are for teaching school or playing sports. Matters of temperament, age, health, and competing interest, to mention a few, are considerations in determining whether or not to have children.⁴¹

Peterson found in a study of college students, that they believed children were not necessary to marital happiness. Further, the study cited overpopulation, increased freedom for women, and an increase in the value of continuous individual

⁴⁰Blood and Wolf, op. cit., p. 122.

⁴¹Suzanne Loebel, Conception, Contraception: A New Look, (St. Louis: McGraw-Hill, 1974), p. 130.

growth and freedom, as reasons for a decrease in the number of children wanted by the couples studied.⁴²

Today, both educated men and women have a different philosophy on the family.

Again, the surface form may look no different from that which we now see or think we see as being representative of the American classes. The contrast will be found in the more private and less visible aspect of families. Emphasis upon the quality, rights, and individual needs of the family members, regardless of age or sex.⁴³

III. Independence of the Female

The new found independence of the female has made a definite change in the family structure. With the patriarchal family in eclipse, the views of the wife take on added importance in deciding on the number of children wanted.

Sears and Maccoby found that the closer the women's children were spaced, the less frequently "delighted" they were about their pregnancies.⁴⁴ Hoffman and Wyatt found:

There is a strong association between family size desires and how exclusively the wife sees herself as oriented to husband and outside interests as opposed to children. Looked at another way, we see that 90 per cent of those who want a small family mention outside or husband orientations, compared to three-quarters of the medium-family mothers and only 45 per cent of the large-family mothers.⁴⁵

⁴²Rolf A. Peterson, "Changes in College Students Attitude Toward Child-bearing from 1971 to 1973," Journal of Personality and Assessment, XXXVIX, (June 1975), p. 227.

⁴³Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 540.

⁴⁴Robert R. Sears, and Eleanor E. Maccoby, Patterns of Child Rearing, (Evanston: Row Peterson and Company, 1957), p. 408.

Aller goes on to describe the female side of the student marriages of the 60's.

Emotional implications and value patterns were evident in the women studied. The mothers found themselves working to support the family-graduation would be delayed. Mothers were not able to relax around their children because of pressures of school and work. They were too irritable and had too much to do to be a "good" parent.⁴⁶

Baby sitting pools were organized which helped to relieve the pressure, but a trend was seen to limit the family size or to delay the start of a family entirely, or at least until completion of schooling for both partners.

In 1971, the advance of women's liberation along with the popular press, began the present view that children are not necessary for happiness⁴⁷ and adjustment-especially from the women's point of view.

This negative view point by women has come under attack,

LeMasters points this out:

It seems to us that the stream (or the feeling) behind the attack on the American mother is related to the emancipation of women which began in the United States during World War I and probably reached its peak during the 1920's. This was a period of massive social change-or revolution-in our society. The great wave of immigration from Europe was dwindling to a trickle; millions of farmers and their children were moving into cities; the new jobs were industrial jobs; and women were invading not only the world of politics but other pockets of American society more or less closed to them before-colleges and universities, all sorts of community activities,

⁴⁵Lois Hoffman and Fredrick Wyatt, "Social Change and Motivations for Having Larger Families: Some Theoretical Considerations," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, VI, (1973) pp. 235-44.

⁴⁶Florence D. Aller, "Some Factors in Marital Adjustment and Academic Achievement of Married Students," Personnel and Guidance Journal, IXI, (March 1963), p. 613.

⁴⁷L.C. Lett, "Who Wants the Child?" American Psychologists, XXVIII, (1973), p. 580.

industry and business, and even that male sanctuary, the saloon (known as a speakeasy during Prohibition). Out of all of this social explosion not only a new American woman emerged, but⁴⁸ also a new American male and a new American family.

Lott pointed out that-

. . . much of the women's liberation literature presented a negative view that one should choose depending on interests, goals, and desires to rear children and that both choices (children or no children) can be positive and rewarding.⁴⁹

Hoffman and Wyatt found the reasons for changes in the women's role to be: technological advances and an increase in women entering the labor market-

In our society neither women nor men are allowed to be simply idle, one must justify oneself in terms of some productive or creative activity.⁵⁰

With all of this in mind, the female is still emerging from a lower status and will continue to strive for more independence, which will also cause more freedom for men by their joint desire to limit their family size.

The married woman is having fewer children and the divorcee is remarrying sooner. And she is living longer to enjoy her new opportunities and freedoms. Clearly, the American woman will exert an ever more powerful influence on the destiny of the U.S. as a result of: her increasing participation in the labor force, her majority in the electorate, and her wishes as to family size, which will determine the nation's future population growth.⁵¹

⁴⁸ LeMasters, op. cit., p. 121

⁴⁹ Lott, op. cit., p. 580.

⁵⁰ Hoffman and Wyatt, op. cit., p. 236.

⁵¹ "We the American Women," Bureau of Census, (May 1973), p.3.

IV. Marital Satisfaction

There is certainly a relation between the number of children and marital satisfaction.

Nothing reduces the preferred number of children more severely than marital unhappiness.⁵²

LeMasters also found:

There is abundant statistical evidence that children stabilize marriages, but this isn't quite the same as improving them. It is obvious, of course, that children deepen and enrich millions of marriages in the United States, but it is less obvious that some married couples have their worst conflicts over their parental role. There are also some marriages that are destroyed by children. It is certainly true that most married couples try harder to preserve their marriage because they have children, but this doesn't prove that the husband-wife relationship itself is made more congenial by the presence of children. It only means that they are willing to endure more frustration to provide a stable family environment for their offspring.⁵³

Some researchers feel that the American mother is really "over-loaded" in her role commitments: she has taken on more jobs than she can handle. This increased responsibility poses even greater problems whether her marriage is stable or unstable. Wives want to hold on to their good relationships with their husbands and accomplish this by not introducing too many distractions. Peterson's study in 1975 found that when his subjects were asked to draw a picture of a happily married couple of either 2 or 5 years of marriage, more

⁵²Blood and Wolf, op. cit., p. 122.

⁵³LeMasters, op. cit., p. 28

children were found in the 5 year picture than the 2 year. An increase in marital satisfaction was given as a factor for the absence of children after only 2 years of marriage.⁵⁴

The quality of human relationships is clearly a salient factor to the majority of college people. Openness and freedom in relationships is another. A "happy family" is in fact the dimension of life most frequently referred to by most college graduates.⁵⁵

Campbell found that there is a growing number of couples who consider childless marriages. He wrote:

Children and marriage still go together and always will, but children are becoming less popular. The continuing, substantial decline in the birth rate in this country indicates that many people no longer regard having children as an inevitable process. The child-free marriage, once pitied or disparaged, is now increasingly recognized as a fulfilling lifestyle and many young couples simply admit, without embarrassment or apology, that they do not intend to have children.⁵⁶

V. Equalitarian Marriages

Equalitarian marriages seem to have better success in realizing childbearing preferences.

The most satisfied wives expect to have more children than anyone else, despite the fact that they do not prefer the largest number. This does not mean that they do not prefer the largest number or expect to have surplus children, but that in reaching their most modest goal they will exceed those who aim higher but fall farther short. This analysis is complicated by the reciprocity of the relationships. Marital satisfaction and childbearing preferences and expectations

⁵⁴Peterson, op. cit., p. 226.

⁵⁵Gottlieb, op. cit., p. 539.

⁵⁶Angus Campbell, "The American Way of Mating, Marriage Si, children only maybe," Psychology Today, VIII, no. 12, (May 1975), p. 39.

tend to interact upon each other in both directions.⁵⁷²²

Aller also noted-

Combining the pursuit of higher education with marriage the democratic ideology places a high value on the family and on the right of each individual to educational opportunities, thus the student marriage is of vital concern to our society.⁵⁸

The roles in our family structure are becoming much more flexible. Davids found that husband-wife equalization, (in regard to decision making), has shifted marriage from, to borrow a phrase, from institutions to companionships.⁵⁹ Men are caring more for their off-springs while women are getting out of the home. A feeling of "family ease" is evolving around the children. They feel just as comfortable with the father as with the mother. Women are better able to seek employment which certainly changes the economic trend of the family structure.

This should mean that the great majority of parents in our society will have their children because they want them-certainly one of the prerequisites for successful performance of the role of father or mother.⁶⁰

Maturation and motivation appear to be significant factors for equalitarian marriages. They seem to go hand in hand with the joint decisions made on family size.

⁵⁷Blood and Wolf, op. cit., pp. 134-135.

⁵⁸Aller, op. cit., p. 609.

⁵⁹Davids, op. cit., p. 191.

⁶⁰LeMasters, op. cit., p. 13.

VI. Economic Status and Social Mobility

Due to economic prosperity, the 60's saw a new beginning of a gradual decline in fertility rates.

More women are going to college, working, and having fewer children. That is bound to make some changes eventually in the institution of marriage, which is currently the rock on which both sexes base much of their happiness and satisfaction with life.⁶¹

With the onset of the recession in the 70's, financial burdens influenced the desire for larger families. It is certainly safe to say that the cost of raising a child is greater now than it was in the 60's, and the married students of today are not necessarily veterans. Their living income, therefore, must come from loans, grants, scholarships, outside employment, or help from their parents. The great majority of them hold down at least a part-time job. These economic realities cause the couples to develop an attitude of limited fertility or delayed fertility, until they move into a better economic situation. Even then, social status and a desire for upward mobility tends to reflect their attitudes on family size.

Along with changes in life styles, there have been changes in attitudes towards family size. Census Bureau surveys taken in 1967 and 1972 demonstrate this change. In 1967 the average number of births expected by wives 18 to 24 was 2.9, while in 1972 the average was 2.4, due to the ability of women to choose and control family size.⁶²

⁶¹Campbell and Weller, op. cit., p. 43.

⁶²Bureau of Census, op. cit., p. 11.

It is difficult to classify married college students into a particular social class. They do however, reflect certain characteristics that can be seen in definite class stratus.

Related to but not synonymous with social class is the concept of social stratification, or the ranking of people according to certain characteristics that can be placed in rank order. Characteristics often used in the United States as the basis for studies of stratification are income, years of schooling, and occupations ranked according to the public prestige accorded each occupation. Although the correlation between such rankings as are found in large groups of individuals is far from perfect, in a general way high ranking on one category is associated with high rankings on the other two, middle rankings are found to go together, and persons with low rankings on one also tend to have low rankings on the other two. There are, however, no sharp breaks at different points along the ranks⁶³ to indicate the boundaries between social classes.

The true essence of social class subculture lies in the intangible aspects of the class subculture-the beliefs, values, and goals. These intangibles differ from class to class in qualitative manner and therefore do not fall into rank orders. Their differences mark the boundaries between the social classes.

Cavan further states:

Each social class tends to have a certain range of years of schooling. But the essential difference between the classes is in the value attached to education. In the classes of higher social status, education in and of itself is a matter of prestige. The college degree has an intrinsic value; it is the mark of a gentleman, a symbol of culture. Also education opens the door to many lucrative occupations. In the lower social levels, education beyond elementary school is regarded as useless and a waste of time; some practical use of time, early employment, and an

⁶³Cavan, op. cit., p. 72.

income however small are of higher value than an education that seems to lead nowhere and which in fact may alienate the person from his family.⁶⁴

Table VII, (page 44) shows the average number of children ever born per women, aged 45 and over, who had ever married, by husbands occupation, as of 1964. Occupation groups 1 through 4 tend to require the most amount of formal educational training. Notice their average numbers as compared with groups 5 through 9, that do not require as much formal preparation. In the 60's, children in threes had become popular with college graduates and with high status people, generally. Conservatism in child-bearing goals was characterized by those who were oriented toward the achievement of higher social status.

It is apparent that a majority of couples hold desired family sizes consistent with the ideal American family they imagine, but the variations among social classes are notable: lower-lower class men and women have a lower level of consistency than upper-middle class men and women and the other classes fall in-between.⁶⁵

Bardis found that college students had the desire to achieve a higher social status partly by emphasizing family planning.⁶⁶

Certainly one of the primary goals of securing a college education is to attain a higher social status or at least

⁶⁴Cavan, op. cit., p. 73.

⁶⁵Lee Rainwater, Family Design, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965), p. 123.

⁶⁶Panos Bardis, "Attitudes toward Oral Contraceptives Among Canadian University Students," University of Toledo, 1974, p. 7.

to secure a occupation that will enable social mobility to occur. These goals can be more easily met through the use of family planning.

VII. Religious Ideologies

Religious ideologies do not seem to carry as much weight in family planning as in the past. The Gallup Poll from 1957 to 1970 found a significant decrease in the influence that religion has on American life, (see Table X, page 47). Rainwater found that neither religion nor race seemed to make much difference in the desired family size at the lower-lower class level. At higher status level, Protestants wanted fewer children than Catholics, and within religious groups there are only minor differences among social classes.⁶⁷ Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell noted that religious differences still exist, although they too, seem to be yeilding to the process of standardization of norms. Catholics do want and expect more children than Protestants, but the difference lies within the variation prescribed by the common norm of two to four children.⁶⁸

For all religious groups, especially Catholics, there is a sharp positive linear relationship between the number of siblings and the number of children desired. The connection of religiousness with fertility values is being measured by the women's observation of various practices as well as by her attitudes and her perceptions of the importance attached to religion

⁶⁷Rainwater, op. cit., p. 122.

⁶⁸Freedman, et. al., op. cit., p. 403.

by herself, her friends, and parents.⁶⁹

Differences among the major American religious groups seems to lie in the expected directions. Meaning, changing trends seem to correlate with Table VIII, (page 45), which shows childbearing preferences, performance, expectations, and discrepancies, by the wife's church preference. Results of the 1965 National Fertility Study found that the number of children expected is the best estimate of the actual number that they will have ultimately. Table XI, (page 48), gives you a breakdown of the Fertility Study's results.

College couples who are of the same faith and practice their faith will become more involved in orderly replacement since religions help transmit family culture. On the other hand, if the husband and wife are of different faiths and practice their separate faiths, the household will tend to become divided for husband and wife will strive for different objectives.⁷⁰

Table IX, (page 46), shows the average number of children per women, aged 45 and over, who had ever been married, by religious affiliation of couples interviewed in the Detroit Study.

The development of such a complex society has caused couples to stray away from religious ideologies and to adhere to the realities of family size. Eisner concluded, in his study, that the choice of the number of children that his

⁶⁹Charles F. Westoff and Raymond H. Potvin, College Women and Fertility Values, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 162.

⁷⁰Petranek, op. cit., p. 19.

respondents desired was in no way affected by age, sex or marital status-but may be affected in some extent by the size of the childhood family, of the respondents, and by the religion in which he was reared and now follows.⁷¹ Recent research suggest that the advent of a child does not necessarily fulfill a marriage, but may be the first point of cleavage that separates husband and wife.⁷²

VIII. Contraceptives and Childbearing

Contraceptives seem to be of great importance for the attainment of certain goals that the student couples set before themselves. A study done in 1955 found that 68 per cent of couples with college education began preventive measures before the first pregnancy, as compared with 24 per cent of couples with only a grade school education.⁷³ In 1964, Bardis outlined some of the reasons for expanding birth control. They are as follows:

1. The emancipation of women, which has rendered them much less reproduction-minded.
2. The economic insecurity generated by industrialization.
3. The often exorbitant expenses involved in child-rearing.
4. The passing of the frontier and the adoption of laws against child labor have changed preadolescent and to some extent, adolescent children into lia-

⁷¹Thomas Eisner, et. al., "Population Control, Sterilization, and Ignorance," Science, (January 1970), p. 162.

⁷²John A. Scarlett, "Undergraduate Attitudes toward Birth Control: New Perspectives," Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXIX, (May 1972), p. 313.

bilities. Even childbirth itself has become more expensive, since it now usually takes place in a hospital.

5. The prevailing budgeting complex, because of which even children must be budgeted through planned parenthood.
6. The educational and other advantages enjoyed by children coming from small families.
7. The vertical social mobility which parents ordinarily emphasize at the expense of having children.
8. The decline of religiosity and the corresponding prevalence of secularism, due to which a child's birth is no longer regarded as an act of God. In 1931, even the Federal Council of Churches expressed its approval of birth control.
9. Recognition of birth control by the medical profession: the American Medical Association recognized this practice officially in 1937.
10. The increase in the number of birth control clinics.
11. The legal approval in all states, except for Connecticut and Massachusetts, of medical advice concerning contraception for reasons of health.
12. More extensive education, which tends to liberalize the population in many respects, including acceptance of birth control.
13. The philosophy of individualism.⁷⁴

Freedman, Whelpton, and Campbell felt that education is more closely related than occupation to the use of family limitation methods and apparently accounts for much of the difference by occupation. When several measures of contraception are considered we find that they vary in much greater degree with the education within occupational groups than

⁷³Blood and Wolf, op. cit., p. 120.

⁷⁴Panos Bardis, "Family Forms and Variations Historically Considered," Handbook of Marriage and the Family, Harold T. Christensen, ed., (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964), pp. 437-438.

with occupation within educational groups.⁷⁵

Advances in medical techniques, the pill, intra-uterine device (IUD), and the many other ways that are in use to free relations between men and women from the fear or risk of begetting children who would be a by-product or an unintended side-effect of fulfilling quite other needs.⁷⁶

Table XII, (page 49), shows the types of contraceptive methods that are most commonly used along with their advantages and disadvantages.

Student clinics for the service of obtaining contraceptive information are springing up around this country's campuses. Both Collins (1970 and Crist (1971), have done studies in this area.

Scarlett revealed, in his study, that the present population of young college-educated adults is, for the most part, alerted to the population crisis that confronts their generation and that with an increasing knowledge, and acceptance of contraception, a long-range decline in birth rates is foreseeable in the future.⁷⁷ As far as the abortion alternative is concerned, the clinics find that the pregnant college women who plan to marry the baby's father, are less likely to come for counseling.

Recent legal abortion laws have made abortion a viable alternative, and the middle-class educated population tends to take advantage of cultural change to control

⁷⁵Freedman, et. al., op. cit., p. 134.

⁷⁶ Davids, op. cit., p. 190.

⁷⁷Scarlett, op. cit., p. 312.

their own⁷⁸ lives more than does the general population.

Michael noted that more educated couples, other things the same, do tend to adopt contraceptive techniques which, on the average, are more effective in preventing unwanted pregnancies.⁷⁹ Some conclusions will now be drawn from the review of the literature.

⁷⁸Barley W. McCarthy and Patricia Brown, "Counseling College Women with Unwanted Pregnancies," Journal of College and Student Personnel, XV, (November 1974), p. 445.

⁷⁹Robert T. Michael, "Education and the Deprived Demand for Children," Journal of Political Economy, (March 1973), p. 1301.

CHAPTER III

Conclusions and Summary

On March 9, 1976, an ERC Oars search was done to cross check any sources known pertaining to child-bearing attitudes of marriage college students, 1950 to the present. Concepts of marital status and married students; marriage and college students; college students and college-university; higher education and womens education, along with working women, were run through the computer. No citations showed up. When the concepts of family planning, population trends, conception and the family were run through-3 citations appeared. With the terms marital status and family, 23 citations appeared, but upon searching the corresponding abstracts, only 7 pertained to the married college student population. The concept of college students and family planning revealed 50 citations. However, out of this group, only 10 dealt with any discussion of childbearing attitudes. A great majority of them were concerned with either the discussion of minority student problems, high school student marriages, population trends, both U.S. and world wide, or divisions of rural and urban campuses.

Therefore, the citations that have been presented in this paper do not necessarily deal directly with the use of the "married student" as the sole population in the studies. A large abundance of research is definitely

lacking in this area.

I considered my topic of timely interest and relative importance, but my field of study might have been too narrow. Perhaps a greater discussion of child-bearing attitudes for a longer time span and the use of a more general population would have produced more studies. I do feel, however, that significant knowledge was gained in my limited findings.

While loving and caring for the offsprings of a marriage union can be truly a wonderful experience, the joys of watching a human being grow and develop, also, can not be described in enough words. But if this experience is clouded by outside forces that have an overwhelming control on the family structure, then the joys of parenting may turn into nightmares.

On the surface, the most compelling reason for reducing initial aspirations is financial-some couples find the medical expenses of having children hard to bear, others are worried by gradually mounting costs each additional child requires clothes, food, recreation, and education. But behind these easy justifications for reducing initial aspirations is a factor that often pinches even more. . . In other words, these people come to believe that having as many children as they initially wanted would be a psychological burden of demands, emotional control, attention⁸⁰, and giving which they would find difficult to manage.

With the American life style, many more segments of society have been given the opportunity to pursue a college education,

⁸⁰Rainwater, op. cit., p. 127.

then ever before. Exposing more people to educational opportunities causes a change to take place in their social status and an emergence of new attitudes. It seems only natural that child-bearing attitudes should shift, in accordance, with the change in upward mobility. No longer do couples fear or resent the prospect of childbearing. They are freer to choose when they want to begin their family and to limit it's size.

. . . family limitation is not a matter of individual wishes, but is designed to promote more responsible parenthood for the maximum number of children the parents are prepared to rear.⁸¹

They are better able to cope with the stresses and strains of a changing society and can appreciate and enjoy the children that they already have.

No longer are the members of the family unit swallowed up by the functioning tasks of maintenance. Individual freedoms are being demanded and concern and understanding are developed as the family unit evolves into a structure of "distinct" individuals. These changes all seem to come about from the "frightening" economic trends and a keen interest in social class.

. . . at any given status level, those who felt more secure economically had more children, conforming to the norm that "you should have as many children as you can afford."⁸²

⁸¹Cavan, op. cit., p. 30.

⁸²Rainwater, op. cit., p. 179

Women's liberation is here to stay, but it seems to be developing on a positive note of "people liberation." Even though society was forced to look at the low social status of the female, it carried it further into the complexities of being a man and a new awareness of "children's rights." Every segment of society will benefit from "people liberation."

Even though the divorce rate is soaring, couples that choose to stay together are really taking a hard look at their marriages. Marital satisfaction can not be achieved unless both partners strive for effective communication on a regular basis. Being able to vent both your positive and negative feelings causes definite decisions to be made and realizations to be dealt with.

Married college students do seem to represent the main stream of our changing society. They are educationally alert, are frequently being exposed to the most recent studies and trends, and are living in a community where their attitudes concerning childbearing preferences are more openly discussed and not hidden behind "closed doors." Granted, they will probably move up into a more structured social class, they will still maintain their attitudes concerning the practice of family planning, so that a much broader section of society will be affected by the future population trends. If a shift in childbearing attitudes takes place in the near

future, you can be sure that college students will be in the mist of the change. After all, the great majority of them will be the innovative leaders of the future.

Table II

Marriages and Birth Rates in the United States.
 I-Number of marriages per 1,000 estimated midyear*
 II-Number of births per 1,000 population**

Year	I	II
1867	9.6	
1868	9.0	
1869	8.9	
1870 to	8.8 to	(1871-75
1874	8.7	37.0)
1875 to	9.1 to	(1876-80
1879	8.9	34.9)
1880 to	9.0 to	(1881-85
1884	8.8	33.2)
1885 to	8.9 to	(1886-90
1889	9.1	31.9)
1890 to	9.0 to	(1891-95
1894	8.6	30.8)
1895 to	8.9 to	(1896-1900
1899	9.0	29.8)
1900	9.3	-
1901	9.6	-
1902	9.8	28.8
1903	10.0	-
1904	9.9	-
1905	10.0	-
1906	10.5	-
1907	10.8	27.7
1908	9.7	-
1909	9.9	-
1910	10.3	-
1911	10.2	-
1912	10.5	26.4
1913	10.5	-
1914	10.3	-
1915	10.0	25.1
1916	10.6	25.0
1917	11.1	24.7
1918	9.7	24.6
1919	11.0	22.3
1920	12.0	23.7
1921	10.7	24.2
1922	10.3	22.3
1923	11.0	22.2
1924	10.4	22.4

Year	I	II
1925	10.3	21.5
1926	10.2	20.7
1927	10.1	20.6
1928	9.8	19.8
1929	10.1	18.9
1930	9.2	18.9
1931	8.6	18.0
1932	7.9	17.4
1933	8.7	16.6
1934	10.3	17.1
1935	10.4	16.8
1936	10.7	16.7
1937	12.1	17.1
1938	13.2	17.6
1939	11.8	17.3
1940	11.0	17.9
1941	12.2	18.9
1942	16.4	20.9
1943	13.9	21.5
1944	12.4	20.2
1945	10.6	19.6
1946	11.0	23.3
1947	10.4	25.8
1948	9.9	24.2
1949	9.2	24.0
1950	9.2	23.5
1951	9.3	-
1952	9.5	-
1953	8.9	-
1954	8.4	24.9
1955	8.5	24.6
1956	8.5	24.9
1957	8.5	25.0
1958	8.5	24.3
1959	8.8	24.1
1960	9.0	23.7
1961	9.2	23.3
1962	9.4	22.4
1963	9.7	21.7
1964	10.4	21.0
1965	10.6	19.4
1966	10.6	18.5
1967	10.6	17.8
1968	11.3	17.5
1969	10.3	17.8
1970	10.7	18.4
1971	10.6	17.2

Year	I	II
1972	10.9	15.6
1973	10.9	14.9
1974	10.5	15.0

Source: *Vital Statistics, Special Reports, Summary of Marriages and Divorce Statistics, United States, 1949, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Federal Security Agency, June 5, 1951), p. 24; Vital Statistics of the United States, 1959, Marriage and Divorce Statistics, Vol. I, Sec. 2 (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Office of Vital Statistics, 1961), pp. 2-17. Marriages refer only to those occurring in the United States. For 1959, Alaska is included; Vital Statistics of the United States, 1963, Marriage and Divorce, Vol. III, p. 1-5; Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1967 (Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, 1967). p. 63; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstracts of the U.S.: 1975, Washington, D.C., 1975.

**Rates for 1871-1935 from A.J. Lotka, Modern Trends in the Birth Rates, "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science," 188 (1936), 2-3; later rates from Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1950, p. 63; 1955, p. 59; 1961, p. 48; 1967, p. 49; and 1975, p. 51.

Table III
World Population Growth

Area	1650	1750	1800	1850	1900	1950	1960
World	545	728	906	1,171	1,608	2,517	3,005
Africa	100	95	90	95	120	222	278
North America	1	1	6	26	81	166	199
Latin America	12	11	19	33	63	163	213
Asia	327	475	597	741	915	1,381	1,660
Europe	103	144	192	274	423	572	639
Oceania	2	2	2	2	6	13	16

Source: Irene B. Taeuber, "The Population Dilemma," Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes, ed., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972), p. 11.

Table IV
Ideal Family Size

	1953	1957	1959	1968	1974
1 Child	1%	1%	(1 to 3 child. 55%)	(1 to 3 child. 59%)	2%
2 Children	28%	18%			46%
3 "	38%	34%			22%
4 "	29%	27%	(4 or more 45%)	(4 or more 41%)	14%
5 "	7%	6%			2%
6 "	5%	4%			3%

Source: Dr. George H. Gallup, The Gallup Poll-Public Opinion 1935-1971, (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 1474, 2168, 2289, and 1974.

Table V
Preferred Number of Children of Couples in Detroit
by Education of Wife, (1955)

Preferred Number of Children	Years of Education of Wife		
	Grade School	High School	College
None	5%	2%	0%
One	1%	1%	1%
Two	19%	25%	22%
Three	18%	26%	37%
Four	39%	35%	29%
Five	5%	5%	8%
Six or More	13%	7%	2%
Number of Families from each Group	149	393	65

Source: Robert O. Blood and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives, (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p. 122.

Table VI

Average Number of Children Expected and Wanted by Married Women, by Wife's Education and Family Income, 1965

Characteristic	Expected	Wanted	Difference (E-W)
All Wives in Study	3.4	2.7	0.7
Wife's Education			
College 4	3.0	2.7	0.3
College 1-3	2.9	2.6	0.3
High School 4	3.1	2.6	0.5
High School 1-3	3.6	2.8	0.8
Less	4.5	3.2	1.3
Family Income			
\$15,000 or more	3.0	2.6	0.4
\$10,000-\$14,999	3.0	2.6	0.4
\$ 8,000-\$ 9,999	3.3	2.8	0.5
\$ 7,000-\$ 7,999	3.3	2.7	0.6
\$ 6,000-\$ 6,999	3.4	2.7	0.7
\$ 5,000-\$ 5,999	3.5	2.8	0.7
\$ 4,000-\$ 4,999	3.7	2.8	0.9
\$ 3,000-\$ 3,999	4.1	2.8	1.3
Under \$3,000	4.6	2.9	1.7

Source: Leslie A. Westoff and Charles F. Westoff, From Now to Zero, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971,) p. 231.

Table VII

Average Number of Children Ever Born Per Women, Aged 45 and Over, Who Had Ever Been Married, by Husbands Occupation, 1964

Occupation of Husband	Average number of Children
Total Population	2.5
1. Professional, technical and kindred workers	2.1
2. Managers, officials and proprietors, excluding farm	2.2
3. Clerical and kindred workers	2.0
4. Sales workers	1.9
5. Craftsmen, foreman, and kindred workers	2.5
6. Operative and kindred workers	2.6
7. Service workers, including in private household	2.4
8. Laborers, except farm and mine	3.0
9. Farmers and farm managers	3.5

Source: Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1967, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 52.

Table VIII
 Childbearing Preferences, Performance, Expectations Dis-
 crepancies, by Wife's Church Preference

	Catholic	Prot.	Jewish	Greek Orth.
A. Preferred No. of Child.	3.63	3.18	3.13	3.31
B. Number born to date	2.17	2.01	1.65	1.44
C. Expected number	2.79	2.66	1.27	1.40
D. Discrepancy	7%	10%	5%	12%
Surplus	44	36	20	19
No discrepancy				
Deficiency	49	55	75	69
Total	100	101	100	100
Minimum no. of families	251	311	20	16

Source: Robert O. Blood and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives, (New York: The Free Press, 1960), p. 136.

Table IX

Average Number of Children Per Women, Aged 45 and Over,
Who Had Ever Been Married, by Religious Affiliation

Religion	Average Number of Children
Total Population	2.8
Roman Catholic	3.1
Protestant	2.8
Jewish	2.2
Other, none, and not reported	2.7

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1961,
(Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office,
1961), p. 53

Table X

Question Used to Rate Religious Importance: At the present time, do you think religion as a whole is increasing or decreasing its influence on American life-or losing its influence?

	1957	1962	1965	1967	1969	1970
Increasing	69%	45%	33%	23%	14%	14%
Losing	14%	31%	45%	57%	70%	75%
About the same	10%	17%	13%	14%	11%	7%
Uncertain	7%	-	-	-	-	-
No opinion	-	7%	9%	6%	5%	4%

Source: Dr. George H. Gallup, The Gallup Poll-Public Opinion, 1935-1971, (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 1482, 1763, 1934, 2198, and 2240.

Table XI

Average Number of Children Expected and Wanted by White Catholic (C) and Non-Catholic (NC) Married Women: 1965

Characteristic	Number Expected			Number Wanted		
	C	NC	(C-NC)	C	NC	(C-NC)
All women in study	3.8	3.0	0.8	3.2	2.5	0.7
Age						
Under 25	3.5	2.9	0.6	3.1	2.5	0.6
25-34	4.1	3.1	1.0	3.4	2.6	0.8
35-44	3.7	3.0	0.7	3.1	2.5	0.6
Education						
College 4 or more	4.6	2.7	1.9	4.0	2.5	1.5
College 1-3	3.3	2.8	0.5	3.0	2.4	0.6
High School 4	3.7	2.8	0.9	3.1	2.4	0.7
High School 1-3	3.7	3.4	0.3	3.0	2.7	0.3
Less	4.5	3.9	0.6	3.8	3.0	0.8

Source: Leslie A. Westoff and Charles F. Westoff, From Now to Zero, (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1971), p. 228.

Table XII
Common Contraceptive Methods

Method	Effectiveness	Advantages	Disadvantages
Coitus Interruptus	Variable		Nuisance, great psychological strain to male partner
Condom	98% when used alone. Better when used in conjunction with spermicidal jelly or vaginal foam	Only used when needed. Easy to use. No physiological effect Freely available	Nuisance
Diaphragm	90% effective. More so when used with adequate amount of spermicidal jelly	Only used when needed. No physiological effect.	Requires care and preparation. Must be fitted by qualified medical personnel.
IUD	98%	One-time decision. No systemic physiological effect. No preparation.	Some women have heavy periods and cramps. Must be inserted by qualified personnel. Cannot be used by everybody.
Oral Contraceptives- (The Pill)	100% when taken as prescribed	No preparation	Increases frequency of thromboembolic disease Long-term physiological effects unknown. Weight gain, morning sickness during early usage.
Vaginal Foam	Not very effective	Only used when needed. Freely available.	Must be applied before sexual intercourse.

Source: Suzanne Lobel, Contraception, Conception, A New Look, (St. Louis: Mc-Graw-Hill, 1974), p. 10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

- Blood, Robert O. and Donald M. Wolfe, Husbands and Wives. New York: The Free Press, 1960.
- Bossard, J. H. S., The Sociology of Child Development. New York: Harper, 1954.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey J. Locke, The Family. New York: American Book Company, 1950.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle, The American Family. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.
- Freedman, Ronald, Pascal K. Whelpton, and Arthue A. Campbell, Family Planning Sterility and Population Growth. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Gallup, George H., The Gallup Poll-Public Opinion, 1935-1971. New York: Random House, 1972.
- Irving, Washington, Diedrich Knickerbocker's a History of New York. New York: Putnam, 1880.
- Landis, Judson T. and Mary G. Landis, Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1958.
- LeMasters, E. E., Parents in Modern America. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1970.
- Loebl, Suzanne, Conception, Contraception: A New Look. St. Louis: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Rainwater, Lee, Family Design. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
- Sears, Robert R. and Eleanor E. Maccoby, Patterns of Child Rearing. Evanston: Row Peterson and Company, 1957.
- Westoff, Charles F. and Raymond H. Potvin, College Women and Fertility Values. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967.
- Westoff, Leslie A. and Charles F. Westoff, From Now to Zero. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1971.

II. Periodicals

- Aller, Florence D., "Some Factors in Marital Adjustment and Academic Achievement of Married Students." Personnel and Guidance Journal, CXI, March, 1963.
- Bardis, Panos D., "Attitudes toward Oral Contraceptives Among Canadian University Students." University of Toledo, 1974.
- Campbell, Angus, "The American way of Mating, Marriage Si, children only maybe." Psychology Today, 8:12, May, 1975.
- Christopherson, Victor, Joseph S. Vandiver, and Marie N. Krueger, "The Married College Student, 1959." Marriage and Family Living, CCII, May, 1960.
- Cohen, David, B., F.J. King, and Willard H. Nelson, "Academic Achievement of College Students Before and After Marriage." Marriage and Family Living, CV, February, 1963.
- Davids, Leo, "North American Marriage: 1990." Futurist, V, October, 1971.
- Eisner, Thomas, "Population Control, Sterilization, and Ignorance." Science, January, 1970.
- Gottlieb, David, "Great Expectations for College Students." Journal of Higher Education, 95:3, October, 1974.
- Hendershott, Gerry E., "Family Satisfaction, Birth Control, and Fertility Values." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31: 2, 1961
- Hoffman, Lois and Fredrick Wyatt, "Social Change and Motivations for Having Larger Families: Some Theoretical Considerations." Merril-Palmer Quarterly, VI, 1973.
- Lott, L. C., "Who Wants the Child?" American Psychologists, CVIII, 1973.
- McCarthy, Barley W. and Patricia Brown, "Counseling College Women with Unwanted Pregnancies." Journal of College and Student Personnel, XV, November, 1974.
- McDonagh, Edward, "Adjustment Problems and Characteristics of University Veterans." Sociology and Social Resources, CXI, January, 1947.

Michael, Robert T., "Education and the Deprived Demand for Children." Journal of Political Economy, March, 1973.

Peterson, Rolf A., "Change in College Students Attitude Toward Child-bearing from 1971 to 1973." Journal of Personality and Assessment, CXIX, June, 1975.

Scarlett, John A., "Undergraduate Attitudes toward Birth Control: New Perspectives." Journal of Marriage and Family, CXIX, May, 1972.

_____, "Fertile Valley." Time, April, 1947.

III. Publications of the Government

_____, "We the American Women." Bureau of Census, May, 1973.

_____, Current Population Report Series P-20, No. 80, February, 1959.

_____, Statistical Abstracts of the United States, Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1949, 1950, 1959, 1961, 1963, 1967, and 1975.

IV. Essays and Articles in Collections

Bardis, Panos D., "Family Forms and Variations Historically Considered." Handbook of Marriage and the Family, Harold T. Christenson, editor, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1964.

Beale, Calvin L., "Leaving the Farm." Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes, editor, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Campbell, Arthur A. and Robert H. Weller, "The Beginning and the End of the Baby Boom." Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes, editor, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Goldscheider, Calvin and Peter R. Uhlenberg, "The Fertility of Minorities." Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes, editor, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

Kirkendall, Lester A., "Married Undergraduates on the Campus." Marriage and the Family in the Modern World, Ruth Cavan, editor, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1963.

Taeuber, Irene B., "The Population Dilemma." Population Growth and the Complex Society, Helen MacGill Hughes, editor, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972.

V. Unpublished Materials

Petranek, Charles, "Marital Integration and Orderly Replacement Activities of College Married Students." Unpublished Masters Thesis, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, 1967.

Smith, Herbert L., "Family Structure and Social Change." Unpublished paper, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, 1962.