

PERSONALITY VARIABLES RELATING TO THE
CHILDBEARING PREFERENCES OF
YOUNG MALE ADULTS

By

IAN TIMOTHY BIRKY

Bachelor of Arts

Goshen College

Goshen, Indiana

1974

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1979

Thesis
1979
B619 p
cop. 2



PERSONALITY VARIABLES RELATING TO THE
CHILDBEARING PREFERENCES OF
YOUNG MALE ADULTS

Thesis Approved:

Julia L. Myhr
Thesis Adviser

James M. Pige

Harold H. Sandberg

Norman G. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

1031804

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my fullest appreciation to Dr. Julia McHale, thesis adviser, for her encouragement, guidance, assistance, and constant accessibility while working on this thesis. Special thanks are also expressed to committee member Dr. James Price, for his support, suggestions, and friendship during this project, and committee member Dr. Kenneth Sandvold, for his advice and listening ear.

I am indebted as well to my wife, Beverly, who stood beside me and created a constant and cheerful environment throughout. Thanks also to JoAnne Valdenegro for her cooperation in relation to this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the problem	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	4
Overview	4
Internal-External Locus of Control	8
FIRO-B	9
List of Hypotheses	18
III. METHODOLOGY	20
Subjects	20
Materials	21
Procedure	22
IV. RESULTS	25
V. DISCUSSION	28
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
APPENDIXES	42
APPENDIX A - DEMOGRAPHIC AND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE	43
APPENDIX B - NOWICKI-DUKE SCALE	46
APPENDIX C - FIRO-B INSTRUCTIONS	50
APPENDIX D - DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FREQUENCY TABLES	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Standard Error Values of Personality Variables Listed by Group	26
II. Mean, Standard Deviation, and Standard Error Values of Demographic Variables	35
III. Variable Frequency Table of Group by Religion of Subject	53
IV. Variable Frequency Table of Group by Religion of Subject's Parents	53
V. Variable Frequency Table of Group by Community Size	54
VI. Variable Frequency Table of Group by Marital Status	54

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Current concern over world population figures has increased both academic and popular interest in fertility rates, patterns, and plans. Terms such as planned parenthood, adoption, and voluntary and involuntary childlessness, have become quite common, signifying an era in which birth planning is perhaps considered respectable. Individuals today perceive themselves as having a number of options in planning a family--including the options of remaining childless, having fewer children, delaying childbearing, etc. Many of these options have become available to the general society only recently. In spite of these changes and trends, research literature contains few definitive studies investigating factors which may differentiate couples or individuals choosing to have children from those choosing not to have children (Gough, 1973). The studies that do exist have concentrated heavily on female subjects or, more recently, on couple interaction with little concern for individual male attitudes (Hass, 1974). The present study attempts to fill this gap and this research deals only with the stated procreation preferences of college males.

The area of decision making with respect to birth planning has also been conspicuously underrepresented by psychologists (Gough, 1973). Psychology has not developed a paradigm by which individuals or married couples can be classified and predictions made, with respect to their procreation preferences. Demographic variables, personality variables, motives and attitudes regarding childbearing, and many other possible factors are currently suspected of influencing the predictability of whether a given person or couple will choose to have children. There is concern by such persons as Gough (1972) and Fawcett (1970) that psychologists need to enter this field of research and join their skills with those of demographers, sociologists, and others.

The present research focuses on the facet of birth planning intentions, looking at a limited number of psychological/demographic variables and how and whether they correlate with the desire to have children. It does so within a specified time framework. Since the study deals with a population of childless single and recently married males, it is prospective in nature with no attempts being made to imply that this population actually will or will not have a given number of children within the selected time framework. This is in keeping with recent recognition by researchers, that pre-conception decision-making differs considerably from pregnancy decision-making (Steinhoff, Smith, & Diamond, 1971).

Given the present lack of clarity and conciseness of hypotheses and theories relating to the area of childbearing

preferences, the present research will be exploratory in nature. The review of the literature will begin with a brief overview of some of the personality variables and demographic characteristics considered in past research. Following this, Rotter's (1954) social learning theory will be introduced as a framework by which to formulate procreation preference hypotheses. It will be discussed as a theory relating expectancies, needs, and behaviors of individuals in their decision making environments. Finally, sections will be devoted to the Internal-External Locus of Control and FIRO-B scales. Variables derived from the use of these instruments will be explained and discussed as indicators and predictors of child preferences.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

Many variables have been defined and used as predictors of birth intentions and behavior. Bottenelli (1975) found that demographic variables, specifically educational level and religious preferences accounted for approximately 4% of the variance of actual family sizes, and attitudinal variables accounted for 22% of the variance. Attitudes include ideas of desiring to continue the family name, having as many children as one can afford, creative expression, need for adult identity, etc. Slosnerick (1975) found that internal and external locus of control scores differentiated those persons wanting more or fewer children.

Other studies investigated variables which apparently account for little, if any, of the variance of fertility patterns. Kiser and Whelpton (1958) found no relationship between personality characteristics such as anxiety, nurturance, need for achievement, and self awareness; and fertility patterns. Mishler, Westoff, and Kelly (1955) found little correlation between emotional adjustment in terms of submissiveness and introversion, and fertility planning. They did find that a "neruotic tendency"--marked feelings of

inadequacy and over concern with themselves, related to having fewer children. Westoff, Potter, and Sagi (1967) state that social mobility appears to have little, if any, relation to fertility norms although one's socio-economic status is inversely correlated. With respect to generalized manifest anxiety, nurturance needs, ability to delay gratification of impulses, self awareness, compulsiveness, ambiguity tolerance, cooperativeness, and need achievement, they found no significant correlation to fertility or fertility planning success. Westoff et al. also looked at social relationships within the family. Adjustment to the role of mother, liking for children, the wife's social participation, employment experience and plans, and areas of husband-wife dominance also failed to correlate with family planning.

A number of methodological problems soon become apparent as researchers attempt to make specific statements concerning procreation decision-making. Pohlman (1970) identifies two of those problems, one being that the ambivalence couples often experience in deciding about childbearing forbids classifying them into distinct categories. The other is the problem of distinguishing between wanting to delay having children and deciding never to have them. Pohlman (1965) points out that in certain subgroups, such as the poor, the very concepts of planning or wanting a child may lack meaning. He notes it is unfortunate, from the standpoint of research, that having children can as easily happen with a lack of decision making, as can failure to have children occur in spite

of attempts to have them. Veevers (1973) and Pohlman (1965) also point out that retrospective and prospective research will discover differences in attitude and motivation with respect to what is occurring behaviorally. Pregnancy, approaching various stages in one's life, or environmental changes such as divorce or death affect attitudes, motivation and, consequently, decisions. It seems important then that two events continue to occur in birth planning research. First, overall theories need to be created which deductively give rise to questions which can be researched to support or negate the theory. Second, research hypotheses need to be formulated and tested which can inductively give rise to theories more paradigmatic in nature.

Social learning theory (SLT) as developed by Rotter (1954) serves as one means by which preferences for or against having children can be evaluated, assuming that it is a preference made in the context of a social environment. Within SLT, the unit of investigation is the interaction of the individual and his meaningful environment. The emphasis of the theory is on learned social behavior. It suggests that different persons respond to different situational cues and that one's personality determinants influence which of these cues are responded to and thus what types of responses are made. Behavior is also thought to be goal-directed in the sense that people strive to attain or to avoid certain aspects of their environment. The occurrence of specific behavior is determined not only by the nature or importance of goals

or reinforcements but also by the person's anticipation or expectancy that these goals will occur. Stated in its simplest terms by means of the equation $BP = f(E \times RV)$, the potential for behavior is a function of expectancy for reinforcement and the value of that reinforcement correlated with needs. Within SLT, both reinforcement values and needs are inferred from the individual's behavior (Phares, 1976). When the focus of discussion is on the person, the term "need" is used. This term may refer to concepts such as the need to be included, to be in control, or to be in intimate relations with others. These three needs are mentioned specifically because Schutz (1958) in his theory of interpersonal behavior believes these to be basic to an individual's interpersonal interactions.

Expectancy is the belief held by an individual, that some reinforcement will occur as a function of some specific behavior on his part, in a specific situation. In an ambiguous condition, Phares (1976) states that perceived locus of control as a problem-solving generalized expectancy can be utilized in "predicting" behavior. Presumably, the lack of explicit situational cues allows a person to react in his own characteristic fashion--as an "internal" or an "external" (Lefcourt, 1976). Internals show more active controlling efforts to acquire self-determined reinforcements. Externals are more likely to await the results of some action on their part, expecting those results to be heavily influenced by the control of outside forces.

Gough (1973) states that further work needs to be done using personality inventories and test batteries in an attempt to identify more of the variables influencing birth planning attitudes. The current study will use the FIRO-B and Internal-External Locus of Control Scales as possible predictors of procreation preferences. This approach is congruent with Gough's expressed belief that multivariate approaches are superior to univariate ones in population research. The FIRO-B will be utilized to account for the variables of reinforcement values (RV) and the Nowicki-Duke I-E scale for the expectancy variable (E). Significant correlations are predicted between types and intensity of needs, locus of control, and the stated preferences of individuals in addressing the issue of preferred procreation behavior. An assumption is also implied here, that issues concerning child-bearing are related to interpersonal expectations, norms, and behavior.

Internal-External Locus of Control

Slosnerick (1975) suggests that a measured internal or external locus of control can be used to differentiate persons on birth desires. He has theorized that persons scoring in the direction of an internal locus of control would see population problems and birth regulation as something within the province of the individual and thus have lower birth intentions in an effort to provide a solution to perceived problems or desires. Externally directed individuals, who would not

perceive birth regulation as something under their control, would be expected to have more children. Slosnerick found that indeed, internally directed subjects ("internals") wanted 2.0 children compared with externally directed "externals" who wanted an average of 2.5. Slosnerick used a multivariate approach which used the internal-external factor along with attitudinal agreement and expectancies for reinforcement in having children. He found that using a number of instruments together increased the predictability of birth intentions. Thompson (1974) and Pope and Namboodini (1968) give further theoretical justification for these larger birth expectations of externals, suggesting that societal norms affirm the goodness of having children and that persons externally controlled are more likely to adhere to the societal pressures and thus have or desire more children. Lefcourt, Hogg, and Sordoni (1975) suggest that if one wishes to use the perception of control as a variable, one should use another assessment device--such as the ability to maintain close intimate relationships. Such variables in combination are likely to be more salient than a 'control' variable by itself.

FIRO-B

Before delineating some expectations of the FIRO-B and its ability along with an Internal-External Locus of Control Scale, to account for a significant amount of the variability in procreation desires, it seems necessary to give a brief description of what the FIRO-B purports to measure. FIRO-B

is an acronym for Fundamental Interpersonal Relation Orientation Behavior and is a 54-item questionnaire which measures three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationships: "inclusion", "control", and "affection." It also offers two scores in each of these areas, one representing expressed or manifest behavior, and one representing wanted behavior. Each score has a range of 0 to 9 with 9 indicating a high intensity of the need and 0 representing a lack or nonawareness of that need. The Inclusion scores assess the degree to which a person associates with others and is suggestive of introversion and extroversion in a Jungian sense. Control measures the extent to which a person assumes responsibility, makes decisions, or dominates people. The Affection scores reflect the degree to which a person becomes emotionally involved with others. Leo Ryan (1977) states that the FIRO-B is an important clinical and research tool. It is simple to administer, takes approximately ten minutes to answer, and can be scored very quickly.

In forming a hypothesis concerning the personality variable of Inclusion it is useful to note, as Rainwater (1965) points out, that a decision to remain childless is unpopular, it stigmatizes a person as deviant, and it probably leads in the direction of alienation from the popular majority. He found that women who wanted no children were considered by a representative sample of adult male and female Americans, to be either totally self-involved, childish, neurotic or in poor health. The men in his sample were generally of the opinion

that no children allowed them more time for their own pursuits and less responsibility. Thompson (1974) points out that persons who plan rationally for childlessness would be aware of normative social pressures discrepant from, and negative sanctions associated with, their decisions to remain childless. In addition, they would be expected to withdraw themselves from the larger social norm group and possibly seek support from similarly deviant reference groups, which are most likely to be small and exclusive. From these ideas one would hypothesize that persons who express a desire to prolong their childless status will have lower Inclusive scores than those preferring children more immediately.

On the high inclusive end, Hoffmann and Wyatt (1960) suggest that a motivation for childbearing may result from a society with increasing loneliness and alienation of individuals from one another. Children may in several ways represent a cushion against social loneliness and alienation, as well as be an indication of a parent's desire to be part of the normative population. Schutz (1958) reviews research that has shown parents in a child-centered home to score higher on Inclusion than those parents in an adult-centered home who tend to ignore their children. This desire to associate with others and to make this possible by actually creating others, gives rise to the hypothesis that people who desire children soon after marriage will receive higher Inclusive scores than the deviant, prolonged childless group.

Although a Control score on the FIRO-B basically refers

to leadership desires or expectations, it also indicates how a person avoids or chooses to make decisions and how he reacts to taking on responsibilities. It refers to desire for power, authority, and control over others and therefore over one's future. It correlates with independence, rebellion, and resistance. A low wanted Control score is often related to the type of person who does not want to be controlled by others. A high wanted Control score reflects abdication of responsibility and a disposition towards accepting control from others. There may be some correlation between this measure and that of the internal and external locus of control. As externally controlled people rely on the influence and domination of others, so would people with high wanted Control scores be expected to follow the leadership and influence of others. If a person feels powerless to make his own decisions he ends up abdicating that control power to others. Groat and Meal (1967) suggest that a perception of powerlessness is a component of alienation which might interfere with the ability to make long-term plans of having no children. In a study by Bauman and Udry (1972), males low in perception of their personal power were found to be eight times less likely to use any form of contraception practice than those high in that perception.

One would also expect people high in leadership qualities to be prone to evaluate more options than the standard options presented by social norms (Lefcourt, 1976). If so, people with high expressed Control scores may realize a variety of

options to any given problem and find other ways to meet needs which have traditionally been met by having children. Slossnerick (1975) found that persons wanting fewer children felt less helpless in finding other goals in life (ones in which children were not perceived as the only option), than did those persons feeling more helpless, and feeling that children appeared to be the only way to acquire their goals. Rainwater (1960) suspects, however, that many people do not yet perceive having children as an option over which they have the right to exert control. Barnes (1970) and Pohlman (1970) also indicate that until very recently and still present in many locales today, social norms continued to dictate that an option here, does not exist.

Another variable which relates to impulse control and thus willingness to assume control responsibility, is that mentioned by Kar (1971). He found, in a sample of families, a positive relation between a variable similar to deferment of gratification and contraceptive use. This variable as measured on a "future orientation" scale was able to differentiate, with some success, persons with small and large families. Persons scoring in a manner indicative of the ability to defer gratification tended to practice contraception more regularly and to have fewer children. Fawcett (1973) found that persons assuming responsibility in planning and an orientation toward the future demonstrated enhanced awareness of, and more regular use of, birth control techniques. Keller, Sims, Henry, and Crawford (1970) found psychological

factors strongly correlated with contraceptive behavior and thus family planning. They found that persons with a feeling of inefficacy--not inwardly convinced they have the power to control their lives--used few contraceptives. Conversely, some of the subjects saw procreation of children to be one of the few activities in which they could still derive a sense of control. Rainwater (1965) suggests that these individuals may well have children in an attempt to exert control over their lives. Lerner (1967) also found that persons with overly dependent personalities and a lack of autonomy tended to use contraceptives less than a control group of "normals."

From the preceding work that is correlated in specific ways with control indices and leadership desires, one can make the following hypothesis. Persons with high expressed Control scores on the FIRO-B, and low wanted scores, are less likely to desire children immediately, than those with scores in the opposite direction. These persons, expressing a sense of leadership and control competency are more able to order their world, and feel powerful enough to make decisions affecting their future. Thompson (1974) found a high degree of efficacy and internality in childless couples. With such individuals there would be less evidence of norm-observing characteristics and a greater evidence of norm-changing characteristics. It is a variable with many different sides, however, as Keller et al. (1970) and Hoffman and Hoffman (1973) point out. Because having children offers some people

a chance to exert control, the variable may be too complex to differentiate those desiring and not desiring children within certain time periods.

The final variable to be considered is that of the Affection score which concerns itself with the need for intimate relationships rather than superficial ones. Hoffman and Wyatt (1960) hypothesize that persons having children may do so to combat social isolation and loneliness. By having children these persons expect to acquire close relationships. Hoffman and Hoffman (1973) extend this concept by pointing out that for women, children may give them the affection needed but denied them by their husbands. On the other hand, for men, children may provide safe relationships in which to show warmth and affection. Rainwater (1965) also believes that both men and women find children a socially acceptable way of receiving affection, or as individuals with whom they can express warmth and tenderness. Pohlman (1969) sees children as providing satisfying relationships for couples who feel neglected among peers yet desire to be included. Having children creates a micro-society in which the parents cannot be ignored.

Persons preferring longer periods of childlessness may also be expected to prefer fewer deep relationships than those desiring children, and exhibit a trait of high selectivity with those relationships that are formed. Pohlman (1970), Silverman and Silverman (1971), and Hencken (1972) note that deliberate childlessness is viewed by most respondents as a

sign of psychological maladjustment and that social pressures work to alienate individuals with such desires. Pohlman (1970) believes that persons desirous of a childless status are able to maintain their stance by remaining unattached to normal reference groups and the dominant society. In her study, Veevers (1972) found that childless wives were perceived by most people in her sample as having unfavorable traits for forming intimate relationships, and are stereotyped as abnormal, selfish, immoral, irresponsible, immature, unhappy, and unfulfilled. She also found that many childless wives had very close relationships with their husbands, drawing constant support and reaffirmation from them while remaining quite inner-directed and indifferent to negative responses by others around them. Her childless subjects were aware of being stigmatized and at times avoided by child-rearing persons, but they exhibited an amazing degree of indifference on this matter. Many of them expressed an interest in remaining relatively unattached and pursuing a life with much movement and travel. Gustavus and Henley (1971) found that childless men seeking vasectomies tend to have "selfish" reasons for doing so, such as the desire to work and to pursue unrestrained life-styles. Thompson and Appelbaum (1971) constructed a study which revealed that students wanting two or fewer children placed much emphasis on the achievement of individual goals and had a desire to remain relatively unattached, in order to pursue a flexible life style. Rainwater (1965) hypothesized from his work that, as individuals

become sharply alienated from the commonly accepted values in their society, they become more narcissistic and self-involved. This attitude leads to less willingness to cope with demanding interpersonal relationships. It may also reduce interest in having children. He suggests that when people feel alone and alienated, but have hope of combatting this alienation, they may indicate higher affectional needs and may choose to have children.

From the literature cited it is hypothesized that individuals desiring children soon after marriage will score higher on the Affection scale than those wanting to remain childless for a longer period of time. Logic suggests that persons preferring extended childlessness may see such an arrangement as allowing them opportunity to develop many relationships because they do not have isolating responsibilities at home. Gough (1973) contradicts this by pointing out that violation of the norm to have children is likely to be accompanied by feelings of guilt. Violators would be expected to avoid contact with normative groups and thus be somewhat more isolated and score lower on an affection rating. Since this study is looking at childlessness for only specified periods of time, however, variance in motives and needs may exist. Campbell (1975) and Bernard (1973) believe that childfree marriages have gained new popularity and that because of decreased stress, couples are more free to pursue their individual goals which can include more intimate relationships.

Hypotheses

From the preceding it is now possible to hypothesize profile differences between individuals desiring children within five years and those preferring to prolong their childless status for a longer period of time. These profiles are derived from the use of Nowicki-Duke scale scores combined with those offered by the FIRO-B.

In order to facilitate more conciseness of the hypotheses, males who prefer to prolong their projected marital childless status will be referred to as Group I males throughout the rest of this work. Males preferring children within their first five years of marriage will be referred to as Group II males.

1) Group I males will obtain lower, more internal scores on the Nowicki-Duke Internal-External scale than Group II males. The lower the score, the more internal the orientation.

2) Group I males will have lower expressed Inclusion scores on the FIRO-B than Group II males.

3) Group I males will have lower wanted Inclusion scores than Group II males.

4) Group I males will have higher expressed Control scores than Group II males.

5) Group I males will have lower wanted Control scores than Group II males.

6) Group I males will have lower expressed Affection scores than Group II males.

7) Group I males will have lower wanted Affection scores than Group II males.

8) The overall profile of I-E and FIRO-B scores will be different between Group I and Group II.

Demographic information will also be gathered for the purpose of identifying the research sample, and may differentiate the two groups. From some of the previously cited literature, one might expect to see differences in the number of children preferred by Group I and Group II males. Lower Inclusion and Affection scores among Group I subjects may be related to a preference for fewer children. However, since the two samples have been selected for as much homogeneity as possible, no a priori correlations will be predicted. If any correlations or differences of significance occur, they will be recognized in a post hoc fashion.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Fifty male students enrolled at Oklahoma State University served as subjects. All males were Caucasian, American citizens between the ages of 20 and 30 who had no children or, if married, had a wife that was not pregnant. The students were selected from a subject pool comprised of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in Behavioral Science courses. Males utilized as subjects volunteered further participation following an initial screening by use of a short questionnaire. Information gathered included identification by sex, race, age, religion, student status, and academic major. Other factors included were marital status and years married; desire for or against having children; present number of children; total number of children expected and when; total number desired and when; reasons for stated preference; and number of siblings in subject's family of origin.

Selected males were divided into two groups based on their stated preferences concerning time of childbearing following marriage. Group I consisted of those males who stated a preference for prolonging their childless status

after marriage, for a period longer than five years. Group II consisted of those males who preferred to have children within the first five years of their marriage. The decision to divide the groups along these lines was suggested by the work of Veevers (1973). Responses obtained from couples in her research indicated that although couples felt no pressure to have children during the first year of marriage, social pressure to have children stepped up during the next few years and was heaviest during the third and fourth years. This pressure then diminished after the fifth year and remained about the same from then on. In the initial survey of the present study, there were no males who stated a preference for children in the first year and only four who stated a preference to remain permanently childless. The sample consisted of about an equal number preferring to have children in the first years and those preferring to wait a longer period of time. The majority of those preferring to delay childbearing beyond five years wanted them within ten years although several stated their preference in terms of a delay of not more than twenty years.

Materials

Three forms were administered as paper-pencil tests to each individual. The first form (see Appendix A) was a questionnaire used to obtain demographic and historical information on each subject. It was used to identify whether the male was to be classified as a Group I or a Group II male, and to identify the individual being tested with

respect to religion, number of siblings, number of preferred and expected children, views towards childbearing, etc.

The Nowicki-Duke Internal-External Locus of Control scale (ANS-IE) (Nowicki and Duke, 1974) for college students (see Appendix B) was used to determine the individual's status with respect to his locus of control as originally defined by Rotter (1966). For the ANS-IE, Nowicki and Duke (1974) report split-half reliabilities in the 60's for college samples and Anderson (1976) reported a KR20 value of .69 for a male sample. To ascertain the relation between the ANS-IE and the Rotter, Nowicki and Duke (1974) administered both scales to two college and one community adult samples. In all three samples, the correlations between the two measures were significant and consistent with requirements ($\underline{r} = .68$, $\underline{df} = 47$, $\underline{p} < .01$; $\underline{r} = .48$, $\underline{df} = 37$, $\underline{p} < .01$). The ANS-IE was selected for use rather than the original Rotter scale because of criticisms against the Rotter scale which include difficult readability and a significant relationship to social desirability responding and to the denial of psychopathology (Joe, 1971; Feather, 1967).

The FIRO-B was the third instrument administered (see Appendix C). The FIRO-B is fully discussed in the Review of the Literature.

Procedure

Following contact with students through an initial screening of Behavioral Science classes at OSU, volunteers

were obtained. From this screening, all male volunteers who satisfied the research requirements were contacted by telephone and given instructions as to where they could meet if still interested in serving as subjects. Fifty subjects in groups of three or four were administered the three scales over a span of three weeks. All information and names remained confidential.

Upon arriving at the testing room, subjects were informed they would be taking three self-administered tests dealing with family issues, requiring about one hour of their time. They were to receive one hour of extra credit in their respective classes for participation. They were further told that if for any reason they felt unable to continue, they were free to leave and would not forfeit their extra credit. Subjects were encouraged to ask the examiner for help with any items they did not understand. Each subject was able to complete each of the forms.

Following the test period, each subject was given an opportunity to meet with the examiner to discuss questions, comments, or feelings they had concerning the item questions. To specific questions concerning the variables investigated in this research, subjects were informed that because of the necessity to maintain a naive set in subjects yet to be tested, no specific information as to the exact nature of the research could be given at that time. General verification that the research dealt with family issues was given. Subjects were then invited to leave their names and addresses

in order to receive a summary and explanation of the results of this research at a later time. All subjects appeared to leave the situation feeling at ease and most indicated interest in receiving results of the study.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The data relating to hypotheses I through VII was analyzed by means of one-tailed t tests ($\alpha = .05$), using each of the six scores from the FIRO-B and the I-E score as the dependent variable. Table I lists the group means and standard deviations for each variable measured.

Hypothesis I, stating that expressed Inclusion scores for Group I males would be lower than those for Group II males, was not substantiated. There was found to be no group difference on this variable ($t = .4339$, $df = 48$, $p < .664$).

Hypothesis II, which predicted the wanted Inclusion scores to differ in the same way as those in Hypothesis I, was also not upheld. There was no significant group difference ($t = -.2521$, $df = 48$, $p < .802$).

Hypothesis III stated that expressed Control scores for subjects in Group I would be higher than those for Group II. No group difference was found ($t = 1.1529$, $df = 48$, $p < .2546$).

Hypothesis IV was that wanted Control scores for males in Group I would be lower than those scores of Group II males. There was no significant mean difference ($t = .4969$, $df = 48$, $p < .6215$).

Comparison of mean expressed Affection scores between

TABLE I
MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND STANDARD
ERROR VALUES OF PERSONALITY
VARIABLES LISTED BY GROUP

		MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
Variable:	FIRO-B1*			
Group I	N = 25	4.44	1.83	0.36
Group II	N = 25	4.68	2.08	0.41
Variable:	FIRO-B2*			
Group I	N = 25	4.28	3.27	0.65
Group II	N = 25	4.04	3.46	0.69
Variable:	FIRO-B3*			
Group I	N = 25	4.08	2.31	0.46
Group II	N = 25	3.28	2.59	0.52
Variable:	FIRO-B4*			
Group I	N = 25	3.72	2.47	0.50
Group II	N = 25	4.08	2.64	0.53
Variable:	FIRO-B5*			
Group I	N = 25	3.16	2.36	0.47
Group II	N = 25	4.04	2.42	0.48
Variable:	FIRO-B6*			
Group I	N = 25	4.16	2.93	0.59
Group II	N = 25	4.60	2.90	0.58
Variable:	I-E			
Group I	N = 25	8.32	2.80	0.56
Group II	N = 25	6.72	2.99	0.60

B1 = expressed Inclusion
B3 = expressed Control
B5 = expressed Affection

B2 = wanted Inclusion
B4 = wanted Control
B6 = wanted Affection

Groups I and II showed no difference. Hypothesis V was not supported by the data ($t = 1.3015$, $df = 48$, $p < .1993$).

Hypothesis VI stated that wanted Affection scores of Group I males would be lower than for those of Group II males. No significant difference was obtained ($t = .5327$, $df = 48$, $p < .5967$).

Hypothesis VII stated that males in Group I would obtain lower scores on an I-E scale, suggestive of a more internal locus of control, than those in Group II. This hypothesis was not substantiated and, in fact, tended to be discounted with a suggestion from the data that the trend is in the other direction ($t = -1.9487$, $df = 48$, $p < .057$).

A multivariate analysis of variance was used to test Hypothesis VIII, that the overall profile of scores for Group I would be different from those of Group II. Again no significant difference between mean score profiles was obtained, $F(7, 42) = 1.18$, $p < .3374$ (Hotelling-Lawley Trace test). This hypothesis, as well as the preceding, was not substantiated, suggesting there is no group difference on any of the variables nor with these variables in any combination. The population of males preferring children within five years after marriage is essentially no different with respect to scores on the FIRO-B and I-E Scale, from those males preferring to prolong their childless status for more than five years.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The hypotheses of this study, that FIRO-B and I-E scores would be different for groups of males differentiated with respect to preferred longevity of childless status, was not substantiated by this study. An effort to explain the absence of mean score differences must include the possibility that in fact, these particular personality variables do not differentiate between the two groups. Fawcett (1971) suggests that in a society with high barriers to effective contraceptive use, it seems more likely that individual fertility intentions merely reflect the state of fertility rather than determine it. If this is the case, social perceptual skills might govern childbearing rather than personality variables such as were used in this study. Rossi (1968) and others have suggested that people say what they think society expects, and thus variability exists only in the arbitrary perceptions of society rather than due to personality variables. As a pilot study attempting to discover new variables, the study would suggest the search is not over and that the FIRO-B and I-E scale may not be adequate instruments with which to differentiate groups with respect to immediate or delayed childbearing. Within the context of Social Learning Theory, needs

as revealed by the FIRO-B may not be correlated to the behavior of stated childbearing preferences.

Several options exist in further explaining the lack of group differences. Perhaps as the trend grows whereby more couples prolong childlessness into their thirties, the option becomes so acceptable that personality variables become meaningless. This might come from the fact that there are fewer negative social sanctions against foregoing early marriage childbearing, and thus couples are not identified as being socially deviant. One result of this childbearing lag, however, is that persons preferring to wait more than five years should be expected to prefer fewer children as a direct result of having fewer remaining childbearing years. Post hoc analysis in fact supports this assumption in that males in Group II, preferring children within the first five years of marriage preferred a mean of 2.56 children whereas the mean number of children preferred by males in Group I who wanted to prolong childlessness beyond five years was 1.68. This difference is significant ($t = 3.83$, $df = 48$, $p < .01$).

Because of impression management, some persons may effectively compensate for personality variables by stating preferences they feel will offset negative self images. Rainwater (1965) discovered that the majority of the people in his U.S. sample who thought their bad points involved egocentricity, selfishness, and stubbornness tended to prefer larger families. In the present study this would have placed them into Group II and effectively minimized differences

expected in areas such as inclusion and affection. Rainwater also found that those in his sample who felt an inability to stand up to the pressures of their roles (because of nervousness, anxiety, or depression) tended to want smaller families. In the present study this group would be identified within the Group I category and again, minimize differences hypothesized in the areas of Control and locus of control. The trend on the I-E scale for Group I males to be more externally oriented might be explained by this Rainwater data.

Looking closer at the discrepancy between this study and that of Slosnerick (1975) with respect to the I-E variable, we find that although he found Internals to want fewer children, the present study showed no difference between Internals and Externals. Rather there seemed to be the suggestion of a trend in the opposite direction. Slosnerick's hypothesis of a correlation between Internals and fewer children came from several contexts but one of them was linked to Pohlman's (1970) research that showed persons desiring no children to be rather strongly individualistic in order to remain unaffected by countervailing pressures and sanctions exerted by other reference groups and the dominant society. Veevers (1974) pointed out, however, the voluntarily childless are characterized more by indifference than concern with respect to their deviancy. As this relates to the present study, it should be emphasized that because of a prevailing trend toward liberalism with regards to having children later in life, males do not have to be individualistic to delay

childbearing and in fact can approach childbearing issues with indifference because of lessened social sanctions against it. If this is the case, nonsignificant differences on I-E scores are explainable in that the choice to delay childbearing does not presuppose one as being deviant and thus individualistic. MacDonald (1970) too, was unable to differentiate Internals and Externals with respect to childbearing variables with married females.

With respect to a trend in the present data showing Internals to prefer a larger number of children than Externals, a relationship may exist in which Internals perceive themselves as sufficiently in control of their environment to raise children in a world where the cost of having greater numbers is inhibitive. Hoffmann and Hoffmann (1973) found from their research that in fact males are aware of issues of money and cost with respect to raising children. Externals may be more subject to uncertainty about providing for children soon after their marriage, along with wanting fewer, in correlation to their coping skills. Also, with the increased popularity of zero population growth (Barnett, 1970; Scanzoni, 1975), those persons who prefer large numbers of children and thus are more socially deviant may be those of an internal locus of control who are prone to behave as their internal norms dictate rather than what the external environment suggests. The present sample of males may show Externals preferring a smaller number of children because they want approval from a society affirming smaller family preferences. Phares (1976)

also refers to recent data which suggest Externals in the last few years have been more active in efforts towards social change and, in the present sample trend, may be attempting to do this by urging zero population growth.

Demographic data from this project was analyzed in a post hoc fashion. Contrary to what might be expected with regards to religion (Thompson and Appelbaum, 1971; Westoff and Potvin, 1967), Group I and Group II did not show a significant difference with respect to the religious preference of the subject (See Table III). A chi-square test was used to test for significance and yielded a value of 3.344 ($df = 3$, $p < .3416$). The religious preference of the parents of each subject was also not found to be different between groups (chi-square = 5.140, $df = 4$, $p < .2733$). The stereotypic view Scanzoni (1975) refers to, suggesting Catholic persons are likely to have greater numbers of children than other religious groups was not substantiated by this data dealing with preferences. The groups were homogeneous with respect to religious backgrounds (See Table IV).

A chi-square test of the hypothesis that Group I and Group II differed with respect to the subjects' community size and whether rural and urban differences existed was not found significant (chi-square = .952, $df = 3$, $p < .813$). The groups were homogeneous with respect to the geographic size of their community (See Table V), although from the work of Whelpton, Campbell, and Patterson (1966), a greater number of subjects in Group I may have been expected to come from urban

backgrounds. The two groups were equal with respect to the number of married and single individuals in each sample also. A t -test was run to verify that age differences did not exist between the two groups (See Table VI). The groups were found to be homogenous with respect to the age of subjects ($t = 1.274$, $df = 48$, $p < .209$). There were also no differences found between the two groups with respect to the socio-economic status of their parents. Westoff, Potter, and Sagi (1963) found an inverse correlation between number of children and the level of one's socio-economic status although the present sample did not substantiate this claim with respect to child preferences.

One final variable considered as possibly being different between the groups was the number of siblings subjects in each of the groups had. Westoff and Potvin (1967) found a slight correlation between a greater number of siblings leading to a greater number of children in the homes of married couples, thus suggesting that males in Group I may have come from smaller families than those in Group II. This post hoc hypothesis was not verified as a t -test indicated no group differences on this variable ($t = .3972$, $df = 48$, $p < .693$). For males in Group I who preferred to delay child-bearing beyond five years, a correlation coefficient of $-.230$ ($p < .269$) was found between the preferred number of children and number of siblings they had. The correlation was not significant. For Group II males preferring children within five years, a correlation coefficient of $.414$ ($p < .05$)

was found between the number of children preferred and the size of family they came from. This suggests that for those males in Group II, the larger family they came from, the greater the probability they would prefer a larger number of children. Means and standard deviations of the preceding demographic variables are shown in Table II.

In summary, one must conclude from two samples of male students at O.S.U. preferring children either within five years of marriage or preferring to delay having children beyond five years, no differences exist between the two groups divided by that criterion and measured on the personality variables of Inclusion, Control, Affection, and locus of control. Demographic variables of religion, community size, socio-economic status, and family size also failed to differentiate between the two groups. Only the number of children preferred by each group differed, which is not surprising in that by delaying childbearing, fewer children can be expected.

Suggestions for further research in this area would include using as one's population, only married subjects who would state their preferences concerning their desired number of children, and dividing the groups on the basis of childlessness preferences and having children. Although this would entail a great deal of work in locating a suitable number of persons to fill the category of childlessness, the differentiation between groups would be much clearer than the present study was able to attain. The decision to divide

TABLE II

MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND STANDARD ERROR VALUES
OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

		MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR
Variable:	Family size of origin			
Group I	N = 25	5.16	1.14	0.23
Group II	N = 25	5.00	1.66	0.33
Variable:	Preferred number of children			
Group I	N = 25	1.68	0.74	0.15
Group II	N = 25	2.56	0.87	0.17
Variable:	Age of Subjects			
Group I	N = 25	22.60	2.70	0.54
Group II	N = 25	23.68	3.27	0.65

the group on the basis of Veevers' (1973) suggestion that a change in social pressure towards childbearing occurs after the fifth year of marriage might also need to be reassessed and perhaps a more clear-cut division of the two groups attained. There is continual need for further personality variables to be explored in an effort to discover whether personality correlates to birth intentions, and whether combinations of traits can be found which give rise to particular decisions. More work also needs to occur in the area of theory formulation and refinement, to enable the researcher to work within a more structured theoretical framework when picking the variables he or she expects will influence the childbearing preferences. Once personality variables are found that affect childbearing preferences, designs must be introduced whereby these variables can be manipulated, in order to discover the ways in which they affect preferences. In so doing, it should become possible to alter the variables in order to change one's preferences and in this way, allow this interest area to assume practical value.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, D. Parental childrearing practices and children's scores on the CNS-IE. Unpublished manuscript, Alberta Social Services and Community Health Department, 1976.
- Barnes, R. L. Birth control in popular twentieth century periodicals. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 159-164.
- Barnett, L. U. S. population growth as an abstractly perceived problem. Demography, 1970, 7, 53-60.
- Bauman, K. E., & Udry, J. R. Powerlessness and regularity of contraception in an urban Negro male sample: A research note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 112-114.
- Bernard, J. The future of marriage. New York: Bantam Books, 1973.
- Bottinelli, R. L. Measuring motivational factors affecting birth planning decisions--An exploratory study. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 1426B. (University Microfilms No. T 333, 8)
- Campbell, A. The American way of mating--Marriage si', children only maybe. Psychology Today, May, 1975, pp. 37-43.
- Fawcett, J. T. Psychology and population--Behavioral research issues in fertility and family planning. The Population Council, 1970.
- Fawcett, J. T. Attitude measures in KAP studies: An overview and critique. In Proceedings of a Conference on Psychological Measurement in the Study of Population Problems, Berkeley, University of California, 1971.
- Fawcett, J. T., & Bornstein, M. H. Modernization, individual modernity, and fertility. In J. T. Fawcett (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on population. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Feather, N. T. Some personality correlates of external control. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1967, 19, 253-260.

- Gough, H. Personality assessment in the study of population. In J. T. Fawcett (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on population. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Gough, H. G. An attitude profile for studies of population psychology. Journal of Research in Personality, 1975, 9, 122-135.
- Groat, H. T., & Meal, A. G. Social psychological correlates of urban fertility. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 945-959.
- Gustavus, S. D., & Henley, J. R. Correlates of voluntary childlessness in a select population. Social Biology, 1971, 18, 277-284.
- Hass, P. H. Wanted and unwanted pregnancies: A fertility decision making model. Journal of Social Issues, 1974, 30(4), 125-165.
- Hencken, A. Some childless marriages were planned that way. Winston-Salem Journal, 1972, 19, 103.
- Hoffman, L. W., & Hoffman, M. L. The value of children to parents. In J. T. Fawcett (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on population. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Hoffman, L. W., & Wyatt, F. Social change and motivations for having larger families: Some theoretical considerations. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 235-244.
- Joe, V. C. Review of the internal-external control construct as a personality variable. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28, 619-640.
- Kar, S. B. Individual aspirations as related to early and late acceptance of contraception. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 83, 235-245.
- Keller, A., Sims, J., Henry, W., & Crawford, T. Psychological sources of resistance to family planning. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1970, 16, 286-302.
- Kirk, R. E. Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1968.
- Kiser, C. V., & Whelpton, P. K. Summary of chief findings and implications for future studies. The Millbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 1958, 36, 282-329.
- Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, 1976.

- Lefcourt, H. M., Hogg, E., & Sordoni, C. Locus of control, field dependence and the conditions arousing objective versus subjective self awareness. Journal of Research in Personality, 1975, 9, 21-36.
- Lerner, B., Raskin, R., & Davis, E. On the need to be pregnant. International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1967, 48, 288-297.
- MacDonald, A. P., Jr. Internal-external locus of control and the practice of birth control. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 206.
- Mishler, E. G., Westoff, C. F., & Kelly, E. L. Some psychological correlates of differential fertility: A longitudinal study. American Psychologist, 1955, 10, 319.
- Nowicki, S., & Duke, M. A locus of control scale for non-college as well as college adults. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1974, 38, 136-137.
- Phares, E. J. Locus of control in personality. New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1976.
- Pohlman, E. Wanted and unwanted: Toward a less ambiguous definition. Eugenics Quarterly, 1965, 12, 19-27.
- Pohlman, E. The psychology of birth planning. Cambridge: Shenkman Publishing Company, 1969.
- Pohlman, E. Childlessness, intentional and unintentional: Psychological and social aspects. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1970, 151, 2-12.
- Pope, H., & Namboodini, N. K. Decisions regarding family size: Moral norms and the utility model of social choice. Research Previews, 1968, 15, 6-17.
- Rainwater, L. And the poor get children. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1960.
- Rainwater, L. Family design: Marital sexuality, family size and contraception. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
- Rossi, A. S. Status of women in graduate departments of sociology. The American Sociologist, 1968, 5(1), 1-12.
- Rotter, J. G. Social learning and clinical psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

- Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1966, 8, 1-27 (Whole No. 1).
- Ryan, L. Clinical interpretation of the FIRO-B. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1977.
- Scanzoni, H. Sex roles, life styles, and childbearing. New York: The Free Press, 1975.
- Schutz, W. C. FIRO -- A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958.
- Silverman, A., & Silverman, A. The case against having children. New York: David MacKay Co., Inc., 1971.
- Slosnerick, M. Psychological correlates of family planning by married adult couples. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 1416B. (University Microfilms, No. T 334, 0)
- Steinhoff, P. G., Smith, R. G., & Diamond, M. The Hawaii pregnancy, birth control and abortion study: Social-psychological aspects. In proceedings of a Conference on Psychological Measurement in the Study of Population Problems. Berkeley: University of California, 1971.
- Thompson, V. Family size: Implicit policies and assumed psychological outcomes. Journal of Social Issues, 1974, 30(4), 93-124.
- Thompson V. D., & Appelbaum, M. I. Social psychological approaches to studies of population issues. Paper presented at American Psychological Association, Washington, D. C., September, 1971.
- Veevers, J. E. The violation of fertility mores: Voluntary childlessness as deviant behavior. In C. Boydell, C. Grindstaff, & P. Whitehead (Eds.), Deviant behavior and societal reactions. Toronto: Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1972.
- Veevers, J. E. Voluntary childless wives: An exploratory study. Sociology and Social Research, 1973, 57, 356-366.
- Veevers, J. E. The parenthood prescription. Alternatives: Perspectives on society and environment, 1974, 3(3), 32-37.

Westoff, C. F., Potter, R. G., & Sagi, P. C. The third child: A study in the prediction of fertility. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Westoff, C. F., Potter, R. G., Sagi, P. C., & Mishler, E. G. Family growth in metropolitan America. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Westoff, C. F., & Potvin, R. H. College women and fertility values. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.

Whelpton, P. K., Campbell, A. A., & Patterson, J. E. Fertility and family planning in the United States. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1966.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC AND INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer as many of the following as possible. All answers will remain confidential.

1. Age: _____
2. What state were you brought up in: _____
3. Size of family you were raised in (including parent(s) and yourself): _____
4. Which parents were part of your family: Father _____ Mother _____ Both _____
5. Did your parents divorce: _____ If so, how old were you: _____
6. Father's occupation: _____ Stepfather's occupation: _____
7. Mother's occupation: _____ Stepmother's occupation: _____
8. Are you adopted: _____
9. Number of brothers: _____ Number of stepbrothers: _____
10. Number of sisters: _____ Number of stepsisters: _____
11. Number of adopted siblings: _____ Number of foster siblings: _____
12. While you were growing up was your family: very poor _____ poor _____ average _____
rich _____ very rich _____
13. Estimated ratio of father's income/mother's income: _____
14. Father's religious preference: Catholic _____ Protestant _____ None _____ Other _____
15. Mother's religious preference: Catholic _____ Protestant _____ None _____ Other _____
16. Your religious preference: Catholic _____ Protestant _____ None _____ Other _____
17. Your church attendance: regular _____ never _____
18. Region where major portion of grade school and high school years were spent:
Rural _____ Urban: 1000 or less _____ 1000-10,000 _____ 10,000-50,000 _____
50,000 or more _____ (in population figures)
19. Number of years spent out of school since high school: _____
20. Present status in school: Freshman-Sophomore _____ Junior-Senior _____ Graduate _____
21. Number of years spent in college to date: Full time _____ Part time _____
22. Academic Major(s) and Minor(s): _____
23. Occupational/Career Interests: _____
24. Type of (part time) job you are presently holding: _____
- XX. If you have never been married, skip to #31.
25. Marriage History: Number of years married to present spouse _____
Number of years you have lived together _____
Number of times married previously _____
Number of children you have had from previous marriages _____
Number in your custody _____
Number of children spouse had from previous marriages _____
Number in her custody _____
Is your spouse presently pregnant _____
26. Academic background of spouse: High school _____ Trade school _____ College _____
Graduate study _____ Other _____
27. Spouse's occupational/career interests: _____
28. Type of job spouse is presently holding: _____
29. Ratio of spouse's income/your present income (include all incomes): _____
30. Has your spouse had any miscarriages while you were married to her: _____
31. To the best of your knowledge, how many children have you fathered: _____
32. List any physical, emotional, or other problems you (or your spouse, if married) may need to consider in planning for children: _____

XX. If you are presently unmarried, complete items #32 through #36 and ignore 'spouse' references. Then skip to #42.

32. Desired or preferred number of children:
- | | You | | Spouse | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------|
| | boys | girls | boys | girls |
| In the first 20 years of marriage: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| In the first 10 years of marriage: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| In the first 5 years of marriage: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Certainty of response for you: | very sure | _____ | _____ | very unsure |
| Certainty of response for spouse: | very sure | _____ | _____ | very unsure |
33. a) In a few sentences, present reasons for your preferences in question #32:

b) To what degree is your preference influenced:

By your spouse:	alot	_____	_____	_____	_____	none
By your family and in-laws:	alot	_____	_____	_____	_____	none
By your friends:	alot	_____	_____	_____	_____	none
By society in general:	alot	_____	_____	_____	_____	none

34. Expected number of children:
- | | You | | Spouse | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------|--------|-------------|
| | boys | girls | boys | girls |
| In the first 20 years of marriage: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| In the first 10 years of marriage: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| In the first 5 years of marriage: | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Certainty of response for you: | very sure | _____ | _____ | very unsure |
| Certainty of response for spouse: | very sure | _____ | _____ | very unsure |

35. How many children do you plan to adopt: _____

36. a) If you desire one or more children, state the reason(s) you believe some people prefer childlessness: _____

b) If you desire no children, state the reason(s) you believe some people prefer children: _____

37. Do you and your spouse discuss preferences and feelings concerning having children: often _____ never _____

38. What type of contraception (birth control) do you and your spouse use:
 rhythm _____ condom _____ IUD _____ diaphragm _____ pill _____ uncertain _____
 sterilization (please state who) _____ other _____

39. Who usually initiates contraceptive protection: _____

40. Who is most dominant in your marriage relationship: _____

41. Who usually compromises most in your marriage relationship: _____

42. List other pertinent information concerning your preferences, expectations, abilities, ideas, etc. with respect to childbearing: (use back if necessary)

APPENDIX B

NOWICKI-DUKE INTERNAL-EXTERNAL
LOCUS OF CONTROL SCALE

Below, you will find a list of statements. We are interested in finding out people's reactions to these statements. After reading each statement you should answer either by circling the YES or the NO space provided on the sheet. If you agree with the statement you should mark the YES response, and if you do not agree you should mark the NO response. You should try to reply to each of the items. There are no right or wrong answers - - the correct response is the one which reflects your true belief.

- - -

1. Do you believe that most problems will solve themselves if you just don't fool with them? YES NO
2. Do you believe that you can stop yourself from catching a cold? YES NO
3. Are some people just born lucky? YES NO
4. Most of the time do you feel that getting good grades mean a great deal to you? YES NO
5. Are you often blamed for things that just aren't your fault? YES NO
6. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject? YES NO
7. Do you feel that most of the time it doesn't pay to try hard because things never turn out right anyway? YES NO
8. Do you feel that if things start out well in the morning that it is going to be a good day no matter what you do? YES NO
9. Do you feel that most of the time parents listen to what their children have to say? YES NO
10. Do you believe that wishing can make good things happen? YES NO
11. When you get punished does it usually seem it is for no good reason at all? YES NO
12. Most of the time do you find it hard to change a friend's "mind" or opinion? YES NO
13. Do you think that cheering more than luck helps a team to win? YES NO
14. Did you feel that it was nearly impossible to change your parent's mind about anything? YES NO

15. Do you believe that parents should allow children to make most of their own decisions? YES NO
16. Do you feel that when you do something wrong there's very little you can do to make it right? YES NO
17. Do you believe that most people are just born good at sports? YES NO
18. Are most of the other people your age stronger than you are? YES NO
19. Do you feel that you have a lot of choice in deciding whom your friends are? YES NO
20. Have you ever had a good luck charm? YES NO
21. Do you feel that one of the best ways to handle most problems is just not to think about them? YES NO
22. If you find a four-leaf clover do you believe that it might bring you good luck? YES NO
23. Did you often feel that whether or not you did your homework had much to do with what kind of grades you got? YES NO
24. Do you feel that when a person your age is angry at you, there is little you can do to stop him or her? YES NO
25. Do you believe that whether or not people like you depends on how you act? YES NO
26. Did your parents usually help you if you asked them to? YES NO
27. Have you felt that when people were angry with you it was usually for no reason at all? YES NO
28. Most of the time, do you feel that you can change what might happen tomorrow by what you do today? YES NO
29. Do you believe that when bad things are going to happen they just are going to happen no matter what you try to do to stop them? YES NO
30. Do you think that people can get their own way if they just keep trying? YES NO
31. Most of the time do you find it useless to try to get your own way at home? YES NO

32. Do you feel that when good things happen they happen because of hard work? YES NO
33. Do you feel that when somebody your age wants to be your enemy there is little you can do to change matters? YES NO
34. Do you feel that it is easy to get friends to do what you want them to? YES NO
35. Do you usually feel that you have little to say about what you get to eat at home? YES NO
36. Do you feel that when someone doesn't like you there is little you can do about it? YES NO
37. Did you usually feel that it was almost useless to try in school because most other children were just plain smarter than you were? YES NO
38. Are you the kind of person who believes that planning ahead makes things turn out better? YES NO
39. Most of the time, do you feel that you have little to say about what your family decides to do? YES NO
40. Do you think it is better to be smart than to be lucky? YES NO

APPENDIX C

FIRO-B INSTRUCTIONS

FIRO-B

William C. Schutz, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire is designed to explore the typical ways you interact with people. There are, of course, no right or wrong answers; each person has his own ways of behaving.

Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think a person should do. This is not what is wanted here. We would like to know how you actually behave.

Some items may seem similar to others. However, each item is different so please answer each one without regard to the others. There is no time limit, but do not debate long over any item.

CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGISTS PRESS, INC.

577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

FREQUENCY TABLES

TABLE III
VARIABLE FREQUENCY TABLE OF GROUP
BY RELIGION OF SUBJECT

FREQUENCY ROW % COLUMN %	CATHOLIC	PROTESTANT	OTHER	NONE
GROUP I	3 12.00 42.86	9 36.00 40.91	2 8.00 100.00	11 44.00 57.89
GROUP II	4 16.00 57.14	13 52.00 59.09	0 0.00 0.00	8 32.00 42.11
TOTAL	7 14.00	22 44.00	2 4.00	19 38.00

TABLE IV
VARIABLE FREQUENCY TABLE OF GROUP
BY RELIGION OF SUBJECT'S
PARENTS

FREQUENCY ROW % COLUMN %	BOTH CATHOLIC	BOTH PROTES- TANT	OTHER	MIXED	NONE
GROUP I	6 24.00 50.00	13 52.00 41.94	2 8.00 100.00	2 8.00 66.67	2 8.00 100.00
GROUP II	6 24.00 50.00	18 72.00 58.06	0 0.00 0.00	1 4.00 33.33	0 0.00 0.00
TOTAL	12 24.00	31 62.00	2 4.00	3 6.00	2 4.00

TABLE V
VARIABLE FREQUENCY TABLE OF GROUP
BY COMMUNITY SIZE

FREQUENCY ROW % COLUMN %	- 1000	1,000 - 10,000	10,000 - 50,000	+ 50,000
GROUP I	2 8.00 40.00	5 20.00 50.00	10 40.00 58.82	8 32.00 44.44
GROUP II	3 12.00 60.00	5 20.00 50.00	7 28.00 41.18	10 40.00 55.56
TOTAL	5 10.00	10 20.00	17 34.00	18 36.00

TABLE VI
VARIABLE FREQUENCY TABLE OF GROUP
BY MARITAL STATUS

FREQUENCY ROW % COLUMN %	SINGLE	MARRIED
GROUP I	18 72.00 50.00	7 28.00 50.00
GROUP II	18 72.00 50.00	7 28.00 50.00
TOTAL	36 72.00	14 28.00

VITA²

Ian Timothy Birky

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PERSONALITY VARIABLES RELATING TO THE CHILDBEARING
PREFERENCES OF YOUNG MALE ADULTS

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lincoln, Nebraska, January 25,
1952, the son of Mr. and Ms. Ezra R. Birky.

Education: Graduated from Flathead High School, Kalispell, Montana, in May, 1970; received the Associate Arts degree from Hesston College, Hesston, Kansas, in April, 1972; received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Natural Science from Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, in May, 1974; attended the Associated Mennonite Biblical Seminary in Elkhart, Indiana, from 1974 to 1975; enrolled in the Master of Science program in Clinical Psychology at Oklahoma State University in 1977; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in Psychology in July, 1979.

Professional Experience: Student Counselor at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana, 1974-1975; Psychiatric Associate at Prairie View Mental Health Center, Newton, Kansas, 1975-1977; Teaching Assistant, Department of Psychology, Oklahoma State University, 1977-1979; Psychological Associate at Langston University, Langston, Oklahoma, 1978-1979; Psychological Associate at Psychological Services Center, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1977-1979.