

THE ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE YOUTH AT OKLAHOMA  
STATE UNIVERSITY CONCERNING THE  
PARENTHOOD ROLE

By

LIZABETH TULLY THOMAS  
//

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1975

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  
December, 1976

Thesis  
1974  
T4585a  
cop.2



THE ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE YOUTH AT OKLAHOMA  
STATE UNIVERSITY CONCERNING THE  
PARENTHOOD ROLE

Thesis Approved:

*Atthea Wright*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Francis Stromberg*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Nick Stinnett*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman J. Durham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

968402

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Althea Wright whose guidance, helpful suggestions, and personal concern enabled me to complete this thesis under a rushed time schedule. I also wish to thank Dr. Nick Stinnett and Dr. Frances Stromberg for their creative suggestions and readiness to help in the preparation of this study.

An undertaking such as this involves many people and I am indebted to all of them: to the respondents who participated in the study; to Kay Murphy, Lois Mickle, Dr. Nick Stinnett, and Dr. Charles Edgley for allowing me to use their classes to collect my data; to JoAnn and Richard Wall who keypunched my data; and to my typist, Mrs. Anna Gleason, for her accurate typing and knowledge of thesis format.

My greatest appreciation and love is extended to my husband, Trey, and my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clarence L. Tully, whose love, encouragement, and financial assistance enabled me to complete this goal, and most especially to Jesus Christ, who makes every day a bright and exciting new adventure, who has given me a great capacity to strive for a happy, healthy home, and who has made the ultimate difference in my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of Problem . . . . .	1
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	5
II. SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	8
Career Paths . . . . .	9
Social Pressures . . . . .	11
Pronatalism . . . . .	13
Effects of Children on Marital Satisfaction . . . . .	16
Parenthood as a Crisis . . . . .	18
Symbolic Importance Attributed to Adoption . . . . .	19
Supportive Ideologies Relating to Feminism . . . . .	20
Summary . . . . .	22
III. PROCEDURE . . . . .	25
Selection of Subjects . . . . .	25
Development of the Instrument . . . . .	26
Administration of Instrument . . . . .	27
Analysis of Data . . . . .	27
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	31
Description of Subjects . . . . .	31
Examination of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results . . . . .	54
V. SUMMARY . . . . .	76
Discussion . . . . .	79
Limitations . . . . .	81
Areas of Possible Future Study . . . . .	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	82
APPENDIX - QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN RESEARCH . . . . .	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects . . . . .	32
II. Family Background Characteristics of the Subjects . .	36
III. Responses to General Personality Characteristics . .	43
IV. Responses to Stinnett's Life Philosophy Scale . . . .	48
V. Responses to Societal and Personal Attitudes Toward Childlessness . . . . .	51
VI. Mean Rankings of the Priorities . . . . .	54
VII. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in Sex of the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope- To-Remain-Childless Group . . . . .	55
VIII. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Religious Preferences of the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Group . . .	57
IX. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Religious Involvement of the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Group . . .	58
X. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Intactness of the Parents' Marriage of the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To- Remain-Childless Group . . . . .	60
XI. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in Socio-Economic Status of the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Group . . .	61
XII. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Father-Child Relationships of the Hope-To- Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain Childless Group . . . . .	63

Table	Page
XIII. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Happiness of Childhood of the Hope-To-Be-Parents and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Groups . . . . .	63
XIV. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Group Regarding the Combination of Career and Motherhood of the Women . . . . .	66
XV. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Group Regarding the Influence of Family Members on the Decision to Have or Not to Have Children . . . . .	67
XVI. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences Between the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain-Childless Group concerning Their General Personality Characteristics . . . . .	69
XVII. Mann-Whitney U: Life Philosophy Classified by Optimism vs. Pessimism, Self-Determination vs. Fatalism and Belief-in-God vs. Atheism . . . . .	71
XVIII. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain Childless Group Regarding Sources of Disapproval for Remaining Childless . . . . .	72
XIX. Chi-Square Value Reflecting Differences in the Hope-To-Be-Parents Group and the Hope-To-Remain Childless Group Regarding Social Value of Childlessness . . . . .	73
XX. Mean Rankings of Time Priorities . . . . .	75

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of Problem

There is concern in the United States today regarding the idealized visual images of maternity presented to girls and young women. The single woman is often urged to marry and the married woman is urged to have children. Students of the family have generally tended to accept the dominant cultural values that married couples should have children and should want to have them (Veevers, 1971). Childless couples have either been completely ignored, or have received relatively little attention to any publications. Most family textbooks do not touch in the phenomenon of childlessness at all (Kirkendall, 1968). When childlessness is discussed, it is generally in terms of involuntary childlessness.

To be considered a true American family, many people feel that a married couple must have children. Concern for world conditions and population growth has led to a decrease in the number of children per family. But, as Stroup (1966) suggests, children have always been a natural part of the family. Men, as well as women, experience pro-natalist or "pro-birth" pressures. They may have to cope with flippant remarks about their virility, be handicapped by not having a "family man" image, and may experience pressures by not having a son to carry on the "family name."



There are indications, however, that today many couples may wish to remain childless voluntarily. There is very little known about the reasons for couples choosing to refrain from playing the "parent" role or their reasons for wanting children. Hobart (1973) has found three major changes which have influenced individual's attitudes toward parenthood: (1) widespread concern for rapid growth of world population; (2) growth of the Women's Liberation Movement; and (3) effective means of birth control.

Obviously, the parent role is not suitable for everyone. Through the media, people worldwide are now aware of the famines, droughts, and disease which are present throughout the world. Even the so-called "educated" countries have rising statistics in abandonment, child abuse, and divorce. The culmination of the above factors cause many individuals to question the motivations of wanting to have children.

The second change, the Women's Liberation Movement has brought about a transition in the female role. Traditionally, the female role was that of wife, mother, and homemaker. Cox (1974), after careful examination of home economics texts, found widespread assumption that all women will become wives and mothers. Franzwa (1974) found in women's magazines that the housewife-mother career is portrayed as the best of all careers, and that a childless woman has wasted her life. However, the Women's Liberation Movement has opened females' eyes to the fact that there are various role choices.

As birth control means are now more readily available, voluntary childlessness is a possible option. Although many persons in today's society will consider it "abnormal" or "degrading" if a woman doesn't choose to become a mother, much public opinion supports the belief that a woman can have a satisfactory life without having had children.

The increase in articles and books concerning the childfree alternative points out the need for more research on childlessness. Peck and Sanderowitz's Pronatalism, The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie (1974) is being used in a college sociology class on the Oklahoma State University campus. The book points out the fact that childlessness may be a possibility for women.

An organization, founded in 1972, has a goal of helping to eliminate societal biases against the childless and promotes the cause of non-parenthood. This organization, National Organization for Non-Parents (N.O.N.) has more than 43 chapters across the United States today.

Census figures reflect a decline in the number of children per family (United States Department of Commerce, 1973, 1974b) on the average from 3.38 in 1968 to 2.97 in 1974. The size of the American family is decreasing.

As one turns on the television set during the day, pronatalist commercial messages keep flashing across the screen, as suggested by Peck (1974). Large families seem to be used to sell products for advertisers. Notable among the many such commercials viewed by Peck were St. Joseph's Aspirin ("I'm Alice Cook. I have six children, and they come in all shapes and sizes. So do their colds."); Cold Power ("Mrs. Ray Dennison has four kids, and endless laundry"); Rain Barrel ("Anita Scheem has a growing family. She does 14 loads of laundry per week"); Ruffles Potato Chips ("I have a large family and nine grandchildren"); and Hour After Hour Deodorant ("I have four kids and I really need it").

The cumulative effect of such pronatalist presentations in the media works at counter purpose to population awareness, by creating the feeling that having many children is still regarded casually; it may mean that you need a little extra laundry power or more deodorant, but there is no suggestion that such a choice to have children carries any implication for the larger society. One may also notice that within each of the above commercials, the family always seems to live in a large, comfortable home, have ample, expensive-looking clothing, and there is always enough food for everyone, not to mention a new car as well.

Past research findings seem to agree that motherhood is the major role of women, particularly young women, and that motherhood is a confining role. The fact is that individuals no longer automatically need to have children (Gould, 1974). Veivers (1971) contends that more research is needed to examine certain relationships of married couples such as the females' role in the home, and the quality of the couples marriage relationships. The above factors could be a motivating influence in an individual's decision not to have children. Although some work has been done in the area of voluntary childlessness, there has been very little scientific investigation of the motivating factors involved in the choice of remaining without children. To determine the attitudes of college age students concerning childlessness and to attempt to identify some reasons behind the childless choice is the purpose for which the present study was designed.

### Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are:

- A. To develop an instrument for measuring the attitudes and values of college youth toward the parenthood role and to determine if students who prefer to become parents differ from those who plan to remain childless in the following areas:
  - (a) Demographic characteristics
  - (b) Family background characteristics
  - (c) Personality characteristics
  - (d) Life philosophies
- B. To divide a selected group of students into two subgroups-- those who hope to become parents and those who hope to remain childless.
- C. To compare the two subgroups with regard to the following characteristics:
  - (a) Sex
  - (b) Age
  - (c) Race
  - (d) Education completed
  - (e) Conservatism (according to self-report)
  - (f) Religious preference
  - (g) Current religious involvement (according to self-report)
- D. To compare the two subgroups with regard to the following family background characteristics as reported by the subjects:
  - (a) Intactness of parent's marriage
  - (b) Employment of mother during major portion of childhood

- (c) Socio-economic status of family of orientation
  - (d) Quality of mother-child relationship
  - (e) Quality of father-child relationship
  - (f) Happiness of childhood
  - (g) Happiness of parent's marriage
  - (h) Happiness of own marriage (if married)
  - (i) Main source of discipline
  - (j) Discipline received from mother
  - (k) Discipline received from father
- E. To compare the two subgroups with regard to the following factors:
- (a) Perception of a woman's ability to combine a career and motherhood
  - (b) Career expectations of the respondent
  - (c) Influence of family members on the decision to have or not to have children
  - (d) Influence of other factors in determining attitudes toward marriage and parenting
- F. To compare the two subgroups with regard to scores on the following subtests in the instrument:
- (a) General personality characteristics
  - (b) Optimism vs. Pessimism Life Philosophy
  - (c) Self-determination vs. Fatalism Life Philosophy
  - (d) Belief-in-God vs. Atheism Life Philosophy

- G. To compare the two subgroups with regard to the subjects' reports of the following:
- (a) Societal sources of pressure
  - (b) Commitment to childlessness
  - (c) Personal value of childlessness
  - (d) Reasons for the childless choice
- H. To compare the two subgroups with regard to which types of activities they feel are most important in the use of their time.

## CHAPTER II

### SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In discussing childlessness, one must discriminate between voluntary childless couples and involuntary childless couples. The voluntarily childless couple is one who chooses to remain void of children, many through voluntary sterilization. Involuntary childless couples are individuals who want to have children and cannot, usually due to some physical impairment. In examining previous research, one must remember that there is a great lack of research concerning voluntary childless individuals. When childlessness is discussed, it is usually in terms of the involuntary childless. Students of the family have generally tended to accept the dominant cultural values that married couples should have children and should want to have them. As a result of this value bias, although parenthood (especially voluntary parenthood) has been extensively studied, the phenomenon of childlessness has been virtually ignored (Veevers, 1974b).

According to Veevers (1974a) there are four ways in which to look at childlessness: (1) The career paths whereby women come to be voluntarily childless, (2) the social pressures associated with that decision, (3) the symbolic importance attributed to the possibility of adoption, and (4) the relevance of supportive ideologies relating to concern with feminism, and with population problems.

## Career Paths

Out of the many socio-economic factors, such as religion, socio-economic status, rural-urban residence, levels of education, occupation, etc., occupation seems to be a most influential factor. Nam (1968) found that blue-collar workers' wives expected seven per cent more births than the wives of white collar workers. Blake (1969) contends that the employment of women outside of the home is a determining factor which is most likely to positively influence a desire for a small family. Pohlman (1970) found that the wives who contemplate childlessness typically have occupational, educational, or some other appealing role in mind, and for them children would prevent or cut down on these and other activities. Fathers, to a lesser degree, may find their careers and avocational lives restricted by parenthood.

LeMasters (1970) has found the father's occupation may impose stress on family life. These stresses may be related to long hours, absence from home, strains and tensions at the office, financial reverses, and so forth.

Although it is usually presumed that "hard times" and hard times alone gave rise to the unprecedented number of childfree marriages during the depression years, Popenoe (1936) reported two reasons for childlessness: these he called "self-centered" and "wife's career." The "wife's career" he states covers those cases in which the wife gave up maternity to work, not because she needed the money but because she preferred the outside occupation and did not want to interrupt it.

Gustavus and Henley (1971) found that several of the couples they interviewed mentioned deep or time-consuming involvement with



careers which would make child rearing inconvenient. Typical of this kind of comment, made by 17 per cent of the above sample, is the following:

Before my wife and I were married seven years ago, we both expressed our desires to have no children, so that we could do justice to our work, unhindered. We both have jobs and come home at night to our hobbies (p. 292).

Whelpton, Campbell and Patterson (1966) found that wives differed less with respect to number of children wanted than with the actual number expected when grouped into other socio-economic indicators such as education, occupation, husband's income and size of place of residence. The two strongest associations were (1) the wife's educational attainment and the ability to control family size and (2) the wife's work experience and fertility. By the time of the 1960 survey of the above authors, the wives who had worked after their marriage had fewer births than those women who had not worked. The working wives also expected a significantly smaller completed family (Whelpton et al., 1966).

Nam (1968) has found that levels of education, level of income, occupation, religion, socio-economic status, rural-urban residence, and whether or not the wife works no longer seems to be as influential in determining family size. In contrast, Gustavus and Henley (1971) found that both childless men and women have higher occupational status than the heads of families in 1960. They also found that the childless couples showed a much higher educational attainment, and other characteristics which might be associated with hedonism including career commitments, style of life, and economic desires.

Veevers (1971) found that the childless women had not experienced successful mothering combined with a career and were highly doubtful about such a venture succeeding. As many would expect, many liberated women would heartily endorse the combination of motherhood and a career.

In Popenoe's (1936) informal study of why some adults were motivated not to have children, only 22 per cent chose the wife's career as a motivation for childlessness, while 31 per cent chose self-centeredness as their first choice. Popenoe's research coincides with the findings of Rainwater (1965) who found that the childless individuals were usually stereotyped as selfish, self-centered, and infantile (Pohlman, 1970; LeMasters, 1970).

#### Social Pressures

Rainwater (1965) found the image of the deliberately childless woman described as either totally self-involved, neurotic, or in poor health. Rainwater found that the tendency to regard the small family or the couple who wanted no children as selfish was practically universal. The woman with three or more children was held in high regard and was seen to be kind and loving. Those who choose childlessness are only about one per cent of the number of married and are often made to feel selfish, unwelcome, and maladjusted (Rainwater, 1965).

Even 60 years ago, Hollingworth (1916) felt that society had devices that subtly forced women to bear and rear children. She contended that law, education, religion, and the media all portrayed women as having only one alternative in life--that of motherhood.

She viewed these as social devices which impelled women to become mothers and want to become mothers.

Parents wishing to be grandparents seem to be one source of pressure (Rainwater, 1965). From his data, Rainwater abstracts one central norm: "that one shouldn't have more children than one can support, but one should have as many children as one can afford" (p. 150).

In a study of both male and female Cornell students, Goldsen, Rosenberg, Williams, and Suchman (1960) found that the coeds had almost universally accepted motherhood as a pre-condition for any other activity. However, the development of contraception--especially the pill--has greatly altered the conditions under which young college men and women consider non-marital relationships.

Pohlman (1974b) conducted a study over a five-year period from 1965 to 1970 which indicated a rise in both the number of college students intending to remain nonparents and a corresponding change in attitude toward others who hold this preference. Hobart (1973) found in a study of Canadian English and French speaking and trade school students, that the influence of traditionalism on family size has declined.

Maxwell and Montgomery (1969) studied the attitudes of 96 white, married, females toward the desirability of having children early in marriage. Previous research indicated a somewhat traditional view, that children should be born early in marriage. In the above author's study the desires of these young women were toward delayed parenthood. Only about five per cent of all couples voluntarily forego parenthood (Veever, 1974b) and this minority group has been

characterized by attitudes and behaviors which many people feel are socially unacceptable. A survey of high school students in a California community showed that 17.2 per cent of those responding intend to be non-parents (Radl, 1973).

Peck (1971) found that although no conclusive evidence is available, testimonials as well as informal interviews in the popular press would seem to suggest that childless couples are subject to a considerable degree of social pressure to have children. Pohlman and Pohlman (1969) have estimated that not over one to two per cent of contemporary marriages in the United States remain intentionally childless.

Some religions contain some social pressures toward parenthood. The Roman Catholic church states that a marriage should be contracted with the intent of having children and if the couples remain childless by choice that the marriage is not valid in the eyes of God. Whelpton et al. (1966) found that Catholics expected 28 per cent more children than Protestants and 48 per cent more than Jews.

#### Pronatalism

Peck and Senderowitz (1974) have defined pronatalism as "any attitude or policy that is 'pro-birth,' that encourages reproduction, that exalts a role of parenthood" (p. 1). Pronatalism, as a facet of social pressure to become parents, is as evident today as it was fifty years ago.

A key element in pronatalist thought is the age-old idea that women's role must involve maternity--that woman's destiny and fulfillment are closely wedded to the natal, or birth experience (Peck and

Senderowitz (1974). Pronatalism seems to deny or at least limit free choice to individuals, while existing at all stages of life.

Franzwa (1974) and Peck (1974) reported that the fiction of many women's magazines portray women in the stereotyped female role of housewife and mother. Peck (1971) reported that commercials, as well as day-time soap operas, all idealize family situations--father-son, mother-daughter relationships. Families are being used to sell products by portraying problems of parenthood being solved by using a certain product. Sentimentalized images of children, as well as pregnancy, are also used to sell various products.

Cox (1974) also found pronatal influences in home economics texts in many junior high schools. She identified the following criteria in identifying pronatalism in textbooks:

1. Inevitability of parenthood assumed;
2. Childfree lifestyles and/or marriages not acknowledged;
3. Childfree marriages treated as problematic or undesirable;
4. Adherence to theories of maternal instinct or maternity as central to women's life;
5. Bias against abortion, adoption, or the only child;
6. Failure, when appropriate, to discuss methods of contraception (p. 99).

Peck and Senderowitz (1974) contend "that to be considered a true family, a married couple must have children" (p. 5). If we were to examine wedding ceremonies, we would find that many do indeed include passages which encourage childbearing. These ceremonies provide an index to social expectation and evaluation.

The traditional American life is the character of expected loyalties. The American people are encouraged to care about nation and community, but most importantly to care about their "family" unit

and children. It still remains true that the man who is a "good family man" or "good provider" for his children is excused from a great deal of faults of character in other areas.

In Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie (Peck and Senderowitz, 1974) all the contributing writers have concluded that there is evidence of pronatalism throughout the United States. Veevers (1971, 1974a, 1974b), LeMasters (1970), Rainwater (1965) and Pohlman (1970) have previously indicated that social pressures exist which encourage parenthood.

There seem to be four prominent issues which relate to the central theme of pronatalism (Peck and Senderowitz, 1974):

1. The existence of pronatalism per se;
2. The increasing recognition that motives for parenthood are individual, not universal;
3. The effects that parenthood can have on personality and identity;
4. The emergence of a 'childfree by choice' alternative lifestyle (p. 6).

Pronatalism poses a threat to true self-determination for women, and by making pronatalism more widely recognized individuals can become aware that they may have many more options open to them during their lifetime other than becoming parents.

The voluntary childless report themselves as feeling very isolated (Veevers, 1971). During an interview which Veevers conducted, many childless women reported they had never heard nor seen voluntary childlessness discussed in any mass media.

The collected writings in Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie (Peck and Senderowitz, 1974) have harbored several innovative suggestions:

1. That parenthood is neither an inevitability nor a universally desirable condition nor a prerequisite to a full life--but a vocation for which only some of us are suited, by aptitude or choice;
2. That serious biases exist at all levels of society against those who choose not to become parents;
3. That there is a strong and heretofore unquestioned social force which has produced both the universal-parenthood ideal and its attendant discriminations. This social force is called pronatalism (p. 9).

### Effects of Children on Marital Satisfaction

In a study conducted by Feldman (1965) it was suggested that childless couples tend to enjoy more satisfactory marital relationships than their peer counterparts who have children. On the basis of data from a number of contradictory studies, it seems evident that the presence or absence of children per se is not consistently related to good or bad marital adjustment (Udry, 1966). Blake (1974) feels that

. . . childlessness makes possible a fuller expression of human individuality and diversity and allows a diversion of resources from reproduction which may help to resolve social problems that are currently engendered by pronatalist constraints (p. 66).

Freedom for the development of individual potentials may be greatly enhanced by the freedom to choose whether or not each individual will become a parent.

Chester (1974) found there is a common persistent belief that there is a relationship between childlessness and marriage breakdown. He believes that a more refined analysis than is currently available is needed. Chester (1974) also believes that previous deductions from official statistics have been incautious, and that by some use of

legal terminology these statistics create a large fertility differential.

Pohlman (1970) believes that children may make it difficult for husbands and wives to find time and energy for real communication and in other ways interfere with the marriage relationship. Ryder (1973) found in his study of the relationship between marital satisfaction and children that the wives who have children reported more often that their husbands do not pay enough attention to them. Figley (1973) also found the same correlation relating to marital satisfaction. A decrease in marital communication and marital adjustment was found during the childbearing period of the reported marriages. A low point in the reported marital relationships was also noted as the couples' children began to leave home.

Feldman (1965) concluded that couples with an infant were significantly less satisfied with their marriages than the childless. He concluded that parenthood had a ". . . pervasive influence on marriage, which continues during the life cycle when children are still at home" (p. 224). LeMasters (1970) found that many people do indeed believe folklore about parenthood. Parents are led to believe a romanticized version about the truth of parenthood. According to LeMasters (1970) people tend to believe:

1. That rearing children is fun;
2. That children are sweet and cute;
3. That children will turn out well if they have good parents;
4. That girls are harder to rear than boys;
5. That today's parents are not as good as those of yesterday;
6. That childbearing today is easier because of modern appliances, child psychology, and so on;
7. That children today really appreciate all the advantages their parents are able to give them;



8. That the hard work of rearing children is justified by the fact that we are going to make a better world;
9. The sex education myth: that children won't get into trouble if they have been told the facts of life;
10. There are no bad children--only bad parents (p. 18).

### Parenthood as a Crisis

LeMasters (1963) investigated the various effects of the addition of the first child to the family. LeMasters found that many American parents--especially middle-class parents seem to experience some incompatibility between their parental roles and other roles. Both husbands and wives reported feelings of loss at being tied down with the baby and thus being less free to do other customary things together.

LeMasters (1963) concluded that:

One can see that these couples were not trained for parenthood, that practically nothing in school, or out of school, got them ready to be fathers and mothers--husbands and wives, yes, but not parents (p. 200).

LeMasters (1963) also hypothesized that the birth of a couple's first child would be a critical event. In his study of 46 middle-class couples, he reported evidence which supported the hypothesis. There were 83 per cent of the couples who reported an "extensive" or "severe" crisis in adjusting to the birth of their first child.

In a study of points of transition in the family life cycle, Feldman (1974) reported that the advent of the first child was a critical period. Parents in his study who had infants only were more resentful and had more arguments than parents in any other stage of the family life cycle. Dyer (1963), essentially replicating LeMasters' study, reported that 52 per cent of the 32 couples who participated in

his study experienced "extensive" crises after the birth of their first child. LeMasters (1963), Dyer (1963, and Hobbs (1965) concluded in three similar studies that parenthood does constitute a crisis. LeMasters defined a crisis as "any sharp or decisive change for which old patterns are inadequate" (p. 353).

#### Symbolic Importance Attributed to Adoption

A recurrent theme in discussions with childless wives is that of adoption (Veevers, 1974a). Many voluntary childless wives mentioned that in the past, they had considered adopting a child, and that they may still consider the possibility at some future date. There seems to be the lack of serious thought about adoption as a real possibility as reflected in the fact that generally the voluntary childless wives had not considered even such elementary questions as whether they would prefer an infant or an older child, or whether they would prefer a boy or girl.

Many voluntary childless females forego the actual birth process and consider adoption because of the fear of the actual birth process, perceived health costs, weight and figure changes, varicose veins, general wear and tear on the body, and the fear of loss of their beauty.

As of 1963 about 120,000 children were being adopted annually in the United States (United States Department of Commerce, 1971). Of this reported number almost one-half (47 per cent) were adopted by relatives, and only about two out of every 100 children in our society are reportedly reared by adoptive parents (LeMasters, 1970).

For the voluntarily childless, the importance of the recurrent theme of adoption appears to lie in its symbolic value rather than in the real possibility of procuring a child by this means and thereby altering one's life style. This symbolic importance is twofold: the reaffirmation of normalcy; and the avoidance of irreversible decisions.

LeMasters (1970) found that adoptive parents are seen to have several advantages, however, over biological parents:

1. They get to choose their child;
2. Adoptive parents are voluntary parents;
3. Adoptive parents have a probation period and can return the child if necessary (p. 171).

For the above reasons, many individuals may feel that the role of adoptive parents may be less complex and less fraught with disaster. The evidence seems to indicate that the greater majority of adoptions in our society turn out reasonably well for both the child and the adoptive parents (LeMasters, 1970). Whether this can be said for biological parenthood in our society may be debatable.

#### Supportive Ideologies Relating to Feminism

The voluntarily childless individual seems to be unaware of the number of other individuals who share his world view. Especially among urban and well-educated middle class couples, voluntary childlessness is not a relative rate phenomenon (Veever, 1974b). The Zero Population Growth Movement has provided a supportive rationale indicating that one is not necessarily being socially irresponsible and neglectful if one does not procreate.

Stolka and Barnett (1969) found evidence that childbearing was considered a major role for a woman. With the emergence of the Women's Liberation Movement, and other feminist's movements, many women are becoming more aware that now they each have a choice, whether to forego the parenthood role or to continue in the "motherhood myth" (Rollin, 1970). Rollin describes the motherhood myth as: "the idea of having babies is something that all normal women instinctively want and need and will enjoy doing" (p. 147).

Rollin (1970) believes that if motherhood isn't instinctive, when, and why, then was the motherhood myth born? Rollin reports that until recently, the entire question of maternal motivation was academic. "Sex, like it or not, meant babies" (p. 149).

Deutsch (1945) in reference to involuntarily childless women, feels that the female receives "severe injury to her femininity" and that the couples without children experience frustrations (p. 175). Deutsch believes that the inability to have a child is much more difficult for the woman since the woman's sexual life is thought to be inseparable from that of being a mother.

Recently, many feminist writers are challenging the role of women as always being mother, nursemaid, school-crossing guard, etc. Greer (1971) believes that a woman seeking alternative modes of life is no longer morally bound to pay her debt to nature. Greer believes that couples seem to have a choice today whether to become parents, instead of having children for all the wrong reasons. The Female Eunuch (Greer, 1971) is one such book which challenges the steretyped role of women.

Greene (1963) refuses to be influenced by negative reactions to her decision to remain childfree. As she states:

Femininity is the acceptance, appreciation and enjoyment of being a woman. Motherhood is only a part of it. The complete woman is also devoted wife, lover, playmate, buffer, a man's stimulant and tranquilizer; a creator (in the kitchen if not at the easel or typewriter), an active mind, an unfettered human being involved in activities and causes and battles beyond the boundaries of a particular plot of crabgrass (p. 264).

Greene (1963) states that there is now a choice for individuals and that each couple should be permitted to make a decision, whether to have children or to remain childless, without social pressures.

#### Summary

Voluntary childless women have been negatively stereotyped by most Americans as supported by the review of literature. This type of stereotyping is unfortunate for there are so many couples who are very wise in making the decision to remain childless.

There are many reported factors which seem to be influential factors concerning fertility: (1) sex; (2) religious orientation; (3) religious preference; (4) combination of motherhood and career; (5) parents' marital status during childhood; (6) socio-economic status; (7) age at marriage; and (8) world and economic conditions.

Gustavus and Henley (1971) contend that the lack of attention given to the voluntary childless couple and to the childless couple in general, probably stems from several factors. First, the phenomenon of childlessness, whether voluntary or involuntary, is rare. With increasingly effective means of contraception available, with abortion laws undergoing examination and change, and with increasing concern

with the growing population, this trend seems to be reversing itself.

Secondly, the neglected study of voluntary childless couples may be a result of the tendency to view childlessness as just another quantitative state of parity. It would seem that there are important childless and parenthood states, since those individuals who are presently childless are in violation of the statistics and social norm to have children.

Finally, if the above problems were to be ignored or deemed not prohibitive, the design of a systematic study of voluntary childless couples is a formidable task. Where are such couples to be found? How can the researcher be sure that the childlessness is voluntary?

Gustavus and Henley (1971) found that the voluntary childless couples showed a much higher educational attainment. Gustavus and Henley (1971) found that 62 per cent of the childless husbands in their study had college degrees or some type of professional training; that the average couple lived in a large metropolitan area; that the couples were about 30 years of age; that they had no religion; they were generally of a high socio-economic status; and that the couple was usually using some method of birth control, usually the pill. With social scientists questioning the instinctual drive to become a parent, we now have learned that the desire for parenthood is largely thought to be learned through socialization processes (Pohlman, 1970).

It should be noted that Veever's (1974a) found that there still exists a negative stereotype concerning the characteristics of voluntarily childless women. The voluntarily childless woman is

thought to be "abnormal, selfish, immoral, irresponsible, immature, unhappy, unfulfilled and non-feminine" (p. 300).

As Pohlman and Pohlman (1969) state:

If the childless are believed to be unhappy, selfish, lonely, emotionally unstable, and immature, then perhaps some people have children in order to avoid such negative traits and/or negative images (p. 308).

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were 279 male and female students from Oklahoma State University. The students were members of various college classes. Permission was granted from teachers of the Family Relations and Child Development 3143 Marriage classes to collect information from their students in each section of the marriage course. Dr. Charles Edgley, Sociology Professor at Oklahoma State University also granted permission for data to be collected in his classes. He allowed data to be collected in two of his Sociology 1113 classes which is an introductory Sociology class. There are 22 sections of this course. He also granted permission to collect data in two Sociology 4990 classes. This is a course in the Sociology of Death and Dying of which there are four sections. Data was collected in Dr. Edgley's sections only.

In an attempt to get a larger sample, permission was gained from Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor of Family Relations and Child Development, to collect data in his class on Research Methods in Family Relations and Child Development (FRCD 5783), of which there is only one section. The reason for including the various classes was the fact that a large sample was needed in order to get enough individuals



who did hope to be parents in the future. A total of 325 questionnaires were collected, but 46 were not useable because these respondents were undecided about the parenthood decision.

#### Development of the Instrument

The questionnaire was developed by gathering ideas of other researchers. Martin (1975) had developed an instrument assessing attitudes toward parenthood prior to this research, and many of her ideas were used in the instrument.

Stinnett (1975) devised the Life Philosophies Scale which was included as a part of the instrument. A list of personality characteristics in which the respondents rate themselves on the characteristics was included from Wright (1972). Questions concerning ranking of time priorities, choice of life style the respondents preferred for the future, and other questions concerning attitudes toward the parenthood role were developed by the researcher.

The questionnaire gathered information concerning background characteristics of the individual, family background characteristics, personality characteristics and life philosophies. The questionnaire was composed primarily of fixed-alternative questions. The questionnaire also contained open-ended questions designed to obtain the individual views and attitudes of the respondents in the sample.

The respondents were asked to rate certain aspects of their own behavior and personality characteristics on a three-point continuum of "more than average," "average," and "less than average." The characteristics to be rated were 25 personality traits that are frequently used to describe personal behavior (Wright, 1972). On

Stinnett's scale the respondent was asked to circle the degree to which he agreed or disagreed with nine proverbs or sayings about life. The Life Philosophies Scale included: (1) Optimism vs. Pessimism Life Philosophy; (2) Self-determination vs. Fatalism Life Philosophy; (3) Belief-in-God vs. Atheism Life Philosophy. Martin (1975) found that Stinnett's Life Philosophy Scale (1975) was reliable by using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient. An item analysis revealed that all of the items in each of the scales were discriminating between those scoring in the top quartile and those scoring in the bottom quartile on the basis of the total scores.

#### Administration of Instrument

The instrument was distributed to the college students during two regularly scheduled Sociology 1113 and 4990 classes, four regularly scheduled FRCD 3143 classes, and one regularly scheduled FRCD 5783 class. The students were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it as soon as they had completed the task. The students filled out the questionnaire during class and the researcher was present during that time in the classroom. The researcher collected each questionnaire as it was completed by the respondent.

#### Analysis of Data

The McGuire-White Index of Socio-Economic Status (1955) was used to determine the socio-economic status of each of the subjects. The chi-square test for two independent groups was utilized to determine if differences existed in the group which hope to remain childless and the group which hope to become parents in the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to the following characteristics:
  - (a) Sex
  - (b) Age
  - (c) Race
  - (d) Education completed
  - (e) Conservatism
  - (f) Religious preference
  - (g) Current religious involvement
  
2. There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to the following family background characteristics:
  - (a) Intactness of parent's marriage
  - (b) Employment of mother during major portion of childhood
  - (c) Socio-economic status of family of orientation
  - (d) Quality of mother-child relationship
  - (e) Quality of father-child relationship
  - (f) Happiness of childhood
  - (g) Happiness of parent's marriage
  - (h) Happiness of own marriage (if married)
  - (i) Main source of discipline
  - (j) Discipline received from mother
  - (k) Discipline received from father

3. There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to the following factors:
- (a) Perception of a woman's ability to combine a career and motherhood
  - (b) Career expectations of the respondent
  - (c) Influence of family members on the decision to have or not to have children
  - (d) Influence of other factors in determining attitudes toward marriage and parenting

4. There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to the following:

- (a) General personality characteristics

The Mann Whitney U was used to examine the remaining factors in Hypothesis 4.

- (b) Optimism vs. Pessimism Life Philosophy
- (c) Self-determination vs. Fatalism Life Philosophy
- (d) Belief-in-God vs. Atheism Life Philosophy

5. There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to the following:

- (a) Societal sources of pressure
- (b) Commitment to childlessness
- (c) Personal value of childlessness
- (d) Reasons for the childless choice

6. There will be no marked difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to which types of activities they feel are most important in use of their time.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Description of Subjects

A detailed description of the 279 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. The hope-to-be-parents group was composed of 22 per cent males and 78 per cent females. The hope-to-remain-childless group contained 39.53 per cent males and 60.47 per cent females. Ages of the respondents ranged from 18 years to 36 years with the largest number of hope-to-be-parents (33.90%) falling into the 18-19 year-old category. The largest number of the hope-to-remain-childless respondents (37.21%) was in the over 22-year category.

The majority of both the hope-to-be-parents group (94.50%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (93.02%) were Caucasian. There were only 3.81 per cent Negroes in the hope-to-become-parents group and only 2.33 per cent Negroes, Indians and "other" in the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Concerning the educational level of the respondent's father, the majority of the hope-to-be-parents group (37.71%) were found to have had some college education, and within the hope-to-remain-childless group, a slightly lesser amount of their fathers had some college education (74.42%). Almost twice as many of the respondents' fathers within the hope-to-remain-childless group had professional training

TABLE I  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	H. Parents*		H. Childless**	
		No.	%	No.	%
		N = 236		N = 43	
Sex	Male	52	22.03	17	39.53
	Female	184	77.97	26	60.47
Age	18-19 years	80	33.90	7	16.28
	20 years	53	22.46	8	18.61
	21 years	54	22.88	6	13.95
	22 years	19	8.05	6	13.95
	over 22 years	30	12.71	16	37.21
Race	Black	9	3.81	1	2.33
	Indian	2	0.85	1	2.33
	White	223	94.49	40	93.02
	Other	2	0.85	1	2.33
Education of Respondent's Father	Some College	207	87.71	32	74.42
	College Graduate	13	5.51	5	11.63
	Professional Training	16	6.78	6	13.95
Conservatism	Conservatism	58	24.68	9	20.93
	Middle-of-road	113	48.09	8	18.61
	Liberal	55	23.30	17	39.54
	Radical	6	2.55	7	16.28
	Revolutionary	3	1.28	2	4.65
Religious Preference	Catholic	24	10.17	3	6.98
	Jewish	2	0.85	0	0.00
	Protestant	179	75.85	27	62.79
	Other	8	3.39	2	4.65
	No Religious Preference	23	9.75	11	25.58
Current Religious Involvement	Very Religious	26	11.02	5	11.63
	Religious	182	77.12	22	51.16
	Non-religious	27	11.44	16	37.21
	Anti-religious	1	0.42	0	0.00

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	H. Parents*		H. Childless**	
		No.	%	No.	%
		N = 236		N = 43	
Current Religious Involvement (Church Attendance)	Frequently	127	53.81	13	30.23
	Occasionally	56	23.73	7	16.28
	Infrequently	42	17.79	12	27.91
	Never attend	11	4.66	11	25.58
Perception of a Woman's Ability to Combine a Career and Motherhood	Very often	32	13.56	14	33.33
	Often	99	41.95	13	30.95
	Sometimes	95	40.25	12	28.57
	Rarely	9	3.81	2	4.76
	Never	1	0.42	1	2.38
Career Expectations of the Respondent	Career	75	32.05	14	32.56
	Hobbies	16	6.84	2	4.65
	Spouse	65	27.78	8	17.61
	Relative-Friends	9	3.85	4	9.30
	Other-Does not Apply	69	29.49	15	14.88
Influence of Family Members on the Decision to Have or not to Have Children	Mother	86	36.44	4	9.30
	Father	15	6.36	4	9.30
	Spouse	8	3.39	2	4.65
	Brothers-Sisters	4	1.70	2	4.65
	Own personal Attitude	123	52.12	31	72.09
Influence of other factors in determining attitudes toward marriage and parenting:					
Number of Years Married	Does not Apply	206	87.29	32	74.42
	1 year	10	4.24	1	2.33
	2 years	8	3.39	1	2.33
	3 years	5	2.12	2	4.65
	4 or more years	7	2.97	7	16.28



TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	H. Parents*		H. Childless**	
		No.	%	No.	%
		N = 236		N = 43	
Desire to be Married in Future	Yes	188	79.67	19	44.19
	No	2	0.85	7	16.28
	Undecided	15	6.37	6	13.95
	Does not Apply	31	13.14	11	25.58
Number of Children	No children	30	12.71	5	11.63
	Girls	8	3.39	6	13.95
	Boys	8	3.39	3	6.98
	Does not Apply	190	80.51	29	67.44
Respondent's Source of Income	Husband	45	19.15	13	30.23
	Wife	8	3.40	1	2.33
	Parents	142	60.43	20	46.51
	Husband-Wife				
	Equally	17	7.23	1	2.33
	Other	23	9.79	8	18.61
Incidence of Quarreling in Parent's Marriage	Very often	15	6.37	7	16.28
	Often	37	15.68	5	11.63
	Sometimes	114	48.31	18	41.86
	Rarely	61	25.85	13	30.23
	Never	9	2.81	0	0.00
Marital Status	Single	204	86.44	30	69.78
	Married	31	13.14	10	23.26
	Divorced	0	0.00	3	6.98
	Widowed	1	0.42	0	0.00
	Annulment	0	0.00	0	0.00
Incidence of Family Living Class	Yes	104	44.07	16	37.21
	No	132	55.93	27	62.79

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

(13.95%) compared with 6.78 per cent of the fathers in the hope-to-be-parents group.

Concerning conservatism, the highest proportion of respondents in the hope-to-be-parents group considered themselves to be of middle-of-the-road orientation (48.09%), while the respondents within the hope-to-remain-childless group considered themselves as liberals (39.54%). A large number of the hope-to-remain-childless group classified themselves as radical (16.28%) and revolutionary (4.65%).

The largest proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (75.85%) listed Protestant as their religious preference. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group Protestant again was listed as their religious preference (62.79%). The "other" description included Church of God, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Unification. There was a large group (25.58%) of the hope-to-remain-childless group who had no religious preference.

The greatest proportion of both the hope-to-parents group (77.12%) and hope-to-remain-childless group (51.16%) considered themselves as religious. Again within religious involvement, namely church attendance or church activities, both the hope-to-be-parents group (53.81%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (30.23%) attend frequently. However, within the hope-to-remain childless group, the incidence of church involvement was much less than in the group who hope-to-be-parents.

The family background characteristics of the subjects are shown in Table II. Concerning the intactness of the parent's marriage, the highest proportion within the hope-to-be-parents group (91.10%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (76.74%) reported the parents

TABLE II  
FAMILY BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	H. Parents*		H. Childless**	
		No.	%	No.	%
Intactness of Parent's Marriage	Married to each other	215	91.10	33	76.74
	Separated	1	0.42	1	2.33
	Divorced	7	2.97	2	4.65
	Divorced and remarried	8	3.39	3	6.98
	Widowed	5	2.12	4	9.30
Employment of Mother during Major Portion of Childhood	Yes (Full time)	64	27.12	9	20.93
	Yes (Part-time)	27	11.44	8	18.61
	No	145	61.44	26	60.47
Socio-economic Status of Family of Orientation	Upper Class	9	3.85	0	0.00
	Upper Middle	72	30.77	16	38.09
	Lower Middle	133	56.84	16	38.09
	Upper Lower	18	7.69	9	21.43
	Lower Lower	2	0.86	1	2.38
Quality of Mother-Child Relationship	Very Close	113	47.90	13	30.23
	Close	88	37.29	23	53.49
	Uncertain	21	8.90	5	11.63
	Distant	10	4.24	1	2.33
	Very Distant	4	1.70	1	2.33
Quality of Father-Child Relationship	Very Close	82	34.75	9	20.93
	Close	104	44.07	14	32.56
	Uncertain	27	11.44	10	23.26
	Distant	13	5.51	9	20.93
	Very Distant	10	4.24	1	2.33
Happiness of Childhood	Very Happy	106	44.92	10	23.26
	Happy	104	44.07	24	55.81
	Uncertain	18	7.63	7	16.28
	Unhappy	8	3.39	1	2.33
	Very Unhappy	0	0.00	1	2.33

TABLE II (Continued)

Variable	Classification	H. Parents*		H. Children**	
		No.	%	No.	%
Happiness of Parent's Marriage	5 - Greatest Degree of Happiness	84	35.59	13	30.23
	4	85	36.02	16	37.21
	3	39	16.53	7	16.28
	2	14	5.93	3	6.98
	1 - Least Degree of Happiness	14	5.93	4	9.30
Happiness of Own Marriage (if married)	5 - Greatest Degree of Happiness	16	6.81	5	11.63
	4	14	5.96	3	6.98
	3	4	1.70	1	2.33
	2	1	0.43	1	2.33
	1 - Does not apply	200	85.11	33	76.74
Main Source of Discipline	Father	14	5.98	4	9.30
	Father with help from Mother	49	20.94	4	9.30
	Equally Father and Mother	93	39.74	18	41.86
	Mother with help from Father	55	23.50	13	30.23
	Mother	23	9.83	4	9.30
Discipline Received from Mother	Very Permissive	84	35.59	13	30.23
	Permissive	85	36.02	16	37.21
	Average	39	16.53	7	16.28
	Strict	14	5.93	3	6.98
	Very Strict	14	5.93		9.30
Discipline Received from Father	Very Permissive	6	2.54	1	2.33
	Permissive	37	15.68	10	23.27
	Average	133	56.36	22	51.16
	Strict	53	22.46	7	16.28
	Very Strict	7	2.97	3	6.98

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

were married to each other. However, it should be noted that many of the hope-to-be-childless respondents (23.26%) did not have parents with intact marriages compared with only nine per cent of the hope-to-be-parents group who had parents who did not have intact marriages.

The majority of both the hope-to-be-parents group (61.44%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (60.47%) reported that their mother was not employed during the major portion of their childhood. This was followed again by both the hope-to-be-parents group (27.12%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (20.93%) reporting that their mother was employed full time during the major portion of their childhood.

The greatest proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (56.84%) were classified within the lower middle class socio-economic bracket. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group (38.09%) were classified within the upper middle and lower middle class socio-economic bracket.

Concerning the quality of mother-child relationship, the highest proportion within the hope-to-be-parents group (47.90%) reported a very close relationship. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) reported a close relationship. A close father-child relationship was reported by a majority (44.07%) of the hope-to-be-parents group. A large number of the hope-to-remain-childless group (32.56%) also reported a close father-child relationship.

The hope-to-be-parents group (44.92%) most frequently were characterized as having a very happy childhood. An almost equal amount within the same group (44.07%) reported a happy childhood. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group (55.81%) reported a happy childhood.

When ranking the happiness of their parent's marriage, 5 representing the greatest degree of happiness to 1 representing the least degree of happiness, within the hope-to-be-parents group (36.02%) most frequently chose 4. Within the hope-to-remain childless group (37.21%), the respondents most frequently chose 5, the greatest degree of happiness. The respondents then ranked the happiness of their own marriage (if married). The rankings were the same as above except 1 represented a "does not apply" category since many respondents were not married. As expected, of the hope-to-be-parents group (85.11%) were not married, and therefore chose 1 or the "does not apply" category. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group (76.74%) also were within the "does not apply" category. Of the group of respondents who were married, the group who do not hope to be parents responded to the greatest degree (5) with 11.63 per cent of the sample. For the hope-to-be-parents group, 6.81 per cent responded with the most favorable response.

The greatest proportion of both the hope-to-be-parents group (39.74%) and the hope-to-remain childless group (41.86%) received discipline equally from father and mother. Most of the hope-to-be-parents group (23.50%) and the hope-to-remain childless group (30.23%) then listed their discipline received was from mother with help from father.

The hope-to-be-parents group (36.02%) reported the discipline received from their mother as permissive. An almost equal number within the hope-to-remain childless group (37.21%) also reported permissive discipline received from their mother.

Both the hope-to-be-parents group (56.68%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (51.16%) reported average discipline received from their father. Within the hope-to-become-parents group (22.46%) reported strict discipline received from their father. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group (23.27%) reported permissive discipline received from their father.

The majority of hope-to-be-parents group (41.95%) responded that a woman can often combine a career and motherhood, while the hope-to-remain childless group (33.33%) reported that a woman can very often combine a career and motherhood. Concerning the career expectations of the respondent, the hope-to-be-parents (32.05%) would find fulfillment in a career. Of the hope-to-remain-childless group (34.88%) most frequently would find fulfillment in other activities. The Other description included agencies where they could interact with other people, such as adoption agencies, and also they responded with traveling.

Both the hope-to-be-parents group (52.12%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (72.09%) stated that no family members influenced them to have or not to have children, it was their own personal attitude. Within the hope-to-be-parents group (87.29%) were not married, so the number of years married did not apply. The same for the hope-to-remain-childless group (74.42%) fell into the same category.

Concerning the desire to be married in the future, the greatest majority of the hope-to-be-parents (79.67%) and the hope-to-remain-childless (44.19%) hope to be married. It was found within the hope-to-be-parents group (80.51%) the number of children did not apply since the majority were not married. The same was found for the

hope-to-remain-childless group (74.42%) as the question did not apply to 67.44 per cent of them.

The majority of the hope-to-be-parents group (60.43%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (46.51%) received their main source of income from their parents. Within the hope-to-be-parents group, 48.31 per cent said that within their parent's marriage they quarreled sometimes. The same incidence of quarreling was found within the hope-to-remain-childless group (41.86%).

The majority of the hope-to-be-parents group (86.44%) were single. A majority of the hope-to-remain-childless group (69.78%) were also single. The majority of the hope-to-be-parents (55.93%) did not have any family living classes, either in high school, or college. The respondents in the hope-to-remain childless group (62.79%) also had not experienced a family living class.

Concerning cooperativeness, the hope-to-be-parents group (51.70%) ranked themselves as average, while the hope-to-remain-childless group (51.16%) ranked themselves more cooperative than the average person. The hope-to-be-parents group (53.81%) ranked themselves as enjoying children more than the average person, while the hope to remain childless group (44.19%) ranked themselves average.

Both the hope-to-be-parents group (53.39%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) rated themselves average concerning self-reliance. Under aggressiveness, the hope-to-be-parents group (60.17%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (58.14%) ranked themselves as average.

Concerning attractiveness, the hope-to-be-parents group (75.85%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (76.19%) rated themselves



average. The hope-to-be-parents group (50.42%) ranked themselves average concerning irritableness, while the hope-to-remain-childless group (60.47%) considered themselves less irritable than the average person.

Both the hope-to-be-parents group (70.34%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (58.14%) rated themselves average concerning the characteristic of mature. Concerning does what others want me to do, the hope-to-be-parents group (60.17%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (58.14%) ranked themselves as average.

Table III represents the responses to the self-rating of general personality characteristics by the respondents. The hope-to-be-parents group (59.32%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) rated themselves as average concerning remaining physically active and vigorous.

The hope-to-be-parents group (58.48%) rated themselves as enjoying life more than the average person, while the hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) rated themselves only average.

Both the hope-to-be-parents group (54.04%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (46.51%) rated themselves average on the characteristic of being tense. Both the hope-to-be-parents group (50.42%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (46.51%) responded to being easily pleased as only average.

Under the characteristic slow to get things done, the hope-to-be-parents group (57.20%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (51.16%) rated themselves average. The hope-to-be-parents group (50.42%) rated themselves more friendlier than the average person, while the hope-to-remain-childless group (51.16%) rated themselves only average.

TABLE III  
RESPONSES TO GENERAL PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Personality Characteristics		More Than Average Person		Average		Less Than Average Person	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Physically Active, Vigorous	* H. Parents	80	33.90	140	59.32	16	6.78
	**H. Childless	14	32.56	23	53.49	6	13.95
Enjoy Life	* H. Parents	138	58.48	96	40.68	2	0.85
	**H. Childless	18	41.86	23	53.49	2	4.65
Intelligent	* H. Parents	93	39.41	139	58.89	4	1.70
	**H. Childless	17	39.54	25	58.14	1	2.33
Tense	* H. Parents	43	18.30	127	54.04	65	27.66
	**H. Childless	12	27.91	20	46.51	11	25.58
Easily Pleased	* H. Parents	107	45.34	119	50.42	10	4.24
	**H. Childless	16	37.21	20	46.51	7	16.28
Slow to get Things Done	* H. Parents	23	9.75	135	57.20	78	33.05
	**H. Childless	6	13.95	22	51.16	15	34.88
Friendly	* H. Parents	119	50.42	111	47.03	6	2.54
	**H. Childless	19	44.19	22	51.16	2	4.65
Perfectionist	* H. Parents	71	30.09	125	52.97	40	16.95
	**H. Childless	17	39.54	13	30.23	13	30.23

TABLE III (Continued)

Personality Characteristics		More Than Average Person		Average		Less Than Average Person	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Accept Responsibility	* H. Parents	115	48.73	115	48.73	6	2.54
	**H. Childless	25	58.14	15	37.21	2	4.65
Moody	* H. Parents	61	25.85	23	52.12	52	22.03
	**H. Childless	15	34.88	21	48.84	7	16.28
Independent	* H. Parents	105	44.49	119	50.42	12	5.09
	**H. Childless	23	53.49	17	39.54	3	6.98
Enjoy Being Alone	* H. Parents	73	30.93	124	52.54	39	16.52
	**H. Childless	20	46.51	20	46.51	3	6.98
Accepted by Others	* H. Parents	78	33.05	147	62.29	11	4.66
	**H. Childless	11	25.58	30	69.78	2	4.65
Nervous	* H. Parents	47	19.92	109	46.19	80	33.90
	**H. Childless	11	25.58	17	39.54	15	34.88
Careless	* H. Parents	8	3.39	102	43.22	126	53.39
	**H. Childless	3	6.98	26	60.47	14	32.56
Deliberate	* H. Parents	31	13.19	151	64.26	53	22.55
	**H. Childless	8	18.61	24	55.81	11	25.58
Impatient	* H. Parents	54	22.88	131	55.51	51	21.61
	**H. Childless	14	32.56	23	53.49	6	13.95

TABLE III (Continued)

Personality Characteristics		More Than Average Person		Average		Less Than Average Person	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Cooperative	* H. Parents	112	47.46	122	51.70	2	0.85
	**H. Childless	22	51.16	19	44.19	2	4.65
Enjoy Children	* H. Parents	127	53.81	96	40.68	13	5.51
	**H. Childless	13	30.23	19	44.19	11	25.58
Self-Reliant	* H. Parents	98	41.53	126	53.39	12	5.09
	**H. Childless	18	41.86	23	53.49	2	4.65
Aggressive	* H. Parents	59	25.00	142	60.17	35	14.83
	**H. Childless	12	27.91	25	58.14	6	13.95
Attractive	* H. Parents	53	22.46	179	75.85	4	1.70
	**H. Childless	9	21.43	32	76.19	1	2.38
Irritable	* H. Parents	101	42.80	119	50.42	13	5.51
	**H. Childless	6	13.95	11	25.58	26	60.47
Mature	* H. Parents	66	27.97	166	70.34	4	1.70
	**H. Childless	16	37.21	25	58.14	2	4.65
Does What Others Want Me to	* H. Parents	26	11.02	142	60.17	68	28.81
	**H. Childless	8	18.61	25	58.14	10	23.26

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain childless group.

The hope-to-be-parents group (52.07%) ranked themselves only average concerning perfectionism. The hope-to-remain-childless group (39.54%) ranked themselves more perfectionist than the average person. The hope-to-be-parents group (48.73%) equally ranked themselves as more than average and average concerning responsibility, while the hope-to-remain-childless group (58.14%) rated themselves more than average to accept responsibility.

The characteristic of moodiness gathered (52.12%) as average from the hope-to-be-parents group, and the hope-to-remain-childless group (48.84%) also ranked themselves as average. The hope-to-be-parents group (50.42%) ranked themselves as average concerning independence. The hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) responded with more than the average person.

The hope-to-be-parents group (52.54%) ranked themselves average concerning the enjoyment of being alone. The hope-to-remain-childless group (46.51%) chose more than average person and average.

The hope-to-be-parents group (62.29%) ranked themselves as average under the characteristic of being accepted by others. The hope-to-remain-childless group (69.78%) also ranked themselves as average.

Both the hope-to-be parents group (46.19%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (39.54%) ranked themselves average under the characteristic of nervousness. The hope-to-remain childless group (53.39%) ranked themselves less careless than the average person, while the hope-to-remain-childless rated themselves as average.

Within the hope-to-be-parents group (64.26%) and the hope-to-remain childless group (55.81%) both ranked themselves average under the characteristic of deliberateness. The hope-to-be-parents group

(55.51%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) felt themselves to be only average in impatience.

In Table IV are the respondents' responses to Stinnett's Life Philosophy Scale (1975). Within the Optimism vs. Pessimism the greatest proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (55.93%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (55.81%) agreed that a "Wise way to live is to look on the bright side of things." Both the hope-to-be-parents group (56.36%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (60.47%) also agreed with the philosophy "For every problem that arises there is usually a solution." Within the hope-to-be-parents group (61.86%) disagreed with the statement, "People rarely get what they want in life." The hope-to-remain-childless group (53.49%) also disagreed with the same philosophy.

Concerning the Self-determination vs. Fatalism Philosophy the hope-to-be-parents group (59.75%) disagreed with the philosophy, "When all is said and done we really have little control over what happens to us in life." The hope-to-remain-childless group (55.81%) also disagreed with the same philosophy. The greatest proportion of both the hope-to-be-parents group (65.25%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (55.81%) agreed that "To a large degree we are the captains of our fate." Again both the hope-to-be-parents group (45.76%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (37.21%) agreed that "Whether we are happy or not depends upon the kinds of things that happen to us in life."

TABLE IV  
 RESPONSES TO STINNETT'S LIFE PHILOSOPHY SCALE

Life Philosophy		Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Optimism vs. Pessimism</u>											
A wise way to live is to look on the bright side of things.	* H. Parents	82	34.75	132	55.93	14	5.93	8	3.39	0	0.00
	**H. Childless	11	25.58	24	55.81	5	11.63	2	4.65	1	2.33
For every problem that arises there is usually a solution.	* H. Parents	77	32.63	133	56.36	9	3.81	17	7.20	0	0.00
	**H. Childless	10	23.26	26	60.47	4	9.30	0	0.00	3	6.98
People rarely get what they want in life.	* H. Parents	1	0.42	16	6.78	32	13.56	146	61.86	41	17.37
	**H. Childless	0	0.00	9	20.93	5	11.63	23	53.49	6	13.95
<u>Self-determination vs. Fatalism</u>											
When all is said and done we really have little control over what happens to us in life.	* H. Parents	4	1.70	17	7.20	21	8.90	141	59.75	53	22.46
	**H. Childless	1	2.33	2	4.65	4	9.30	24	55.81	12	27.91
To a large degree we are the "captains of our fate."	* H. Parents	25	10.59	154	65.25	22	9.32	26	11.02	9	3.81
	**H. Childless	9	20.93	24	55.81	7	16.28	3	6.98	0	0.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

Life Philosophy		Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Self-determination vs. Fatalism (Continued)</u>											
Whether we are happy or not depends upon the kinds of things that happen to us in life.	* H.Parents	13	5.51	108	45.76	33	13.98	65	27.54	17	7.20
	**H.Childless	5	11.61	16	17.21	7	16.28	14	32.56	1	2.33
<u>Belief-in-God vs. Atheism</u>											
There is a higher power (God) that operates in the daily lives of people.	* H.Parents	135	57.20	62	26.27	29	12.28	5	2.12	5	2.12
	**H.Childless	14	32.56	17	39.54	9	20.93	1	2.33	2	4.65
God answers prayer.	* H.Parents	125	52.97	71	30.09	29	12.29	8	3.39	3	1.27
	**H.Childless	13	30.23	11	25.58	16	37.21	1	2.33	2	4.65
There is no power higher than man.	* H.Parents	1	0.42	2	0.85	23	9.75	51	21.61	159	67.37
	**H.Childless	0	0.00	1	2.32	11	25.58	11	25.58	20	46.51

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.



Within the Belief-in-God vs. Atheism category, the hope-to-be-parents group (57.20%) strongly agreed that "There is a higher power (God) that operates in the daily lives of people." The hope-to-remain-childless group did not as strongly agree as they more often responded with agree (39.54%) to the philosophy.

Under the philosophy "God answers prayer" the hope-to-be-parents group (52.97%) strongly agreed. The hope-to-remain-childless group (37.21%) was undecided concerning the same philosophy.

Both the hope-to-be-parents group (67.37%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (46.51%) strongly disagreed with the philosophy "There is no power higher than man."

On Table V are the responses to societal and personal attitudes toward childlessness. Concerning the source of disapproval for remaining childless, in the hope-to-be-parents group (39.40%) and the hope-to-remain-childless group (30.23%) both responded that parents would show the most disapproval. Within the hope-to-be-parents group, 36.44 per cent were unsure whether they would be willing to go through sterilization. In contrast, in the hope-to-remain-childless group, 34.88 per cent responded no and an equal proportion responded yes to the question of sterilization.

Within the hope-to-be-parents group (43.64%) were undecided about the amount of social value in childlessness, as were the hope-to-remain-childless group (30.23%). However, 27.91 per cent of the hope-to-remain-childless group responded that there was very much social value in childlessness compared with only 9.75 per cent responding with very much in the hope-to-be-parents group. Of the hope-to-be-parents group (83.90%) believed that voluntary childlessness was not a natural

TABLE V  
 RESPONSES TO SOCIETAL AND PERSONAL  
 ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILDLESSNESS

Variable	Classification	*H. Parents		**H. Childless	
		No.	%	No.	%
<b>Societal sources of pressure</b>					
(Source of dis-approval for remaining childless)	Spouse	67	28.39	7	16.28
	Parents	93	39.40	13	30.23
	Friends	18	7.63	4	9.30
	In-Laws	36	15.25	9	20.93
	Other	22	9.32	10	23.27
<b>Commitment to childlessness (Attitude toward sterilization)</b>					
	Yes	72	30.51	15	34.88
	No	78	33.05	15	34.88
	Unsure	86	36.44	13	30.23
<b>Personal value of childlessness:</b>					
Amount of social value in childlessness	Very much	23	9.75	12	27.91
	Much	71	30.09	12	23.26
	Undecided	103	43.64	13	30.23
	Little	27	11.44	4	9.30
	Very little	12	5.09	4	9.30
<b>Attitude toward voluntary childlessness as a natural inclination for women</b>					
	Yes	31	13.14	9	20.93
	No	198	83.90	33	76.74
	Undecided	7	2.97	1	2.33
<b>Attitude toward involuntary childlessness</b>					
	Blessing	3	1.27	5	11.91
	Bitter Disappointment	171	72.46	12	28.57
	Wouldn't bother	55	23.31	23	54.76
	Undecided	7	2.97	2	4.76

TABLE V (Continued)

Variable	Classification	*H. Parents		**H. Childless	
		No.	%	No.	%
Parenthood as greatest responsibility in life.	Strongly agree	134	57.02	21	48.84
	Agree	85	36.17	15	34.88
	Disagree	12	5.11	4	9.30
	Strongly disagree	4	1.70	3	6.98
Reasons for childless choice	Population growth	50	21.19	5	11.63
	World conditions	22	9.32	1	2.33
	Occupation	64	27.12	14	32.50
	Finances	53	22.46	8	18.61
	Other	47	19.92	15	14.88

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

inclination for women. The same large proportion was found within the hope-to-remain-childless group (76.74%).

As expected, the hope-to-be-parents group (72.46%) reported that involuntary childlessness would be a bitter disappointment for them. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group (54.76%) reported that involuntary childlessness would not bother them.

Concerning parenthood as the greatest responsibility in life, of the hope-to-be-parents group (57.02%) strongly agreed, while only 48.84 per cent of the hope-to-remain-childless group strongly agreed. Concerning the reasons for the childless choice in the hope-to-be-parents group 27.12 per cent chose occupational involvement. The

hope-to-remain-childless group (34.88%) most often chose the other category. The Other included such things as desire to maintain the childless lifestyle, wish to avoid the responsibility of rearing children, unsuited temperamentally, wish to avoid pregnancy and childbirth, distaste for physical changes of the body during pregnancy, and emotional strain.

In Table VI are shown the mean rankings of time priorities. The respondents were to rank the following activities according to the importance they felt each had for them personally with the most important activity ranked with a one: community involvement, social activities, family, work, and individual leisure time activities outside the family. For the hope-to-be-parents group, community involvement received a mean score of 4.45, while the hope-to-remain-childless group responded to community involvement with a mean score of 4.35. Concerning social activities, the hope-to-be-parents received a mean score of 3.57 and the hope-to-remain-childless group received a score of 3.42. The family received a mean score of 1.19 from the group who hope-to-be-parents, while the group which hope-to-remain-childless responded to family with a mean score of 1.93. The hope-to-be-parents group received a 2.37 mean score on work, while the hope-to-remain-childless group responded with a 2.09. On leisure time, the hope-to-be-parents received a 3.42, and the hope-to-remain-childless group received a mean score of 3.21. The interesting finding concerning the rankings of time priorities was that both the group who hope-to-be-parents and the group who hope-to-remain-childless ranked family with the highest priority. However, when looking closely, the hope-to-be-parents group had a mean rank of .74 lower than the group who hope-to-remain-childless.

TABLE VI  
MEAN RANKINGS OF TIME PRIORITIES

Variable	*H. Parents $\bar{X}$	**H. Childless $\bar{X}$
Community involvement	4.45	4.35
Social activities	3.57	3.42
Family	1.19	1.93
Work	2.37	2.09
Individual leisure time activities outside the family	3.42	3.21

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

#### Examination of Hypotheses and

#### Discussion of Results

Hypothesis I (a). There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to sex.

The chi-square test indicated that there existed a significant difference between the two groups according to sex. A greater proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (77.97%) than the hope-to-remain-childless group (60.47%) were female.

TABLE VII  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN SEX  
 OF THE HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE  
 HOPE-TO-REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Male	52	17		
Female	184	26	5.08	.02

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Hypothesis I (b). There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to age.

The chi-square test indicated that no significant difference existed.

Hypothesis I (c). There is no significant difference between the group which hope to become parents and the group which hope to remain childless with regard to race.

The chi-square test indicated that no significant difference existed. The relationship between childlessness and race remains unclear. Veivers (1971) hypothesizes that the incidence of childlessness has previously been higher among non-whites. However, this study found no significant relationship.

Hypothesis I (d). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-become-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to education completed.

The chi-square test indicated that no significant difference existed. Whelpton et al. (1966) found that educational attainment was not as influential on fertility as it has been in the past.

Hypothesis I (d). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-become-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to conservatism.

The chi-square test indicated that between the two groups no significant difference existed. However, 39.54 per cent of the hope-to-be-childless group rated themselves liberal in their thinking. On the other hand, the hope-to-become-parents group were less committal, responding most often (48.09%) with middle-of-the road. Martin (1975) also found in her study of childlessness that the childless group was clearly inclined to rate themselves as liberal while the parent group more frequently chose the moderate category. She hypothesizes that the decision process which involved one against many may reinforce the childless' support of liberal, political or social issues, and that the decision to remain childfree in a society that almost universally chooses parenthood requires much self-examination, individualism and tenacity.

Hypothesis I (f). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-become parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to religious preference.

The chi-square value, 9.23, shown in Table VIII indicated that a significant difference exists at the .05 level. Almost three times as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group as the hope-to-be-parents group indicated no religious preference.

Stolka and Barnett (1969) found that religion had influenced women to believe that children made marriages happier, and religion certainly affects attitudes concerning contraception, abortion, and sterilization.

TABLE VIII  
CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE  
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCES OF THE HOPE-TO-BE-  
PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-  
REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Catholic	24	3		
Jewish	2	0		
Protestant	179	27		
Other	8	2		
No religious preference	23	11	9.23	.05

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.



Hypothesis I (g). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to current religious involvement.

The data allowed rejection of this hypothesis. A significant difference did exist between the two groups. The greatest difference was that more than three times as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group then the hope-to-be-parents group considered themselves non-religious. Also, a larger proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group considered themselves religious, than did the hope-to-remain-childless group.

TABLE IX

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT OF THE HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	<u>p</u>
Very religious	26	5		
Religious	182	22		
Non-religious	27	16		
Anti-religious	1	0	19.22	.001

\* Designates hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates hope-to-remain-childless group.

Hypothesis II (a). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain childless with regard to intactness of parents' marriage.

The chi-square value, 10.01, shown in Table X indicates that a significant difference existed at the .04 level. A greater proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (91.10%) than the hope-to-remain-childless group (76.74%) indicated their parents were married to each other. A closer look at the percentages shows that in the hope-to-remain-childless group there were 23.26 per cent of the respondents' parents' marriages which were not now intact marriages. In the group who hope-to-be-parents, there were only 8.90 per cent who had parents who did not now have intact marriages. Martin (1975) found that a larger proportion of her childless group came from families where the parents' marriages were not as successful as the parent group. More than twice as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group than the hope-to-be-parents group reported their parents were divorced or separated.

Hypothesis II (b). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the mother's employment during the major portion of childhood.

A significant difference was not found to exist between the childless group and the parent group concerning the mother's employment during the major portion of childhood. Previous research (Veevers, 1974a) indicated that many childless women had mothers who did not work.

TABLE X

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE  
INTACTNESS OF THE PARENTS' MARRIAGE OF THE  
HOPE-TO-BECOME-PARENTS GROUP AND THE  
HOPE-TO-REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP

Attribute	*H. Parent No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Married to each other	215	33		
Separated	1	1		
Divorced	7	2		
Divorced and Remarried	8	3		
Widowed	5	4	10.01	.04

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Hypothesis II (c). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to socio-economic status of family of orientation.

The chi-square test indicated that a significant difference did exist between the two groups. The McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955) was used to determine social class. There was only a small group of respondents (3.85%) who hope to be parents in the upper class group. By combining the upper middle and lower middle groups together, there were 87.61 per cent of the hope-to-be-parents group in the middle class category. In the group of respondents who hope-to-remain-childless there were 76.18 per cent in the middle class category. In combining

the upper lower and lower lower class categories, there were 8.55 per cent of the hope-to-be-parents group in the lower class. This can be compared with a total of 23.81 per cent of the hope-to-remain-childless group who were found to be of lower class socio-economic classification. Perhaps there has been a past experience of financial strain in the lives of these respondents which makes them not as eager to take on the financial responsibility of children. Approximately three times as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group were classified as upper lower socio-economic class. Gustavus and Henley (1971) and Martin (1975) found that the childless couples in their sample were of significantly higher social status than the United States population in general when using education, occupation or income as a means of measurement.

TABLE XI

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP

Attribute	*H. Parent No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Upper Class	9	0		
Upper Middle	72	16		
Lower Middle	133	16		
Upper Lower	18	9		
Lower Lower	2	1	12.16	.01

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Hypothesis II (d). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the quality of the mother-child relationship.

The chi-square test indicated no significant difference between the two groups. Martin (1975) however, did find a significant difference between the two groups concerning the mother-child relationship. The majority of the parent group more frequently characterized their relationship as very good than did the childless.

Hypothesis II (e). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the quality of father-child relationship.

Unlike Martin's study (1975) there was a significant difference which existed between the two groups according to the quality of father-child relationship. A larger proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (37.45%) than did the hope-to-remain-childless group (20.93%) reported a very close relationship with their father. Approximately four times as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group reported a very distant relationship with their father.

Hypothesis II (f). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the happiness of childhood.

Table XIII indicates that a difference significant at the .01 level did exist between the hope-to-remain-childless group and the hope-to-be-parents group according to the happiness of childhood. Almost twice as many of the hope-to-be-parents group reported a very happy childhood. Over twice as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group were uncertain about the happiness of their childhood.

TABLE XII

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE  
FATHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS OF THE HOPE-TO-  
BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-  
REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$X^2$	p
Very Close	82	9		
Close	104	14		
Uncertain	27	10		
Distant	13	9		
Very Distant	10	1	18.40	.001

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

TABLE XIII

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE  
HAPPINESS OF CHILDHOOD OF THE HOPE-TO-BE-  
PARENTS AND THE HOPE-TO-REMAIN-  
CHILDLESS GROUPS

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$X^2$	p
Very Happy	106	10		
Happy	104	24		
Uncertain	18	7		
Unhappy	8	1		
Very Unhappy	0	1	13.85	.01

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Bram (1974) found that 50 per cent of the childless women in her study assessed the relative happiness of their families as "less happy" than the average or "very unhappy."

Hypothesis II (g). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to happiness of parents' marriage.

The chi-square test indicated no significant difference between the two groups.

Hypothesis II (h). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the happiness of their own marriage (if married).

The chi-square test indicated no significant difference between the two groups. Feldman (1974) reported that couples with an infant were significantly less satisfied with their marriage than the childless. Martin (1975) found that a larger proportion of the parent group described the happiness of their marriage as very good than did the childless. More than twice as many childless respondents as parent respondents reported their marriage happiness as moderate to poor.

Hypothesis II (i). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the main source of discipline.

The chi-square test indicated no significant difference between the two groups. These results suggest that source of discipline is not a major influence on the decision to remain childless.

Hypothesis II (j). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain childless with regard to the discipline received from mother.

No significant difference existed among the two groups. The type of discipline received from the respondent's mother had no influence on the desire to remain childless according to these results.

Hypothesis II (k). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain childless with regard to the discipline received from father.

The chi-square test indicated no significant difference existed between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain childless with regard to the type of discipline received from father.

Hypothesis III (a). There is no significant difference between the group which hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain childless with regard to the perception of a woman's ability to combine a career and motherhood.

A significant difference was found at the .01 level for the two groups. More than twice as many of the hope-to-be-childless group felt that a woman could combine a career and motherhood very often, which reflects that the hope-to-remain-childless group had a more accepting attitude toward the female's ability to combine a career with motherhood.



TABLE XIV

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE  
HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-  
REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP REGARDING  
THE COMBINATION OF CAREER AND  
MOTHERHOOD OF THE WOMEN

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Very often	32	14		
Often	99	13		
Sometimes	95	12		
Rarely	9	1		
Never	1	1	12.74	.01

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Hypothesis III (b). There is no significant difference between the group who hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the career expectations of the respondent.

The chi-square test indicated that no significant difference existed between the two groups. These results suggest that career expectations had no influence on the desire to remain childless.

Hypothesis III (c). There is no significant difference between the group who hope-to-be-parents and the group which hope-to-remain-childless with regard to the influence of family members on the decision to have or not to have children.

The chi-square test indicated a significant difference at the .01 level concerning the influence of family members on the decision to have or not to have children. These findings are similar to those of Martin (1975). Almost three times as many of the hope-to-be-parents group as the hope-to-remain-childless group indicated the mother exerted influence upon their decision to have or not to have children. A greater proportion of the hope-to-remain-childless group (72.09%) than the hope-to-be-parents group (52.12%) indicated it was primarily their own personal attitude that influenced their decision.

TABLE XV

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-REMAIN-CHILDLESS GROUP REGARDING THE INFLUENCE OF FAMILY MEMBERS ON THE DECISION TO HAVE OR NOT TO HAVE CHILDREN

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Mother	85	4		
Father	15	4		
Spouse	8	2		
Brothers or Sisters	4	2		
Own personal attitude	123	31	13.04	.01

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

Hypothesis IV (a). There is no significant difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the hope-to-remain-childless group with regard to their general personality characteristics.

Significant differences were observed between the two groups with regard to some of their general personality characteristics (see Table XVI). Within the hope-to-be-parents group 58.48 per cent rated themselves above average concerning the characteristic of enjoys life. Among the hope-to-remain-childless group 53.49 per cent rated themselves average under the characteristic of enjoys life which reflects a slightly less positive response to this characteristic than in the hope-to-be-parents group.

Within the hope-to-be-parents group (50.42%) and the hope-to-remain childless group (48.51%) both groups rated themselves as average concerning the characteristic easily pleased. However, there was a significant proportion of the hope-to-remain-childless group (16.28%) who rated themselves as below average concerning the characteristic easily pleased. This finding reflects the general attitude that they are not as easy to please as the hope-to-be-parents group. Young people who consider themselves easily pleased would probably find themselves more comfortable in a parent role.

Concerning perfectionism in the hope-to-be-parents group 52.97 per cent rated themselves average while 39.54 per cent of the hope-to-remain-childless group rated themselves as above average in perfectionism. This finding revealed that the group of young people who did not want to have children responded with a higher incidence of perfectionist qualities. This quality does not seem to be compatible with parenting as people who have children must be willing to

TABLE XVI

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE  
HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-REMAIN-  
CHILDLESS GROUP CONCERNING THEIR GENERAL  
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
<u>Enjoys Life</u>				
Above Average	138	18	6.87	.03
Average	96	23		
Below Average	2	2		
<u>Easily Pleased</u>				
Above Average	107	16	9.31	.01
Average	119	20		
Below Average	10	7		
<u>Perfectionist</u>				
Above Average	71	17	8.21	.01
Average	125	13		
Below Average	40	13		
<u>Careless</u>				
Above Average	8	3	6.69	.03
Average	102	26		
Below Average	126	14		

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

accept childlike behavior from their children.

Regarding the characteristic of careless, 53.39 per cent of the hope-to-be-parents group rated themselves as below average, while 60.47 per cent of the hope-to-remain-childless group rated themselves

as average. This reflected an attitude in the hope-to-remain-childless group that they were more careless. Persons who are parents have a great responsibility and being careless may not be a desirable trait for future parents to have.

The general personality characteristics which were not found to be significantly different between the two comparative groups included the following: (1) physically active, vigorous; (2) intelligent; (3) tense; (4) slow to get things done; (5) friendly; (6) accept responsibility; (7) moody; (8) independent; (9) enjoy being alone; (10) accepted by others; (11) nervous; (12) deliberate; (13) impatient; (14) cooperative; (15) enjoy children; (16) self-reliant; (17) aggressive; (18) attractive; (19) irritable; (20) mature; (21) does what others want me to.

Hypothesis IV (b, c, d). There is no significant difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the hope-to-remain-childless group with regard to their Optimism vs. Pessimism Life Philosophy, Self-Determination vs. Fatalism Life Philosophy, and Belief-in-God vs. Atheism Life Philosophy.

Comparisons were made of the scores of the two groups on Stinnett's Life Philosophy Scale (1975) utilizing a Mann-Whitney U test (Table XVII). The comparison between the two groups with regard to the Optimism vs. Pessimism Life Philosophy and the Belief-in-God vs. Atheism Life Philosophy revealed a significant difference. The parent group indicated a significantly higher degree of optimism than did the childless group. The hope-to-be-parents group also expressed a significantly greater tendency toward Belief-in-God than did the hope-to-remain-childless group. An analysis of the Self-determination

vs. Fatalism Life Philosophy indicated no significant difference. Table XVII reflects the responses of the two groups to the Life Philosophy Scale.

TABLE XVII

MANN-WHITNEY U: LIFE PHILOSOPHY CLASSIFIED BY OPTIMISM  
VS. PESSIMISM, SELF-DETERMINATION VS. FATALISM  
AND BELIEF-IN-GOD VS. ATHEISM

Life Philosophy	<u>z</u>	p
Optimism vs. Pessimism	-2.21	.02
Self-determination vs. Fatalism	-0.51	n.s.
Belief-in-God vs. Atheism	-3.33	.001

Hypothesis V (a). There is no significant difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the hope-to-remain-childless group with regard to societal sources of pressure.

The chi-square test indicated that a significant difference existed among the two groups concerning source of disapproval for remaining childless ( $p < .04$ ). A higher proportion of the hope-to-be-parents group (28.39%) than the hope-to-remain-childless group (16.28%) listed spouse as the source of disapproval for remaining childless.

TABLE XVIII  
 CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE HOPE-TO-  
 BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-REMAIN-CHILDLESS  
 GROUP REGARDING SOURCES OF DISAPPROVAL  
 FOR REMAINING CHILDLESS

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Spouse	67	7		
Parents	93	13		
Friends	18	4		
In-Laws	36	9		
Other	22	10	9.83	.04

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

The chi-square test revealed no significant difference between the two groups concerning attitude toward sterilization.

Hypothesis V (b). There is no significant difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the hope-to-remain-childless group with regard to commitment to childlessness.

The chi-square test indicated no significant difference existed between the two groups concerning attitude toward sterilization.

Hypothesis V (c). There is no significant difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the hope-to-remain-childless group with regard to personal value of childlessness.

The chi-square test indicated that a significant difference existed between the two groups concerning amount of social value in childlessness. Almost three times as many of the hope-to-remain-childless group indicated the social value of childlessness as very much.

TABLE XIX

CHI-SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN THE  
HOPE-TO-BE-PARENTS GROUP AND THE HOPE-TO-  
REMAIN CHILDLESS GROUP REGARDING  
SOCIAL VALUE OF CHILDLESSNESS

Attribute	*H. Parents No.	**H. Childless No.	$\chi^2$	p
Very much	23	12		
Much	71	10		
Undecided	103	13		
Little	27	4		
Very Little	12	4	12.99	.01

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.

\*\* Designates the hope-to-remain childless group.



Hypothesis V (d). There is no significant difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the hope-to-remain-childless group with regard to reasons for the childless choice.

The chi-square test indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups concerning the reasons for the childless choice.

Hypothesis VI (a). There is no marked difference between the hope-to-be-parents group and the group which hope-to-remain-childless on the rankings of time priorities.

Table XX shows the rankings of time priorities. The mean scores were computed with the lowest mean score representing the most important time priority for the respondents. The respondents ranked the following: community involvement, social activities, family, work, and individual leisure time activities outside the family with the most important activity receiving a rank of one. There was little difference in the mean scores of the two groups.

TABLE XX  
MEAN RANKINGS OF TIME PRIORITIES

Variable	*H. Parents <u>X</u>	**H. Childless <u>X</u>
Community involvement	4.45	4.35
Social activities	3.57	3.42
Family	1.19	1.93
Work	2.37	2.09
Individual leisure time activities outside the family	3.42	3.21

\* Designates the hope-to-be-parents group.  
 \*\* Designates the hope-to-remain-childless group.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY

The overall purpose of this research was to explore the different perceptions and attitudes of college youth who hope to be parents and those who hope to remain childless. This study included 279 students enrolled at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in the Spring of 1976. Fifty-two of the hope-to-be-parents group were male and 184 were female. Of the hope-to-remain-childless group, 17 were male and 26 were female. The respondents were members of Sociology and Family Relations and Child Development classes.

The questionnaire was designed to assess the respondent's (1) background characteristics, (2) family background characteristics, (3) personality characteristics, and (4) life philosophies (Stinnett's Life Philosophy Scale, 1975). The questionnaire was composed primarily of fixed-alternative questions, but open-ended questions were also included.

Frequencies and percentages were obtained for all information. The chi-square test for two independent samples was used in an analysis of all information except the Life Philosophy Scale in which the Mann-Whitney U was utilized. Mean scores were computed for the rankings of time priorities in which the respondents ranked according to importance to them activities which they felt should take their time as adults.

The results and conclusions of the study were as follows:

1. There were more females than males who hope to be parents ( $p < .02$ ).
2. The group who hope to be parents had greater religious involvement which was significant at the .001 level.
3. The group who hope to be parents had a greater proportion of their own parents who still had intact marriages ( $p < .04$ ).
4. The group who hope to be parents were represented more often in the middle and upper class social strata ( $p < .001$ ).
5. The group who hope to be parents more often responded that they were very close or close to their own fathers ( $p < .001$ ).
6. The group who hope to be parents responded that their childhood had been very happy or happy more often than the group who hope to remain childless ( $p < .01$ ).
7. The group who hope to remain childless had a more positive perception of a woman's ability to combine motherhood and a career ( $p < .01$ ).
8. The group who hope to remain childless more often responded that their choice was due to their own personal attitude and not because of other family members' influences ( $p < .01$ ).
9. Regarding the personality characteristics, enjoys life, easily pleased, perfectionist, and careless, were all found to be significant. The group who hope to be parents responded more favorably to enjoys life ( $p < .03$ ). This group also responded more favorably to easily pleased ( $p < .01$ ).  
The group who hope to remain childless more often responded

that they were above average in perfectionism, significant at the .01 level.

The group who hope-to-be-parents rated themselves as less careless than the group who-hope-to-remain childless ( $p < .03$ ).

10. Concerning life philosophies, Optimism vs. Pessimism and Belief-in-God vs. Atheism were found to be significant. The group who hope to be parents were more positive in the Optimism vs. Pessimism scale ( $p < .02$ ). Concerning Belief-in-God vs. Atheism the group who hope-to-be-parents responded more positively to a stronger belief in God ( $p < .001$ ). Self-determination vs. Fatalism was not found to be significant.
11. Concerning the source of disapproval at remaining childless, the group who hope-to-become-parents responded that their parents first, and then their spouse would show the greatest disapproval ( $p < .04$ ). The group who hope-to-remain-childless responded that their in-laws would be the greatest source of disapproval.
12. The group who hope-to-remain-childless responded more often that there was greater social value in childlessness ( $p < .01$ ).
13. In observing the mean rank scores for the two groups in their choice of how they felt their time should be used in adult activities, the two groups made approximately the same choices. Although family was chosen as the most important activity for both groups, the group who hope-to-be-parents had a higher proportion of individuals responding that family was their first priority. The rankings for both groups

were (1) family, (2) work, (3) individual leisure time, (4) social activities and (5) community involvement.

14. The hope to remain childless group was more liberal in regard to most social and political issues.

#### Discussion

This study seems to indicate that there is a relationship between family background variables and the decision to have children in the future. Generally, the hope-to-become-parents group assessed the happiness of their childhood, the relationship with their father, and the intactness of their parent's marriage in significantly more positive terms. The hope-to-be-parents group assessed themselves as having greater religious involvement than the hope-to-remain-childless group. More of the group who hope-to-be-parents considered themselves as very religious and religious.

In the study there were more females than males who hope to be parents. This may be attributed to maternal instinct, or to the fact that often extra attention is given to females while they are pregnant, which they feel would be desirable, or religious factors have influenced their decision. Socio-economic factors played an important role within the group who hope to be parents. Middle and upper class social strata were found to be more significant within this group. Possibly, the respondents felt that since their parents were financially able to take care of them, they, in turn, would also be able to accept the financial responsibility of children.

The hope-to-be-parents group responded more favorably to enjoys life and easily pleased than did the hope to remain childless

group. They also felt themselves to be less careles. However, the hope-to-remain-childless group assessed themselves to be more perfectionist than did the hope-to-become-parents group.

The hope-to-be-parents group seemed to believe that their lives would be more fully enriched by having children and if they were unable to have children, many would not be able to find fulfillment elsewhere. Within the hope-to-remain-childless group, the respondents had a more positive perception of the ability of a woman to combine a career and motherhood, whereas within the hope-to-be-parents group, they believed that a woman could only often and sometimes combine a career with motherhood.

There were 43 of the total group of 279 who said they preferred not to have children in the future. The researcher was surprised at the high proportion. Possibly, more of the advantages and rewards of the childfree lifestyle are now being presented to young people. If more people become aware of the childfree option perhaps only those persons who want to will have children which could result in a decrease in child abuse and neglect.

The hope-to-be-parents group felt that their parents and spouse would show the greatest disapproval if they chose to remain childless. This may be due to a desire to maintain a stable home, or eagerness to please members of our family and society.

If more young people become aware of an alternative to parenthood, voluntary childlessness may stop being so negatively received by our society, and more people would feel more comfortable in choosing the childfree lifestyle.

### Limitations

The reader should be aware of the scarcity of prior research and apparent neglect of the subject by social scientists. A major limitation in research of this type is locating persons who do not choose to be parents. In this study many of the students were not married, and were called upon to make a decision about parenthood prior to being faced with the real decision. The sample was limited to Sociology and Family Relations and Child Development classes which could have produced some biases.

### Areas of Possible Future Study

This study indicates a great need for additional research designed to evaluate the family background characteristics of the childfree couple, to evaluate the societal rewards and punishments for remaining childfree, and to learn more about the proportion of young people in the United States who are choosing to be childless. Since little research is to be found concerning this subject, it is desirable for Family Life educators to present studies such as these to young people, so they may become aware of the option of foregoing parenthood. Within these studies, young people may become aware of the pro's and con's of parenthood.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bean, Frank D. and Linda H. Aiken. "Intermarriage and Unwanted Fertility in the United States." Journal of Marriages and The Family, XXXVIII, No. 1 (February, 1976), 61-72.
- Bernard, Jessie. The Future of Marriage. New York: Bantam Books, 1973.
- Blake, Judith. "Demographic Sciences and the Redirection of Population Policy." Population Studies. Kenneth Kammeyer, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969, 378-400.
- Blake, Judith. "Coercive Pronatalism and American Population Policy." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974, 29-67.
- Bram, Susan. "To Have or Have Not: A social Psychological Study of Voluntarily Childless Couples, Parents-to-Be, and Parents." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1974.)
- Campbell, Angus. "The American Way of Mating: Marriage Si, Children Only Maybe." Psychology Today, VIII, No. 12 (1975), 37-43.
- Chester, Robert. "Is There A Relationship Between Childlessness and Marriage Breakdown?" Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974, 114-126.
- Cox, Nancy. "Pronatal Influences in Home Economics Texts in a Junior High School." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974, 98-113.
- Deutsch, Helene. The Psychology of Women. II. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1945.
- Dyer, Everett D. "Parenthood as Crisis: A Re-Study." Marriage and Family Living, XXV, No. 2 (1963), 196-201.
- Erikson, Erik H. "Inner and Outer Space: Reflections on Womanhood." Daedalus, XCIII, No. 1 (Spring, 1964), 582-606.

- Feldman, Harold. "The Development of the Husband-Wife Relationship." Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Department of Child Development and Family Relationships, unpublished mimeographed report, 1965.
- Figley, Charles. "Child Density and the Marital Relationship." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV, No. 2 (1973), 272-280.
- Franzwa, Helen H. "Female Roles in Women's Magazine Fiction." Unger and Denmark, eds. Woman: Dependent or Independent Variable. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1974.
- Goldsen, Rose K, Morris Rosenberg, Robin Williams, Jr., and Edward A. Suchman. What College Students Think. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960, 46-47.
- Gould, Robert. "The Wrong Reasons To Have Children." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1974, 193-198.
- Grabill, Wilson, Clyde V. Kiser and Pascal K. Whelpton. The Fertility of American Woman. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Greene, Gael. "A Vote Against Motherhood." Saturday Evening Post, (January 26, 1963), 10-12.
- Greer, Germaine. The Female Eunuch. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Gurin, Gerald, Joseph Veroff and Sheila Feld. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Gustavus, Susan O. and James R. Henley, Jr. "Correlates of Voluntary Childlessness in a Select Population." Social Biology, XVIII (1971), 277-284.
- Hauser, Phillip M. "The Census of 1970." Scientific American, CCXXV (1971), 17-25.
- Hill, Reuben, J. Mayone Stycos and Kurt W. Back. The Family and Population Control. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Hobart, Charles W. "Attitudes Toward Parenthood Among Canadian Young People." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV (1973), 71-82.
- Hobbs, Daniel F., Jr. "Parenthood as Crisis: A Third Study." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVII (1965), 367-372.

- Hollingsworth, Leta S. "Social Devices for Impelling Women to Bear and Rear Children." The American Journal of Sociology, XXII (1916), 19-29.
- Jacoby, Arthur P. "Transition to Parenthood: A Reassessment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI (1969), 720-727.
- Johnson, Anne D. "Teaching Population Education to Home Economics Students." Journal of Home Economics, XXIII (November, 1974), 15.
- Kennedy, Maggie. "A Woman's Choice: Motherhood Role is Not For All." Dallas Times Herald, March 18, 1975.
- Kirkendall, Lester A. A Reading and Study Guide for Students in Marriage and Family Relations. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1968.
- Kunz, Phillip R. and Merlin B. Brinkerhoff. "Differential Childlessness by Color: The Destruction of a Cultural Belief." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI (1969), 713-717.
- LeMasters, E. E. "Parenthood as Crisis." Marriage and Family Living, XXV (1963), 196-201.
- LeMasters, E. E. Parents in Modern America. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1970.
- Lester, Marianne. "Right Now." McCalls (March, 1974), 129.
- Martin, Sandra. "An Exploratory Study: The Effects of Family Background Variables on the Decision to Remain Childless." (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)
- Maxwell, Joseph W. and James E. Montgomery. "Societal Pressure Toward Early Parenthood." The Family Coordinator, XVIII (1969), 340-344.
- McQuire, C. and C. D. White. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research paper in Human Development, No. 3. Austin: University of Texas, 1955.
- Mead, Margaret. Male and Female. New York: W. Marrow, 1949.
- Nichols, Lynnell. "Why We Don't Want Children." Redbook (January, 1970), 10-14.
- Movius, Margaret. "Voluntary Childlessness: The Ultimate Liberation." The Family Coordinator, XXV (January, 1976), 57-63.

- Nam, Charles B., ed. "Boom Babies Come of Age: The American Family at the Crossroads." Population and Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968, 265-278.
- Peck, Ellen. The Baby Trap. New York: Pinnacle, 1971.
- Peck, Ellen and Judith Senderowitz, eds. "Introduction." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974, 1-9.
- Peck, Ellen. "Television's Romance with Reproduction." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974, 78-97.
- Pohlman, Edward. "Childlessness, Intentional and Unintentional." The Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, CLI (1970), 2-12.
- Pohlman, Edward. "Changes in Views Toward Childlessness: 1965-1970." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974a, 276-277.
- Pohlman, Edward. "Motivations in Wanting Conceptions." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1974b, 159-190.
- Pohlman, Edward and Julia Mae Pohlman. The Psychology of Birth Planning. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1969.
- Popenoe, Paul. "Motivation of Childless Marriages." Journal of Heredity, XXVII (1936), 469-472.
- Radl, Shirley. Mother's Day is Over. New York: Charterhouse, 1973.
- Rainwater, Lee. Family Design: Marital Sexuality, Family Size, and Contraception. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
- Rheingold, Joseph C. The Fear of Being a Woman. New York: Grune and Stratten, Inc., 1964.
- Rollin, Betty. "Motherhood: Who Needs It?" Look, XXXIII (1970), 11-17.
- Ryder, Robert. "Longitudinal Data Relating Marriage Satisfaction and Having a Child." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV (1973), 604-606.
- Sanger, Margaret. Women and the New Race. Elmsford, New York: Maxwell Reprint Company, 1969.
- Scanzoni, John. "Sex Role Change and Influences on Birth Intentions." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVIII, No. 1 (February, 1976), 43-58.

- Sherman, Julia A. On the Psychology of Women. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.
- Silverman, A. and A. Silverman. The Case Against Having Children. New York: McKay Company, 1971.
- Stinnett, Nick. "Personal Communication Developed as a Part of The Family Strengths Research Project, 1975." Stillwater: Family Relations and Child Development Department, Oklahoma State University (to be published).
- Stinnett, Nick. Life Philosophy Scale. Stillwater: Family Relations and Child Development Department, Oklahoma State University, 1975.
- Stolka, Susan M. and Larry D. Barnett. "Education and Religion as Factors in Women's Attitudes Motivating Childbearing." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1969), 740-750.
- Stroup, A. Marriage and Family: A Developmental Approach. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1966.
- Taubin, Sara. "Speaking Frankly." Journal of Home Economics (November, 1974), 15.
- Udry, R. J. The Social Context of Marriage. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1966.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Birth Expectations Data: June, 1971. Current Population Reports, Series P-20 (232), June, 1971.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Birth Expectations Data: June, 1973. Current Population Reports, Series P-20 (254), June, 1973.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Fertility Expectations of American Women: June, 1974. Current Population Reports, Series P-20 (277), June, 1974a.
- United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Prospects for American Fertility: June, 1974. Current Population Reports, Series P-20 (269), June, 1974b.
- Veevers, J. E. "Childlessness and Age at First Marriage." Social Biology, XVIII (1971), 292-295.
- Veevers, J. E. "Voluntarily Childless Wives: An Exploratory Study." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company (1974a) 295-304.

- Veevers, J. E. "Voluntary Childlessness: A Neglected Area of Family Study." Pronatalism: The Myth of Mom and Apple Pie. Peck and Senderowitz, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company (1974b), 305-314.
- Whelpton, Pascal K., Arthur A. Campbell and John E. Patterson. Fertility and Family Planning in the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.
- Wright, Althea Marie. "College Students' Attitudes Concerning Father-Son Relationships." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN RESEARCH

Please answer the following questions as accurately as you can. It is important that you answer ALL questions. You are asked not to put your name on the questionnaire. This assures your anonymity. Therefore, you are encouraged to answer all questions as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. Your cooperation in this research project is greatly appreciated.

## 1. Sex

 Male Female

## 2. Age \_\_\_\_\_ years

## 3. Race

 Black Indian White Other (Please specify)

## 4. Marital Status

 Single Married Divorced Widowed Annulment

## 5. If married, how many years have you been married to your present spouse? \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

## 6. If not married, do you desire to be married in the future?

 yes       no       undecided

## 7. How many children do you have?

 No children Girls Boys



8. Do you plan to have children in the future?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes          \_\_\_\_\_ No
9. Indicate below your present political orientation:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Very conservative  
\_\_\_\_\_ Conservative  
\_\_\_\_\_ Middle-of-road  
\_\_\_\_\_ Liberal  
\_\_\_\_\_ Radical  
\_\_\_\_\_ Revolutionary
10. Indicate below your degree of religious orientation:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Very religious  
\_\_\_\_\_ Religious  
\_\_\_\_\_ Non-religious  
\_\_\_\_\_ Anti-religious
11. Indicate below your attendance in church or church activities at the present time:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Frequently (3 times or more per month)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Occasionally (6-12 times per year)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Infrequently (less than 6 times per year)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Never attend
12. Indicate your religious preference at the present time:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Baptist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Catholic  
\_\_\_\_\_ Episcopal  
\_\_\_\_\_ Jewish  
\_\_\_\_\_ Methodist  
\_\_\_\_\_ Morman

## 12. (Continued)

- Presbyterian
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- No religious preference

## 13. Your education:

- Some college (please specify how many semesters at present time)
- Semesters
- College graduate
- Professional training (Clergy, Law, Medicine, Graduate School)

## 14. Who earns most of the income for your family?

- Husband
- Wife
- Parents
- Husband-wife equally
- Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

## 15. Do you think that a woman can combine both a career and motherhood?

- Very often
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

## 16. Who do you believe most influenced your attitudes towards being a future parent?

- Mother
- Father
- Spouse

16. (Continued)

- Brothers or sisters
- Own personal attitude
- Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

17. Parent's marital status during your childhood:

- Married to each other
- Separated
- Divorced
- Divorced and Remarried
- Widowed

18. Father's current occupation: (if retired, last occupation prior to retirement)

\_\_\_\_\_

19. Mother's current occupation: (If retired, last occupation prior to retirement)

\_\_\_\_\_

20. Was your mother employed for the major part of your childhood?

- Yes (Full-time employment)
- Yes (Part-time employment)
- No

21. Father's education:

- Did not finish high school
- High school graduate
- Some college (please specify semesters) \_\_\_\_\_
- Business school
- College graduate
- Technical or trade school
- Professional training (Clergy, Medicine, Law, or Graduate School)

22. What is the primary source of the income of your family in which you grew up?
- Inherited savings and investments
  - Earned wealth, transferable investments
  - Profits, royalties, fees
  - Salary, commissions (regular, monthly, yearly)
  - Hourly wages, weekly checks
  - Odd jobs, seasonal work
  - Private charity or public relief
23. Do you feel that within your parents' marriage, they quarreled:
- Very often
  - Often
  - Sometimes
  - Rarely
  - Never
24. Indicate below which characterizes the happiness of your childhood?
- Very happy
  - Happy
  - Uncertain
  - Unhappy
  - Very unhappy
25. Indicate the closeness of your relationship with your mother:
- Very Close
  - Close
  - Uncertain
  - Distant
  - Very Distant

26. Indicate the closeness of your relationship with your father:

- Very Close
- Close
- Uncertain
- Distant
- Very Distant

27. In my family, the discipline I received was mainly from:

- My father
- My father with some help from my mother
- Equally my father and my mother
- My mother with some help from my father
- My mother

28. Check the one which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your father:

- Very Permissive
- Permissive
- Average
- Strict
- Very Strict

29. Check the one which most nearly describes the type of discipline you received from your mother:

- Very Permissive
- Permissive
- Average
- Strict
- Very Strict

30. Indicate how you would judge the happiness of your parent's marriage on a 5-point scale. (5 = the greatest degree of happiness, 1 = the least degree of happiness)

5            4            3            2            1

31. If you are presently married, rate the happiness of your own marriage on the following scale. (5 = the greatest degree of happiness, 1 = the least degree of happiness)

5            4            3            2            1

32. How much social value do you believe there is in a couple choosing to remain childless?

\_\_\_\_\_ Very much

\_\_\_\_\_ Much

\_\_\_\_\_ Undecided

\_\_\_\_\_ Little

\_\_\_\_\_ Very little

33. Do you consider voluntary childlessness to be a natural inclination for most women?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

34. If your answer is "No" to the above question, why do you feel that it is not the natural inclination for most women?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

35. Who do you believe would demonstrate the most disapproval if you decided not to have children?

\_\_\_\_\_ Spouse

\_\_\_\_\_ Parents

\_\_\_\_\_ Friends

\_\_\_\_\_ Clergy

\_\_\_\_\_ In-Laws

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

36. If you decide that you didn't want any children, would you be willing to go through sterilization to insure that you wouldn't become a parent? (Man-vasectomy, woman-tubal ligation or hysterectomy?)

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

\_\_\_\_\_ Unsure

37. How would you feel about not being able to have any children by natural means?

\_\_\_\_\_ A blessing in disguise

\_\_\_\_\_ A bitter disappointment

\_\_\_\_\_ Wouldn't bother you

38. Following are some proverbs and sayings about life. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each by circling the appropriate letter. The response code is:

SA - Strongly Agree

A - Agree

U - Undecided

D - Disagree

SD - Strongly Disagree

- |    |  |    |   |   |   |    |
|----|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| a. | A wise way to live is to look on the bright side of things.                              | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| b. | For every problem that arises there is usually a solution.                               | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| c. | People rarely get what they want in life.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| d. | When all is said and done we really have little control over what happens to us in life. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| e. | To a large degree we are the "Captains of our fate."                                     | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| f. | Whether we are happy or not depends upon the kinds of things that happen to us in life.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |

## 38. (Continued)

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| g. There is a higher power (God) that operates in the daily lives of people. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| h. God answers prayer.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| i. There is no power higher than man.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |

## 39. If you chose to remain voluntarily childless, would your reasons be: (May choose more than one)

- \_\_\_\_\_ Concern for population growth
- \_\_\_\_\_ Concern for world conditions (War, Famine, etc.)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Occupational involvement
- \_\_\_\_\_ Desire to maintain the childless lifestyle
- \_\_\_\_\_ Wish to avoid the responsibility of rearing children
- \_\_\_\_\_ Unsuitable temperamentally
- \_\_\_\_\_ Wish to avoid pregnancy and childbirth
- \_\_\_\_\_ Financial responsibility of rearing children
- \_\_\_\_\_ Distaste for physical changes of the body during pregnancy
- \_\_\_\_\_ Emotional strain
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

## 40. Answer each of the following items with a check in the column that most appropriately describes your behavior and characteristics:

- |                                | More than<br>Average Person | Average | Less than<br>Average Person |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|
| Physically active,<br>vigorous |                             |         |                             |
| Enjoy life                     |                             |         |                             |
| Intelligent                    |                             |         |                             |
| Tense                          |                             |         |                             |
| Easily pleased                 |                             |         |                             |



## 40. (Continued)

	More than Average Person	Average	Less than Average Person
Slow to get things done			
Friendly			
Perfectionist			
Accept responsibility			
Moody			
Independent			
Enjoy being alone			
Accepted by others			
Nervous			
Careless			
Deliberate			
Impatient			
Cooperative			
Enjoy children			
Self-reliant			
Aggressive			
Attractive			
Irritable			
Mature			
Does what others want me to			

41. If you had a choice, would you prefer to spend the major portion of your life: (Female respondents only)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have no children, stay at home
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have children, stay at home
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have children, have a career at the same time
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have no children, have a career
- \_\_\_\_\_ Remain single
42. If you had a choice, would you prefer to spend the major portion of your life: (Male respondents only)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have no children, have a career
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have children, have a career
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have children, stay at home
- \_\_\_\_\_ Be married, have no children, stay at home
- \_\_\_\_\_ Remain single
43. Have you ever had a family living class?
- \_\_\_\_\_ No
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes
- \_\_\_\_\_ High School
- \_\_\_\_\_ College
44. Parenthood is one of the greatest responsibilities human beings have in life:
- \_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Agree
- \_\_\_\_\_ Agree
- \_\_\_\_\_ Disagree
- \_\_\_\_\_ Strongly disagree
45. If you did not have children, do you feel you could find fulfillment elsewhere? If so, where?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

46. Concerning your time priorities for your future life, place in rank order of importance to you the following:

- a. \_\_\_\_\_ Community involvement
- b. \_\_\_\_\_ Social activities
- c. \_\_\_\_\_ Family
- d. \_\_\_\_\_ Work
- e. \_\_\_\_\_ Individual leisure time activities outside the family

VITA

Lizabeth Tully Thomas

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: THE ATTITUDES OF COLLEGE YOUTH AT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY  
CONCERNING THE PARENTHOOD ROLE

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, July 16, 1953,  
the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence L. Tully. Married  
on June 1, 1974 to George C. Thomas, III.

Education: Graduated from Shawnee High School, Shawnee, Oklahoma,  
in May, 1971. Received Bachelor of Science degree from  
Oklahoma State University, May 10, 1975, with a major in  
Psychology; completed requirements for the Master of Science  
degree in December, 1976 at Oklahoma State University.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu.