DOCTORAL DISSERTATION SERIES

PUBLICATION: 5052

AUTHOR: John Frederick Kantner , Ph. D., 1953
University of Michigan

TITLE: SOCIAL MOBILITY, FERTILITY AND FERTILITY PLANNING

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1953

SOCIAL MOBILITY, FERTILITY AND FERTILITY PLANNING

by

John F. Kantner

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1952

Committee in charge:

Assistant Professor Ronald Freedman, Chairman
Professor Carl Fischer
Professor Amos Hawley
Professor E. Lowell Kelly
Doctor Gerhard Lenski

SOCIAL MOBILITY, FERTILITY AND FERTILITY PLANNING

by John F. Kantner

The problem of this study is the relationship between social mobility, defined as an intergenerational change of status, and various aspects of reproductive behavior. Specifically, fertility (measured by number of children ever born) and fertility planning are considered as dependent variables.

The data were gathered in 1940 as part of an intensive study of fertility among a select group of couples residing in Indianapolis, Indiana. Through a series of interviews with 860 native, white, Protestant couples whose marriages had never been disrupted, information relative to fertility, fertility planning, and a series of background characteristics was obtained. Among the latter were data on the occupational and educational status of the parents of the interviewees. These data were used as base lines for defining the social mobility of sons and daughters. Age of wife, duration of marriage, and socio-economic status are dealt with as possible sources of variation. Fertility planning is measured by a set of categories which loosely may be described as (1) couples who plan both number and spacing of children (2) couples who plan number of children alone (3) couples who plan neither number nor spacing but who apparently have not had more children than they want and (4) couples with more children than they want.

Very little relationship is found between social mobility and fertility planning. However, when social and physical mobility together are taken as independent variables, a direct relationship is suggested. Physical mobility alone is not related to fertility planning. Socially mobile couples do appear however to employ contraceptive measures with greater regularity than nonmobile couples.

The relationship between social mobility and fertility is more pronounced than that between social mobility and fertility planning. In the case of up mobility the relationship is inverse. There are exceptions to this, chiefly within the Clerical occupations. The relationship with down mobility depends largely on the way this type of mobility is measured. Occupationally down mobile couples frequently have fewer, educationally down mobile couples more children than comparable nonmobile couples. There is no evidence that up mobile couples have larger families in the opening years of marriage. The data also indicate that mobile couples plan smaller families than nonmobile couples. The sharpest differences between the fertility of mobile and nonmobile couples emerge when both occupational and physical mobility are considered even though physical mobility alone is not related to fertility.

Although it appears that mobile couples generally have smaller families, there are a number of exceptions. A tentative reformulation of the hypothesis is presented which explains the data equally well and also assimilates a number of the exceptions. This revised hypothesis holds that mobile couples become involved as a result of their mobility in

inconsistent group memberships. This, it is suggested, leads to indecision with respect to reproduction which in turn results in deferred fertility and tenacious but indefinite habits of contraception.

Preface

This study of social mobility and fertility is based on data collected for a study of social and psychological factors affecting fertility inaugurated by a group of social scientists over ten years ago. This group, known as the Committee on Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility consists of Lowell J. Reed, Chairman; Daniel Katz; E. Lowell Kelly; C. V. Kiser; Frank Lorimer; Frank W. Notestein; Frederick Osborn; S. A. Switzer; Warren S. Thompson; and P. K. Whelpton. The project is under the sponsorship of the Milbank Memorial Fund with grants from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

At its early meeting the Committee formulated a number of hypotheses but none of these was concerned with the relationship of social mobility to fertility. The present investigation is a by-product of the original study and any shortcomings of the data for this unanticipated use should not be charged to the Committee.

The job of becoming acquainted with the data was greatly facilitated by P. K. Whelpton and C. V. Kiser. Ronald Freedman, Amos Hawley and G. E. Swanson made a number of useful suggestions for the revision of earlier drafts. Finally, I am indebted to Dean J. Wilfred Lambert of the College of William and Mary for placing his

tabulating machines at my disposal. To his assistants, C. C. Maness and Marianna Dickerson, I am also grateful for help which they willingly gave well beyond the call of duty.

Table of Contents

Chapter		Page
1	The Problem and the Hypotheses	1
	Hypothesis 1	2
	Hypothesis 2	6
	Definitions	9
	The Data	13
2	Social Mobility and Fertility Planning	18
	Up Mobility	18
	Down Mobility	32
	Up Mobility and Physical Mobility	40
	Regularity of Contraception	46
	Summary and Interpretation	49
3	Social Mobility and Fertility	53
	All Planning Groups	53
	Size of Planned Families	61
	Occupational and Physical Mobility	68
	Period Analysis of Fertility	72
	Mobility, Fertility and Residual Socio-economic Variation	81
	Summary	84
4	Evaluation and Reinterpretation of the Hypotheses	87
	A Tentative Reinterpretation	92
Appendix I	The Index of Socio-economic Status	99
Appendix II	The Chapin Social Status Scale	102
Bibliography		105

TABLES

		Page
1.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.	20
2.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning, Mobility and Socio-Economic Status of Husband and Wife: Up Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.	21
3.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.	25
4.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status, Mobility Status of Husband and Wife and Socio-economic Status: Up Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.	26
5.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.	29
6.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.	30
7.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.	35
8.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.	36
9.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.	37
10.	Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.	38

Page

11. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status, Mobility Status of Husband and Wife and Socio-Economic Status: Down Occupational and Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination . 39

12. Percent of Up and Down Mobile Couples to Same Occupational or Educational Level Planning Number and Spacing of Children. 41

13. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status by Occupational and Physical Mobility of Husband. 45

14. Regularity of Contraception by Occupation and Mobility Status of Husband. 48

15. Regularity of Contraception of Quasi-Planned by Mobility Status of Husband. (Standardized for Occupation of Husband.) 50

16. Percent "Always" and "Usually" Using Contraception or Having Pregnancies as Desired by Mobility Status and Occupation of Husband. 51

17. Births per 100 Couples by Occupation of Father and Son. 54

18. Births per 100 Couples by Education of Father and Son. 56

19. Births per 100 Couples by Occupational Mobility of Husband and Wife and by Index of Socio-Economic Status. 57

20. Births per 100 Couples by Educational Mobility Status of Husband and Wife and by Index of Socio-Economic Status. 59

21. Mean Number of Children per 100 Couples Living at Time of Last Intentional Pregnancy by Mobility Status and by Occupation of Husband: Excluding Childless Couples. 60

22. Mean Number of Children per 100 Couples Living at Time of Last Intentional Pregnancy by Mobility Status and by Occupation of Husband: Including Childless Couples. 62

Page

23. Percent Childless Among Mobile and Nonmobile Couples by Occupation of Husband. 65

24. Percent Childless Among Mobile and Nonmobile Couples by Type of Mobility and by Socio-Economic Status. 66

25. Occupation Standardized Birth Rates for Mobile and Nonmobile Couples by Fertility Planning Status: Up Mobility. 67

26. Births per 100 Couples Satisfied with Size of Family by Occupational Mobility Status and by Index of Socio-Economic Status. 69

27. Births per 100 Couples by Occupational and Physical Mobility: Mobile and Nonmobile Matched for Occupation of Husband. 70

28. Percentage Childless by Occupational and Physical Mobility: Mobile and Nonmobile Matched for Husband's Occupation. 71

29. Percent Distribution by Parity and by Mobility Group. 73

30. Patterns of Family Growth by Occupational Group-Mobile and Nonmobile (Including Childless Couples.) 74

31. Fertility During First Four Years of Marriage by Occupational Group - Excluding Childless Couples. 76

32. Fertility by Period and by Occupational and Physical Mobility. 77

33. Percent Distribution of Mobile and Nonmobile Couples Having Two or More Children in First Four Years of Marriage by Pattern of Subsequent Fertility. 79

Page

34. Crude and Net Worth Standardized Birth Rate by Mobility Status of Couples Matched for Occupation of Husband and Index of Socio-Economic Status. 80

35. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status of Mobile and Nonmobile Couples Matched for Occupation of Husband and for Index of Socio-Economic Status. 83

SOCIAL MOBILITY, FERTILITY AND FERTILITY PLANNING

Chapter I

The Problem and the Hypotheses

The coexistence in open class societies of high rates of vertical mobility and declining fertility inevitably suggests their interrelationship. One-half century ago Arsene Dumont formulated his now famous "theory of social capillarity"[1] which states that vertical mobility and fertility are inversely related. Yet demographers have not followed Dumont's lead in spite of the great plausibility of the hypothesis and its impressive synthesizing potentialities. Such isolated sociological propositions as the relationship of social change and achieved status, Pearl's logistic curve of population growth, Pareto's observations on the circulation of the elite might have achieved some integration from this hypothesis. Although the effect of differential fertility on vertical mobility has been studied,[2] virtually nothing is known regarding the reverse relationship. Perhaps the hypothesis has not appealed to investigators be cause of its obviousness but its negation is easily conceivable, as the following section will indicate.

The Hypothesis and Its Rationale

The relationship between social mobility and fertility is the principal

---

[1] Dumont, Arsene, "La Morale basee sur la demographie," 181 pp., Schleicher Freres, Paris, 1901.

[2] Sorokin, P. A., Social Mobility, Harper and Bros., 1927; Sibley, E. "Some Demographic Clues to Stratification", American Sociological Review, Vol. VII, 1942.

subject of this investigation. However, in view of its crucial role as an intermediate variable in any relationship involving fertility, the extent of fertility planning will be treated both as a dependent variable and as a control.

Hypothesis 1 - The Rationality Hypothesis

One hypothesis interrelating social mobility, fertility planning and fertility may be stated in terms of the three following propositions:

Hypothesis 1:

(a) The families of socially mobile couples are smaller than those of socially non-mobile couples of comparable status.

(b) Socially mobile couples are more effective fertility planners than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

(c) The size of planned families of socially mobile couples is smaller than that of non-mobile couples of comparable status.

It seems desirable to present three subhypotheses even though (c) may appear to be merely a refined test of (a). (a) might be true because (b) and (c) are true but other outcomes are possible. For example (a) could be true even though (b) and (c) are not true. In such a case the findings relative to (a) would suggest problems of interpretation and new hypotheses that might be overlooked if it were merely found that (b) and/or (c) were not true.

The most apparent rationale for part (b) of Hypothesis 1 suggested by sociological theory is as follows: social mobility (defined here only as change of status) leads to an emancipation from traditional behavior

patterns, and this in turn leads to social action on a more rational basis. Rationality is not conceived in absolute terms but involves merely the wider availability of means for whatever ends are in sight. The increased availability of means may result from the acquisition of new knowledge or from the removal of taboos on prohibited means. It is assumed that fertility management is a preferred means when available even though family size norms vary. For the reasons given, this means is more likely to be available to socially mobile couples. This view of the situation usually includes the tacit assumption of a conscious comparison of means. As Freedman and Whelpton[3] point out there is an equal possibility that more effective means[4] are adopted nonreflectively as a result of group conformity. By this view hypothesis 1b requires an assumption about the differential distribution of effective means. Mobility then operates primarily by introducing the individual to new techniques and perhaps secondarily by preparing him for their acceptance; however, the mobile person is not thereby more rational. Both dynamisms are possible, and so long as we do not go beyond a cultural definition of effectiveness, both are generally acceptable.

Hypothesis 1 a assumes that the transition from large family patterns appropriate to an earlier social order to the small families of

---

[3]Freedman, R. and P. K. Whelpton, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, X. Fertility Planning and Fertility Rates by Religious Interest and Denomination," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, July 1950, xxviii, No. 3, p. 296.

[4]No absolute definition of effectiveness is necessary here.

the emerging social structure is not complete. Through this assumption we are able to formulate an hypothesis relative to family size. Mobility, then, not only facilitates the implementation of given ends but also hastens the erosion of old ends. Among nonmobile couples on the other hand there would be a greater persistence of survivals from an earlier period. Thus for example, Freedman[5] has shown that interurban migrants resemble the ideal-typical urban dweller to a greater extent than do the nonmigrant residents of Chicago with whom they were compared. Therefore (a) may be true, in part because of (b) and in part because of greater historical inertia among nonmobile groups. However, (a) could be true even if only (b) and not (c) were true.

Hypothesis 1c which states that mobile couples plan smaller families is assumed because greater historical inertia is expected among nonmobile couples. That is, even if differences in fertility planning are eliminated, mobile couples experience a more rapid reduction in their family size norms or, conversely, there is a greater tendency for the survival of large family norms among nonmobile couples. Moreover, it is probable that when a status is held only a short time, as in the case of mobile couples, great energy must be spent in its validation and in acquiring competence for its fulfillment. This may frequently be at the expense of children. One might also expect that mobility to some degree impairs those relationships of mutual aid which mitigate the process of

---

[5]Freedman, Ronald, Recent Migration to Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1951.

status establishment.[6] The number of cooperative relationships would seem to depend upon knowledge of the environment. Friendship and "family influence" for example are important aspects of this knowledge and perhaps work most favorably for an individual when no change of status is involved.

These arguments underlying Hypothesis 1 have been stated without respect to direction of movement. Dumont's theory of social capillarity was concerned solely with up mobility but many of the same effects might be expected as correlates of down mobility. The principle reason for not expecting the same relationships in the case of down mobility is the possible existence of factors which select for this type of social mobility those least capable of effective fertility management. Therefore up and down mobility will be investigated separately. It should be evident that the problem of selective factors is likewise present in connection with up mobility but is less troublesome there since upward selection probably operates in the same direction as social mobility. The inability to separate the effects of mobility from those due to selective factors would be a serious deficiency were it not that this investigation seeks merely to make a rough choice among plausible explanations.

---

[6] To the extent that this means greater economic insecurity, a reduction in fertility and to an even more marked degree an increase in childlessness is to be expected. See Kiser, C. V. and P. K. Whelpton, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, XI, The Interrelationship of Fertility, Fertility Planning and Feeling of Economic Security," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Vol. XXIX, No. 1, Jan. 1951.

With the problem thus localized more intensive investigation would then be in order.

To reveal the strategy of this study a second hypothesis, contradictory to the preceeding one, will be presented in the paragraphs to follow.

Hypothesis 2 - The Inertia Hypothesis

The second hypothesis may be stated in the following five propositions in which explicit attention is paid to the direction of mobility.

Hypothesis 2:

(a) Up mobile couples will have larger families than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

(b) Up mobile couples will be less effective fertility planners than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

(c) Up mobile couples will have larger planned families than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

(d) Down mobile couples will have smaller families than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

(e) Down mobile couples will be more effective fertility planners than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

(f) Down mobile couples will have smaller planned families than nonmobile couples of comparable status.

Parts (d), (e), and (f) of Hypothesis 2 are like (a), (b), and (c) of Hypothesis 1. Both Hypothesis 1 and parts a, b, and c of Hypothesis 2 predict opposite outcomes and are of greatest interest in this study.

It is assumed in Hypothesis 2 that the fertility-depressing and the rationality-stimulating effects of up mobility will not be sufficient to overcome the inertia of large family patterns and ineffective means

acquired in one's group of orientation.[7] Down mobile couples "bring with them" tendencies toward smaller patterns and relatively more effective means to fertility management. It is not necessary in either case to assume that consciously formulated patterns are being "carried." Rather one need only accept the plausible proposition that these patterns are part of the mobile individuals' early habit structure developed in his group of orientation. Such a view is consistent with theories of human behavior which stress the potency and persistence of early conditioning but these provide few clues for predicting the guise in which subsequent behaviors will appear. Indeed we come to expect the most subtle transformations so that the idea of a simple carry over of earlier habits is an inadequate base for Hypothesis 2.[8]

It is not difficult to find other theories which lend credibility to Hypothesis 2. First there is the notion of relative deprivation. According to this, up mobile couples because of the favorable contrast with the levels of living among their groups of orientation would feel less urgency in connection with fertility management. The assumption here is that the relative absence of threat to an acceptable mode of life is

---

[7] This is an expansion of the familiar "family of orientation" concept. It includes a more extensive field of interaction than the latter.

[8] That the inertia of old habits may be a widely useful explanation seems evident from the ubiquity of the lag phenomenon (without ethical connotations) in human adaptation.

conducive to the persistence of old habits, particularly those that involve a reference to the future, e. g., creation of a family. The reverse is true for the down mobile individual. Of course relative deprivation is a two-edged sword and may lead to opposite predictions if comparisons are made with the destination groups or if the old and the new modes of life are not comparable.[9]

If the inverse relationship between coital rates and socio-economic status[10] found in the general population is not changed as a result of social mobility and if mobility is not selective by coital rate this too would contribute to the plausibility of Hypothesis 2 since up mobile couples would be exposed to the risk of an unplanned pregnancy to a greater extent than nonmobile (destination) couples. The opposite would be predicted for down mobile couples. In addition, data presented by Komorovsky[11] suggest that the tensions associated with down mobility

---

[9]If the new mode of life (at destination) is incomprehensible the old status seen through the fog of nostalgia may tend to downgrade the present situation in spite of certain objective advantages. See Handlin, Oscar, The Uprooted, Little, Brown and Co., 1952.

[10]Pearl, Raymond, "Biological Factors in Fertility," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 188, November 1936. See also Hanney, O. L., "A Note on the Frequency of Human Coitus," American Journal of Sociology, 38, 1932; Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, and Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, W. B. Saunders Co., 1948.

[11]Komorovsky, Mirra, The Unemployed Man and His Family, Dryden Press, 1940.

would reduce the coital rate for down mobile couples still more.

The preceeding arguments should be sufficient to make plausible a prediction in terms of either hypothesis. It will be necessary to consider differences in the predictions made by these two hypotheses in greater detail. Before this can be done, however, certain definitions must be presented and the data described.

Definitions

Social mobility. The social mobility dealt with in this study is intergenerational. Differences in status between generations are measured by differences in occupation or education between father and son and in some instances father and daughter. In determining up and down occupational mobility the familiar classification developed by Edwards[12] is assumed to be roughly adequate. This classification involves the following rankings of occupations which is thought to reflect in general descending degrees of prestige and skill: Professional, Proprietary, Clerical, Skilled, Semiskilled and Unskilled. That the Edwards' classification is graded in terms of fertility rates as well has been shown repeatedly.[13] Thus this ranking of occupations may be used as an index of status position and at the same time as an index of differential fertility levels. I f this were not true Hypotheses 1 and 2 could not be tested with

---

[12]Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Comparative Occupational Statistics for the United States, 1870 to 1940.

[13]Kiser, C. V, and P. K. Whelpton, IX Fertility Planning and Fertility Rates by Socio-Economic Status, Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Vol. XXVII, No. 2, April, 1949.

a single set of occupational categories.

Fertility. The basic measure of fertility is children ever born per 100 couples. The manner of dealing with age of wife at marriage, duration of marriage, and other matters relevant to an evaluation of this measure is described below.

Fertility Planning. Four broad categories representing descending degrees of success in planning family size are employed. These may be described briefly as follows:[14]

(1) Number and Spacing of Pregnancies Planned. The 403* couples in this group exhibit the most complete planning of fertility in that they had no pregnancies that were not deliberately planned by stopping contraception in order to conceive. The group consists of two major subdivisions: (a) 121 couples practicing contraception regularly and continuously and having no pregnancy, and (b) 282 couples whose every pregnancy was deliberately planned by interrupting contraception in order to conceive. This planning group will be referred to throughout the study as N. S. P.

(2) Number Planned. This group of 205 couples consists mainly of those whose last pregnancy was deliberately planned by stopping contraception in order to conceive but who had one or more previous pregnancies under other circumstances. Because of this, the couples are regarded as having planned the number but not the spacing of their pregnancies. This planning group will be designated as N. P.

---

[14]Taken from Kiser, Clyde V. and P. K. Whelpton, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, XI. The Interrelation of Fertility, Fertility Planning, and Feeling of Economic Security." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, XXIX, No. 1, Jan. 1951.

*The sample of which this is one subgroup is described in the next section.

(3) Quasi-Planned. This group includes 454 couples who did not deliberately plan the last pregnancy in the manner described above but who either wanted the last pregnancy or wanted another pregnancy. The designation for this group is Q. P.

(4) Excess Fertility. This group is composed of 382 couples classified as least successful in planning size of family because one or more pregnancies had occurred after the last that was wanted. In some cases the unwanted pregnancy was wanted at the time it occurred. The designation for this group is E. F.

Only "relatively fecund" couples were studied. All couples with four or more live births are so classified. Couples with 0 - 3 live births were "relatively fecund" unless they had good reason to believe that conception was physiologically impossible during a period of twenty-four (for never pregnant couples) or thirty-six (for others) consecutive months since marriage. In addition to medical evidence, failure to conceive when contraception was not regularly practiced during these periods was considered "good reason" for such belief.

Certain remarks are needed for the full interpretation of these planning categories. First it is important to note that only the Number and Spacing Planned (N.S.P.) classification refers unambiguously to the entire period of married life. The remaining categories are differentiated largely in terms of the situation at the time of the last pregnancy although in the case of Number Planned (N. P.) previous ineffectiveness may be inferred. As a scale the classification does not meet the criterion of unidimensionality. Effectiveness in planning fertility, honesty in answering questions and tolerance for children are

probable components. Nor may it be assumed that the other scale positions (N. P., Q. P., and E. F.) correctly order couples in terms of past or future effectiveness. The chief difference between N. P. and Q. P. couples is that the former demonstrate more convincingly that the last or a subsequent child is wanted by reporting the suspension of contraception in order to conceive.[15] It is not unlikely that some N. P. would have had another pregnancy even if they had not stopped contraception nor is their demonstration of fertility control impressive enough to exclude the possibility of their becoming E. F.'s before reproductive life is concluded. For the present study knowledge of Fertility Planning effectiveness of couples prior to the time of interview is important. A few considerations will make it clear that only in the case of N. S. P. couples can anything be inferred safely about past effectiveness. For example the percentage of wives who learned of and practised contraception prior to first pregnancy is slightly larger for Q. P. than for N. P. This is true also of E. F. wives who had only "one too many" pregnancies. That this contraception was effective is perhaps indicated by the fact that the interval between marriage and first birth was slightly longer for Q. P. and E. F. ("one

---

[15] This statement ignores the few N. P. couples who used abortion as a technique or who had more children than they wanted because the last pregnancy produced twins. Also Q. P. included some couples who never used contraception until a predetermined number of children were born and then prevented subsequent pregnancies.

too many") couples than for N. P. couples in spite of the fact that N. P. couples appear to prefer as long an interval.[16] The N. P. couples are thus not superior in fertility planning in the early period of married life to the couples who are subsequently classified as less effective. The average months of exposure per conception before the first pregnancy for Q. P. and E. F. ("one too many") are 26.6 and 31.0; for N. P., 24. However for subsequent pregnancies the average months of exposure per conception are: N.P., 248.0; Q.P., 116.8; E.F. ("one too many"), 74.3. The greater regularity of N. P. contraception seems to underlie these differences.[17] Thus although at the time of interview N. P., Q.P., and E. F. probably represent descending degrees of success it is not advisable to extend the ordering of these categories backward in time. In the analysis to follow the comparison of N. S. P. distributions will be relied upon primarily in looking for differences between mobile and nonmobile couples in fertility planning effectiveness.

The Data[18]

The Sample - Between March 1, 1941 and August 1941, 41,498

---

[16]The facts are set forth in detail in Kiser and Whelpton, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, VI. The Planning of Fertility. The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, January 1947.

[17]Ibid. Table 12.

[18]For a fuller discussion of the data see Whelpton, P. K. and Kiser, Clyde V.: Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, IV. Developing the Schedules, and Choosing the Type of Couples and the Area to be Studied. The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, October 1945; V. The Sampling Plan, Selection, and the Representativeness of

native-white couples with wife under forty-five were included in a Household Survey of Indianapolis. From information gathered in this initial survey a group of 2,589 native-white Protestant couples whose marriages were contracted during 1927-1929, and were unbroken at the time of interview was selected for more intensive study. Additional requirements for inclusion in the Study[19] were: the wife was under thirty and the husband under forty at marriage, neither previously married, both residents of a city with a population of 25,000 or more most of the time since marriage, and both having at least completed grammar school. This restricted group was selected because it seemed to the investigators to be the most significant group that could be studied with the funds at hand.[20] The homogeneity of the Study group was a protection against the devestating effects of subclassification of a sample of limited size.

The field work was carried out between April 5, 1941 and January 31, 1942. When it was concluded, long schedules had been completed for 860 "relatively fecund" couples.[21] This sample of the

---

Couples in the Inflated Sample. The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, January, 1946.

[19]The enumeration of the original 41,498 couples is known as The Survey. The more intensive investigation of the smaller group of 2,589 couples is known as The Study.

[20]See "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, IV," op. cit., p. 152 f.

[21]The 220 briefer schedules filled out for "relatively sterile" couples are of no concern for this investigation.

2,589 eligible couples employed a type of disproportionate stratification. Stratification was by number of children and by rental group within parity groups.[22] In order to compensate for the disproportionality by parity groups, weights based on the percentage distribution by parity of the total group of eligibile couples[23] were secured. However, instead of applying these weights each time parity groups were to be combined, a sufficient number of schedules within each parity were duplicated to restore proportionality. This procedure yielded records of 1444 "relatively fecund" couples, known as the "inflated" sample. The "inflated" sample has been shown to be quite similar to the original group of eligible couples with respect to distributions of live births, dwelling units by rental value, age of husbands and wives, and educational attainment.

Types of Information Used - Data were available from the Study for the following items:

> Occupation of Father - defined as the one he followed while the husband (wife)[24] "was growing up" (age 6 - 16).
>
> Occupation of Husband - defined as his longest occupation. In about seventy-five percent of the cases the husband's longest occupation is also his last. In fifty-one percent of the cases it is also his first occupation after marriage. Both of these figures refer to the same job within an occupation and would

---

[22] A parity group is a family size group with size being determined by the number of children. The stratification within parities is proportionate.

[23] Actually the total number of eligible, cooperative, fecund couples.

[24] Father and mother refer to the parents of the couples interviewed. Husband and Wife refer to the interviewees.

undoubtedly be higher if only those changes between occupational classes were noted.

Education of Father (Mother) - highest grade completed.

Education of Husband (Wife) - highest grade completed

Index of Socio-Economic Status for each family studied. This is a composite index which includes husband's average annual earnings since marriage, net worth, shelter rent at interview, husband's longest occupation since marriage, purchase price of car, education of husband, education of wife, and rating of the household on Chapin's Social Status Scale. Appendix I indicates the way in which this index is summarized. Appendix II presents the Chapin Social Status scale.

Homogeneity of Sample and Subgroups. Before variation in fertility can be attributed to any other cause, the possibility that it may be due to differences in age composition of the subgroups must be disposed of. One way of doing this is to show the subgroups to be homogeneous in these respects. Age differences among wives would have had the greatest significance and in the following paragraphs the homogeneity of the sample and of important subgroups is considered with respect to both the age of the wife at interview and her age at marriage.

Age of Wife: Although the sample restrictions limit the variation in age among the Indianapolis wives, it is well to compare the age distribution of mobile and nonmobile wives. When classified by age at last birthday the occupationally mobile wives have a median age of 32.5 years. The median for nonmobile wives is 32.3. The mean ages are 33.4 and 33.0 respectively.

Age of Wife at Marriage: Since only marriages which occurred

between 1927 and 1929 were included in the study similarity in the ages of wives would guarantee general similarity in age at marriage. Nevertheless small differences in age at marriage are found within certain subgroups of the study. The mean ages at marriage by planning group are as follows:

	Occupationally Mobile		Occupationally Nonmobile
	Up	Down	
N. S. P.	22.3	21.5	21.1
N. P.	20.2	19.8	19.5
Q. P.	21.3	20.2	19.4
E. F.	20.6	19.6	20.8

The mean ages by husband's occupation are as follows:

	Occupationally Mobile		Occupationally Nonmobile
	Up	Down	
Prof.	21.6	*	20.7
Prop.	22.2	21.6	22.0
Clerical	20.9	21.2	20.8
Skilled	20.2	20.4	20.3
Semi-Sk.	*	19.8	18.9

In all but four instances the mean age at marriage of nonmobile wives is less than that of mobile wives. These differences are so slight however that it is doubtful if this has any effect on fertility. This conclusion seems doubly justified when it is recalled that all couples have been married over ten years during which period the effect of small differences in age at marriage on fertility would be dissipated.

Chapter 2

Social Mobility and Fertility Planning

Up Mobility - Comparison of Mobile Couples with Destination Groups. In this section the fertility planning status of up mobile couples is compared with that of nonmobile couples of the same occupational or educational level - the so called "destination groups." In later sections comparison will be made with couples occupying the occupational or educational levels to which mobile couples belonged before mobility took place - the "orientation groups." Down mobility will also receive consideration in separate sections with comparisons again made with destination as well as orientation groups. As was mentioned in Chapter 1, the direction (up or down) of mobility was determined by the relative occupational or educational positions of father and son. The ranking of occupations has already been given. A special problem arises when the husband's father was a farmer. Data on the ranking of occupation collected by the National Opinion Research Center suggest that farmers may be ranked somewhere between skilled and semi-skilled workers. This scheme is followed in the following tables. Since these couples originate in a high fertility milieu the requirement for testing the inertia hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) is satisfied. There is little question that the cultural displacement involved in a change from a rural to an urban occupation provides a test of the rationality hypothesis (Hypothesis 1).

The data in Table 1 show the distributions of mobile and nonmobile couples by fertility planning categories. The columns are to be read vertically. Nonmobile couples appear first in each series and are of course indicated by the similarity of the father's and son's occupation. A comparison series includes all sons of the same occupation. These data provide a test of parts (b) of Hypotheses 1 and 2. In this first section of Chapter 2 all references to nonmobile couples are to destination groups.

Occupationally up mobile couples are not, according to Table 1, more likely to be classified as effective in fertility planning than are nonmobile couples of the same occupational class. Mobile couples in which the husband is a skilled worker are more effective than their destination groups, the differences being significant at the .01 level. However this last conclusion is based almost entirely upon the distribution within the Q. P. and E. F. categories. In view of the attitudinal criterion used in defining these categories, this latter difference between mobile and nonmobile couples may represent a difference in the definition of the situation rather than a difference in fertility planning effectiveness. The findings are similar when we define as mobile only those couples in which both husband and wife are mobile (Table 2)[25]. In Table

---

[25]The wife's mobility status is determined from the occupations of her father and her husband. Where groups were of sufficient size (Class I

Table 1. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Son	Fertility Planning Status: All Couples[1]	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
Prof.[2]	Prof.[2]	100.0	50.0	15.4	30.8	3.8
Prop.[3]	Prof.	100.0	42.8	2.4	52.4	2.4
Skilled[5]	Prof.	100.0	37.5	25.0	8.3	29.2
Farmer	Prof.	100.0	50.0	7.1	21.4	21.4
Prop.	Prop.[3]	100.0	44.4	16.7	16.7	22.2
Skilled	Prop.	100.0	32.1	14.3	28.6	25.0
Farmer	Prop.	100.0	31.2	9.4	43.8	15.6
Clerical[4]	Clerical[4]	100.0	41.0	10.3	25.6	23.1
Skilled	Clerical	100.0	30.8	16.9	27.8	24.6
Semi-Sk.[6]	Clerical	100.0	31.8	4.5	31.8	31.8
Un-Sk.[7]	Clerical	100.0	4.2	12.5	45.8	37.5
Farmer	Clerical	100.0	35.5	6.4	32.2	25.8
Skilled	Skilled[5]	100.0	24.7	11.7	18.2	45.4
Semi-Sk.	Skilled	100.0	38.3	10.6	36.2	14.9
Un-Sk.	Skilled	100.0	24.0	0.0	64.0	12.0
Farmer	Skilled	100.0	24.2	12.9	41.9	21.0

1. For numbers on which percentages are based see Table 17.
2. Professional and Semi-professional
3. Proprietor, manager and official.
4. Clerical, Sales and Kindred workers.
5. Craftsmen, Foremen and Kindred workers.
6. Operatives and Kindred workers.
7. Protective Service workers, Service workers except Domestic and Protective, Laborers.

Table 2. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning, Mobility and Socio-Economic Status of Husband and Wife: Up Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Index of Socio-Economic Status	Fertility Planning Status									
	All Couples		Number and Spacing Planned		Number Planned		Quasi-Planned		Excess Fertility	
	Up Mob.	NMD[2]	Up Mob.	NMD[2]	Up Mob.	NMD[2]	Up Mob.	NMD[2]	Up Mob.	NMD[2]
(High) I[1]	100.0	100.0	42.5	47.6	7.5	19.0	40.0	23.8	10.0	9.5
II	100.0	100.0	42.8	39.1	8.6	21.7	25.7	21.7	22.8	17.4
III	100.0	100.0	20.0	26.3	17.5	10.5	25.0	26.3	37.5	36.8
IV[1]	100.0	100.0	26.5	16.0	11.8	8.0	26.5	28.0	35.3	48.0
(Low) V	100.0	100.0	8.7	0.0	17.4	22.2	30.4	27.8	43.5	50.0
	Number of Couples									
(High) I[1]	40	21	17	10	3	4	16	5	4	2
II	35	23	15	9	3	5	9	5	8	4
III	40	20[a]	8	5	7	2	10	5	15	7
IV[1]	34	41	9	6	4	3	9	12	12	20
(Low) V	23[b]	36	2	0	4	8	7	10	10	18

1. Excluding nonmobile couples with career mobility.
2. NMD: Nonmobile couples of same Socio-economic level but not necessarily same occupation as mobile couples.

a. One couple classified as using douche "for cleanliness only" dropped.
b. Some couples included in which only one member up-mobile.

2 mobile couples excel in fertility planning only in the two lowest socio-economic groups, if by excel we mean greater percentage N. S. P. and lesser E. F.

The findings in Tables 1 and 2 are more consistent with Hypothesis 2 than with Hypothesis 1 but do not provide strong support for either. The predictive power of Hypothesis 1 should be greatest on upper status levels since here, presumably, the most extreme instances of vertical mobility are to be found. However mobile couples make their poorest showing on these levels. On the other hand, according to Hypothesis 2 we would expect mobile couples to make their poorest showing on upper status levels because of the great differences in background between mobile and nonmobile couples. At lower status levels there is a convergence of backgrounds of mobile and nonmobile couples and in terms of Hypothesis 2 it is not surprising that on these levels mobile couples are as effective as nonmobile couples. However, Hypothesis 2 does not hold in the case of Farmer to Professional (Table 1) nor does it account for the superior effectiveness of mobile couples in classes IV and V. There are certain other facts that cannot be assimilated to either hypotheses:

---

and Class IV), nonmobile couples having some career mobility were eliminated. All tables in which the mobility status of husband and wife are jointly considered are based on distributions of the uninflated sample of 860 couples. The disproportionality by parity in this sample is not an objection since in any case it is not feasible to control family size. However, percentages and rates based on this sample will not be the same as those computed from the inflated sample. The smaller sample has the advantage of having a single rather than a double source of sampling error.

Unskilled to Skilled are more effective than Unskilled to Clerical; Semi-skilled to Skilled; Farmer to Clerical are more effective than Farmer to Proprietor. In short, the data support Hypothesis 2 in more instances than Hypothesis 1 but neither hypothesis receives overwhelming support.

Intergenerational mobility may also be measured in terms of differences in educational achievement. In Table 3 the fertility planning status distributions of up educationally mobile couples is compared with those of nonmobile couples of equal education. As in the previous tables the first entry in each series refers to nonmobile couples (or as close an approximation to nonmobility as the data will allow). A series is indicated by the similarity of the son's education.

A comparison of N. S. P. distributions indicates that up mobile couples are generally more effective planners than nonmobile couples of equal educational attainment. Exceptions are found where mobility may be due to the upward secular trend in educational level rather than to the husband's own striving.[26] The data in Table 4, showing couples classified by the joint mobility status of husband and wife, also indicate

---

[26]This states an assumption not made explicit in the earlier discussion of Hypothesis 1. It seems reasonable that Hypothesis 1 will have minimal effect when the change in status is due to altered legal requirements and to new definitions of expected behavior that are class wide in scope. Under these conditions mobility will be en masse and the comparison-doubt sequence which presumably accompanies individual mobility will be prevented to a large degree. This argument applies only below the High School 4 level.

that, except in class V, mobile couples are more effective fertility planners. However, of the 18 comparisons between mobile and non-mobile couples in Tables 3 and 4, only 12 are consistent with Hypothesis 1. This could occur, according to the results of the sign test, 25 percent of the time as the result of chance.

Within the mobile group there is some evidence of a positive relationship between extent of mobility and planning effectiveness. Fifty-five percent of the couples in which the husband attended college and the father is a high school graduate are N.S.P. and N.P. (row 2-Table 3); this figure is 62 percent when the father has less than seven years of education (row 5). Similarly for couples in which the husband is a high school graduate and the father has one to three years of high school, the percentage is 32 (row 9); if the father has eight years of education the percentage is 52; if only six to seven years of education, the percentage is 56. Corresponding percentages for couples in which the husband is classified as high school 1-3 and the father (a) has completed the eighth grade, (b) has only seven years of education are thirty-five and forty respectively.[27] While these differences are consistent Hypothesis 1[28] chance cannot be ruled out as an explanation. Six of the

---

[27]If mobile couples in which the father has five years of schooling or less are included in the comparisons, the differences virtually disappear. This may have something to do with the greater extent of "forced mobility" i.e. mobility due to the upward secular trend in educational achievement among these couples since none rise very far in the educational scale.

[28]However it could still be the case that positive selection among mobile couples rather than the effect of mobility itself is responsible for these facts.

Table 3. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Educational Mobility. Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Education[2] of Father	Education[2] of Son	All Couples[1]	Fertility Planning Status: Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
Col. 1-4	Col. 3-4	100.0	35.7	16.7	31.0	16.7
H.S. 4	Col. 3-4	100.0	44.4	11.1	33.3	11.1
H.S. 1-3	Col. 3-4	100.0	34.8	17.4	39.1	8.7
G.S. 8	Col. 3-4	100.0	53.4	6.9	15.5	24.1
G.S. 7 or less	Col. 3-4	100.0	41.2	20.6	38.2	0.0
Col. 1-4	Col. 1-2	100.0	45.7	8.6	28.6	17.1
G.S. 8 or less	Col. 1-2	100.0	46.4	7.2	27.5	18.8
H.S. 4	H.S. 4	100.0	20.6	17.6	32.4	29.4
H.S. 1-3	H.S. 4	100.0	16.0	16.0	40.0	28.0
G.S. 8	H.S. 4	100.0	36.7	15.6	31.2	16.5
G.S. 6-7	H.S. 4	100.0	32.4	23.5	38.2	5.9
G.S. 5 or less	H.S. 4	100.0	13.0	15.2	52.2	19.6
H.S. 1-3	H.S. 1-3	100.0	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3
G.S. 8	H.S. 1-3	100.0	19.8	15.0	37.4	27.8
G.S. 6-7	H.S. 1-3	100.0	22.6	17.0	24.5	35.8
G.S. 5 or less	H.S. 1-3	100.0	25.0	9.6	21.2	44.2
G.S. 8	G.S. 8	100.0	28.9	8.1	34.8	28.1
G.S. 6-7	G.S. 8	100.0	16.4	18.0	21.3	44.3
G.S. 5 or less	G.S. 8	100.0	22.4	10.2	20.4	46.9

1. For numbers on which percentages are based see Table 18.
2. Col. = College; H.S. = High School; G.S. = Grade School.

Table 4. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status, Mobility Status of Husband and Wife and Socio-Economic Status: Up Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Index of Socio-Economic Status	All Couples				Fertility Planning Status							
	Number		Percent		Number and Spacing Planned		Number Planned		Quasi-Planned		Excess Fertility	
	Up Mob.	NMD[1]	Up Mob.	NMD[1]	Up Mob.	NMD[1]	Up Mob.	NMD[1]	Up. Mob.	NMD[1]	Up. Mob.	NMD[1]
(High) I II	86	26	100.0	100.0	46.5	26.9	15.1	26.9	27.9	30.8	10.5	15.4
III	34	27	99.9	100.0	23.5	18.5	14.7	18.5	32.4	37.0	29.4	25.9
IV	30	42	100.0	100.0	36.7	21.4	3.3	14.3	20.0	33.3	40.0	31.0
(Low) V	18	36	99.9	100.0	5.6	8.3	22.2	8.3	27.8	33.3	44.4	50.0

1. NMD: Nonmobile couples of same socio-economic level but not necessarily of same occupation as mobile couples.

nine comparisons within the mobile group are consistent with Hypothesis 1 but this would occur as the result of chance more than twenty-five percent of the time.

Comparison of Mobile Groups with Orientation Groups. To compare up mobile couples with nonmobile couples of the same occupation or education may be too rigorous a test of Hypothesis 1. Mobility may well have the rationality stimulating effects hypothesized, but this may not appear when up mobile couples are compared with their destination groups. Perhaps a more suitable control group is the orientation group. At any rate perspective on the problem is gained by comparing mobile couples with nonmobile couples of the same level of orientation. (Henceforth the latter, the orientation groups, will be designated as NM_o. NM_o are couples of the same occupational or educational level as were the mobile couples with whom they are compared before mobility. Destination groups are designated as NM_d).

Table 5 provides data comparing occupationally up mobile and NM_o couples. In this and the following table a nonmobile-mobile series is indicated by the similarity of the father's occupation. An examination of the N.S.P. and E.F. distributions shows the mobile couples to be more effective. In addition the greater percentage N.S.P. (in 9 out of 10 comparisons) indicates that the mobile couples were more effective at the outset of marriage.[29] Similarly the educationally up mobile in Table

---

[29]Unless it is assumed that an equal percentage of NM_o were initially N.S.P. but regressed from this category at a rapid rate. Such an interpretation seems less plausible than the one given.

6 are more effective than their respective NM_o groups. In seventeen out of twenty cases in Tables 5 and 6 the mobile couples are more effective. This could occur as the result of chance only one percent of the time.

Evidence that the factors which contribute to planning effectiveness are operating early in marriage (greater percentage of mobile N. S. P. than NM_o) needs greater elaboration. One interpretation is, of course, Hypothesis 1, since intergenerational mobility is completed for most couples at marriage. The job of attributing causality to selective factors, mobility per se or to uncontrolled post mobility conditions remains. This cannot be done successfully with the study design[30] of this investigation but at least two considerations narrow the choice to selection or mobility rather than post mobility conditions: (a) the apparent superiority of mobile couples in fertility planning at the outset of marriage. If old patterns were to be discarded as the implications of the new situation unfold, some evidence of lag would be expected. The most obvious reflection of this would be a relatively higher proportion of the group falling in the Number Planned category. This does not occur. (b) the existence of overlap in degree of effectiveness between different occupational and educational groups of mobile couples. Thus in spite of differences in occupation and education among mobile couples the distinct breaks in effectiveness that one expects to find are often lacking. Either mobility or the

---

[30] A correlation design. See Stouffer, Samual A., "Some Observations on Study Design," American Jour. Sociol. Vol. 55, pp. 355-361.

Table 5. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.[1]

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Son	Fertility Planning Status: All Couples[2]	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
Prop.	Prop.	100.0	44.0	16.7	16.7	22.2
Prop.	Prof.	100.0	42.8	2.4	52.4	2.4
Skilled	Skilled	100.0	24.7	11.7	18.2	45.4
Skilled	Prof.	100.0	37.5	25.0	8.3	29.2
Skilled	Prop.	100.0	32.1	14.3	28.6	25.0
Skilled	Clerical	100.0	30.8	16.9	27.8	24.6
Semi-Sk.	Semi-Sk.	100.0	14.5	18.8	26.1	40.6
Semi-Sk.	Clerical	100.0	31.8	4.5	31.8	31.8
Semi-Sk.	Skilled	100.0	38.3	10.6	36.2	14.9
Farmer	Operative[3]	100.0	20.8	15.1	37.7	26.4
Farmer	Prof.	100.0	50.0	7.1	21.4	21.4
Farmer	Prop.	100.0	31.2	9.4	43.8	15.6
Farmer	Clerical	100.0	35.5	6.4	32.2	25.8
Farmer	Skilled	100.0	24.2	12.9	41.9	21.0

1. Groups where N less than 20 not shown.
2. For numbers on which percentages are based see Table 17.
3. Operatives whose fathers were farmers is the largest group of farmer's sons and is considered the nonmobile group since there are only 3 farmers (sons) in the sample.

Table 6. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Up Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.[1]

Education of Father	Education of Son	Fertility Planning Status: All Couples[2]	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
H.S. 4	H.S. 4	100.0	20.6	17.6	32.4	29.4
H.S. 4	Col. 3-4	100.0	44.4	11.1	33.3	11.1
H.S. 1-3	H.S. 1-3	100.0	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3
H.S. 1-3	Col. 3-4	100.0	34.8	17.4	39.1	8.7
H.S. 1-3	H.S. 4	100.0	16.0	16.0	40.0	28.0
G.S. 8	G.S. 8[a]	100.0	28.9	8.1	34.8	28.1
G.S. 8	Col. 3-4	100.0	53.4	6.9	15.5	24.1
G.S. 8	Col. 1-2	100.0	41.1	7.1	30.4	21.4
G.S. 8	H.S. 4	100.0	36.7	15.6	31.2	16.5
G.S. 8	H.S. 1-3	100.0	19.8	15.0	37.4	27.8
G.S. 6-7	G.S. 8[a]	100.0	22.4	10.2	20.4	46.9
G.S. 6-7	Col. 3-4	100.0	41.2	20.6	38.2	0.0
G.S. 6-7	H.S. 4	100.0	32.4	23.5	38.2	5.9
G.S. 6-7	H.S. 1-3	100.0	22.6	17.0	24.5	35.8

1. Group where N is less than 20 not shown.
2. For numbers on which percentages are based see Table 18.
   a. G.S. 8 is actually G.S. 7-8. Therefore both G.S. 8 - G.S. 7-8 and G. S. 6-7 - G.S. 7-8 are considered as nonmobile.

operation of common selective factors could produce this tendency toward homogeneity. (Compare for example the N. S. P. (Mob) couples of Tables 5 and 6.)

Summary and Interpretation - Up Mobility and Fertility Planning. When destination groups are the basis of comparison, the relationship between up mobility and fertility planning effectiveness is closest in the case of educational up mobility but even here chance cannot be eliminated as an explanation of the findings. Up mobile couples are, however, more effective than nonmobile couples whose occupational or educational status is that of the mobile couples before mobility, i. e. NM_o couples. A comparison of the N. S. P. distributions of mobile and NM_o couples suggests that mobile couples are differentiated from the latter early in marriage. A relatively small number of mobile N. P. is also consistent with this interpretation since this is the planning category that would be large if mobile couples achieved their greater effectiveness after a time lag. These facts, together with a greater than expected homogeneity among mobile couples with respect to percent N. S. P., point either to the operation of selective factors or to the effect of mobility per se rather than to the influence of the post mobility situation.

Thus whether one accepts Hypothesis 1b which states that up mobile couples are more effective or Hypothesis 2b which states that up mobile couples are less effective depends upon the question - more effective than whom? Up mobile couples are more effective than the

couples they left behind (NM_o) but in general they are less effective than the groups among whom they have arrived (NM_d). This outcome suggests some sort of interaction between the two tendencies. According to this view up mobility stimulates, or selects for, rationality but not to a degree sufficient to overcome the influence of behavior patterns acquired in the original social environment. This is not, of course, the only interpretation that can be made. It is possible that Hypothesis 1 is valid and that the differences in fertility planning between up mobile couples and NM_d are attributable to uncontrolled differences in socio-economic status. For example, if within each occupational group the nonmobile couples were of higher socio-economic status this might account for their fertility planning superiority since we know that fertility planning effectiveness is positively related to socio-economic status. However, within the occupational groups here considered there is no consistent tendency for NM_d to be of higher socio-economic status. The median net worth of NM_d is higher in two and lower in two of the four occupational groups. Provisionally then, the first interpretation - interaction of the two tendencies - is preferred.

Down Mobility. We are here dealing with Hypothesis 1b and Hypothesis 2e. According to Hypothesis 1b it is again predicted that the mobile couples - in this case down mobile couples - will be more effective than nonmobile couples of comparable status. Hypothesis 2e makes a similar prediction. Therefore, since both hypotheses predict in the

same direction,[31] down mobility is of less crucial significance than up mobility in the testing of the hypotheses. In Tables 7 and 8 down mobile couples are compared with their groups of orientation. As before, these tables are read vertically with a series indicated by the similarity of the father's occupation. The conclusion to be drawn from these tables is that down mobile couples are less effective fertility planners than their groups of orientation (NM_o).[32] Only one percent of the time would these results, i. e. ten out of ten comparisons in Tables 7 and 8, bedue to chance. However, when comparisons are made between down mobile couples and NM_d we find that, except where minimal mobility may be suspected (Skilled to semi-skilled and shifts within the white collar group), down mobile couples are more effective. (Tables 9 to 11; Tables 9 and 10 are read vertically with a series identified by the son's occupation; Table 11 is read by comparing horizontally the Mobile and Nonmobile columns.) If the cases of minimal mobility listed above are disregarded, twelve of the fifteen remaining comparisons are consistent with the Hypotheses. This result would be due to chance only five percent

---

[31]Unless one expects down mobile couples to be more effective than their groups of orientation (NM_o). This is not the case. See Tables 7 - 8.

[32]Couples in which the husband is Grade School 8 and Col. 1-2 and whose fathers were respectively "High School 1 and above" and Col. 1-4 are actually more effective than NM_o couples. These cases are not presented because of doubt that the latter category represents down mobility and because of the small numbers involved in the former (4 Fathers H.S. 1-3, 10 H.S. 4, and 6 Col. 1-4).

of the time.

A more crucial type of comparison so far as the hypotheses are concerned is made in Table 12. Even though both hypotheses make identical predictions with respect to the effect of down mobility on fertility planning, one would expect, according to Hypothesis 2, that up and down mobile couples having the same occupation or educational attainment would differ rather greatly in degree of effectiveness. Down mobile couples would, because of their more favorable backgrounds, be more effective than up mobile couples. From Hypothesis 1 one would expect no differences or perhaps a somewhat greater degree of effectiveness among up mobile couples. The data are more consistent with the latter interpretation. However, these data are mainly valuable as negative evidence in regard to Hypothesis 2 rather than evidence for Hypothesis 1.

Summary and Interpretation - Down Mobility and Fertility Planning. Down mobile couples are less effective than their groups of orientation but more effective than nonmobile couples at their new status levels. This is consistent with both hypotheses. Down Mobile couples are not generally more effective than up mobile couples of the same occupational or educational level. This is more consistent with Hypothesis 1 than with Hypothesis 2. Finally there are a few cases of down mobility to adjacent status levels or shifts within the white collar occupations that are inconsistent with both hypotheses. These are interpreted as status changes representing minimum mobility and therefore less damaging to the

Table 7. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Occupational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Son	Fertility Planning Status: All Couples [1]	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
Prof.	Prof.	100.0	50.0	15.4	30.8	3.8
Prof.	Prop.	100.0	37.5	33.3	12.5	16.7
Prof.	Clerical	100.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	30.0
Prop.	Prop.	100.0	44.4	16.7	16.7	22.2
Prop.	Clerical	100.0	26.2	20.2	35.7	17.8
Prop.	Skilled	100.0	27.9	9.3	23.2	39.5
Prop.	Semi-Sk.	100.0	31.6	10.5	34.2	23.7
Clerical	Clerical	100.0	41.0	10.3	25.6	23.1
Clerical	Semi-Sk.	100.0	25.0	0.0	45.0	30.0
Skilled	Skilled	100.0	24.7	11.7	18.2	45.4
Skilled	Semi-Sk.	100.0	12.1	16.2	36.4	35.4

1. For numbers on which percentages are based see Table 17.

Table 8. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Origin.

Education of Father	Education of Son	Fertility Planning Status: All Couples[1]	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
H.S.4	H.S.4	100.0	20.6	17.6	32.4	29.4
H.S.4	H.S.1-3	100.0	13.6	0.0	40.9	45.4
Col.1-4	Col.3-4	100.0	35.7	16.7	31.0	16.7
Col.1-4	H.S.1-3	100.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	28.6

1. For number on which percentages are based see Table 18.

Table 9. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Occupational Mobility. Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Son	All Couples [1]	Fertility Planning Status: Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
Semi-Sk.	Semi-Sk.	100.0	14.5	18.8	26.1	40.6
Farmer	Semi-Sk.	100.0	20.8	15.1	37.7	26.4
Prop.	Semi-Sk.	100.0	31.6	10.5	34.2	23.7
Clerical	Semi-Sk.	100.0	25.0	0.0	45.0	30.0
Skilled	Semi-Sk.	100.0	12.1	16.2	36.4	35.4
Skilled	Skilled	100.0	24.7	11.7	18.2	45.4
Prop.	Skilled	100.0	27.9	9.3	23.2	39.5
Clerical	Clerical	100.0	41.0	10.3	25.6	23.1
Prof.	Clerical	100.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	30.0
Prop.	Clerical	100.0	26.2	20.2	35.7	17.8
Prop.	Prop.	100.0	44.4	16.7	16.7	22.2
Prof.	Prop.	100.0	37.5	33.3	12.5	16.7

1. For number of couples on which percentages are based see Table 17.

Table 10. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning and Mobility Status of Husband: Down Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Education of Father	Education of Son	Fertility Planning Status: All Couples[1]	Number and Spacing Planned	Number Planned	Quasi-Planned	Excess Fertility
G.S. 8	G.S. 8	100.0	28.9	8.1	34.8	28.1
H.S. 1-3 & Above	G.S. 8	100.0	35.0	10.0	10.0	45.0
H.S. 1-3	H.S. 1-3	100.0	0.0	9.1	63.6	27.3
H.S. 4	H.S. 1-3	100.0	13.6	0.0	40.9	45.4
Col. 1-4	H.S. 1-3	100.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	28.6

1. For number of couples on which percentages are based see Table 18.

Table 11. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status, by Mobility Status of Husband and Wife and by Index of Socio-Economic Status: Down Occupational and Educational Mobility Compared with Non-Mobility at Destination.

Fertility Planning Status and Index of Socio-Economic Status	Occupational Mobility Status		Educational Mobility Status	
	NMD	Down Mob.	NMD	Down Mob.
Number and Spacing Planned				
I and II	50.7	54.2	26.9	44.8
III	26.3	25.0	18.5	25.0
IV	16.0	21.0	21.4	8.0
V	0.0	11.1	8.3	4.5
Number Planned				
I & II	20.6	12.5	26.9	31.0
III	10.5	10.0	18.5	20.0
IV	8.0	12.3	14.3	8.0
V	22.2	11.1	8.3	13.6
QuasiPlanned				
I & II	17.4	29.2	30.8	6.9
III	26.3	45.0	37.0	35.0
IV	28.0	38.6	33.3	40.0
V	27.8	20.6	33.3	13.6
Excess Fertility				
I & II	11.1	4.2	15.4	17.2
III	36.8	20.0	25.9	20.0
IV	48.0	28.1	31.0	44.0
V	50.0	57.1	50.0	68.2
Total Number of Couples				
I & II	44	24	26	29
III	20	40	42	25
IV	25	57	42	25
V	36	63	36	22

hypotheses than they otherwise would be.

The question arises as it did in connection with up mobility as to whether the general fertility planning superiority of down mobile couples over NM_d might be due to the former's superior socio-economic position within a given occupational group. From this point of view a comparison of the net worth (see footnote 47 below) of couples of the same occupation but of different mobility status is inconclusive. Except among Proprietors, the net worth of down mobile couples is greater than the net worth of NM_d. In every case down mobile couples exceed up mobile couples in average net worth. Thus in some instances superior net worth and superior fertility planning status are associated and in others they are not. Although an explanation in terms of differential socio-economic position is not thereby eliminated, the lesser complexity of the original hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) argues for its tentative acceptance.

Up Mobility and Physical Mobility. Although there are scattered confirmations of Hypothesis 1 throughout the foregoing as well as indications that Hypothesis 2 may be of slight importance, it is surprising that Hypothesis 1 should not have received greater verification. Such great importance has been attached to mobility in sociological theory that one would expect its effects to be apparent even in relatively uncontrolled situations. There are at least two possible explanations. It may be that mobility ("new experience") is so diffuse in American life

Table 12.[a] Percent of Up and Down Mobile Couples to Same Occupational or Educational Level Planning Number and Spacing of Children.

Occupation and Education of Husband	Percent Number & Spacing Planned	
	Up Mobile	Down Mobile
Occupation:		
Proprietor	31.7	37.5
Clerk	29.2	26.0
Skilled	29.1	27.9
Education:		
College 1-2	46.4	45.7
High School 1-3	21.2	14.0

a. Computed from Tables 1, 3, 9, 10.

that mobility differentials are fast disappearing. A related notion is that social mobility has been important in the past because of its association with physical mobility. Perhaps when social and physical mobility occur together Hypothesis 1 will be found to hold since the certainty of a change in milieu is increased. A previous investigation has found that physical mobility alone (when measured by number of moves since marriage) is not associated with greater planning effectiveness.[33] Thus any relationship between social and physical mobility and fertility planning will be due to the combined effect of the two types of mobility.

It is not possible to subclassify every mobility group by the number of residential moves since marriage (the measure of physical mobility) and still have groups large enough for analysis. But if all mobile and all nonmobile couples are collected into two groups the control for occupation is lost. Standardization for occupation i. e. arbitrarily equating the occupational distributions of both groups before computing percentages, was tried but the low reliability of some of the specific rates (percentages) made this technique undesirable. The procedure finally adopted was to match the mobile and nonmobile

---

[33]Kantner, J. F. and P. K. Whelpton, "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility XVI Fertility Rates and Fertility Planning by Character of Migration," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Vol. No. 2 April, 1952.

groups for occupation.[34]

Combining physical and social mobility should favor Hypothesis 2 as well as Hypothesis 1 because in so doing the proportion of couples with small community or rural backgrounds in increased in the experimental groups. Actually such backgrounds are more characteristic of occupationally mobile couples as a whole. Of the occupationally nonmobile only 4.8 percent[35] lived in rural communities after marriage compared with 10.0 percent of the occupationally mobile. The percentages for small community[36] and rural residence before marriage are 23.2 and 55.4 percent respectively. For occupationally mobile couples who have moved one or more times since marriage these figures

---

[34]The matching was done by giving each group a similar occupational distribution. The percentage distribution by occupation is as follows:

	percent
Professional	14.0
Proprietor	16.0
Clerical	21.0
Skilled	25.0
Semi-Skilled	24.0
	100.0

These percentages were obtained by making those adjustments in the mobile and nonmobile distributions that would involve the least number of discarded cases. When the percentage distribution had been determined, the punched cards for the groups from which cases were to be dropped were randomized and the required number of cases selected for discard by picking every nth card. The distribution by live births of the discarded and retained cards were then compared as a check on the procedure. No important differences were found. The average age of the wife at marriage is 20.4 for the nonmobile and 21.1 for mobile couples.

[35]of the matched group.

[36]Under 25,000.

are 31.8 percent rural after marriage and 60.1 percent small town or rural before marriage.

The findings in Table 13 are consistent with Hypothesis 1. Couples that are both occupationally and physically mobile have the largest percentage N.S.P. and the smallest percentage E. F. Judging by the percentage E. F., the occupationally mobile, physically nonmobile have an intermediate position with respect to effectiveness. Relatively large percentages Q. P. and low percentage N. P. seem to be associated with effectiveness. Table 13 presents the best evidence so far encountered for Hypothesis 1. These differences would doubtless be larger were it not that career mobility (status change during the husband's occupational career) has not been eliminated from the occupationally nonmobile groups. In addition some physical mobility, that which took place at marriage, is also characteristic of the physically nonmobile couples.[37] Chi square computed for Table 13 indicates that the differences are significant beyond the one percent level. If, however, chi square is reduced by the ratio of the uninflated to the inflated sample the differences in Table 13 might be expected to occur through

---

[37]See Kantner, J. F. and P. K. Whelpton, op. cit., footnote 32. Couples reporting "no moves before marriage" and "no moves since marriage" comprise a larger group than those classified as living all the time in communities of "300,000 and over" before marriage and in "Indianapolis Only" since marriage. As many as 163 couples may have made a move at the time of marriage and be classified as physically nonmobile.

Table 13. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status by Occupational and Physical Mobility of Husband.[1]

Fertility Planning Status	Occupationally Nonmobile		Occupationally Mobile	
	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage
Total	100.0	100.1	99.9	99.8
Number & Spacing Planned	29.0	27.8	28.7	35.5
Number Planned	13.0	20.4	14.0	10.8
Quasi-Planned	19.8	24.1	34.3	36.2
Excess Fertility	35.1	20.4	22.0	15.9
Under-Planned[2]	3.1	7.4	0.9	1.4

1. For totals on which percentages are based see Table 27.
2. Under-planned Couples are those who unintentionally limited family size by use of douch "for cleanliness only."

chance between five and 10 percent of the time. One might be reluctant to dismiss this finding if it were not for the fact that the greatest contributions to chi square come from the discrepancies between observed and expected numbers within the Q. P. and E. F. groups. Thus again it may be a matter of how the family size situation is defined rather than a matter of effectiveness. An attempt to deal with this problem is made later in this paper but for the moment we must conclude that no statistically reliable evidence for the rationality hypothesis (Hypothesis 1) has been found.

Regularity of Contraception. The main conclusion reached thus far (that up mobile couples are seldom as effective in planning fertility as their destination groups) is strengthened by showing that among couples in planning status categories other than N. S. P. up mobile couples have employed contraception with greater regularity during the months in which conceptions have occured. This is, of course, an additional indication of ineffective planning. In Table 14 data are presented showing the regularity with which contraception has been practised during months of conception by couples who are not N. S. P.

One should probably not stop with this. There is no obvious reason to doubt that, in the case of couples who use contraceptives ineffectively, contraceptive regularity during the months sampled is representative of general contraceptive behavior.[38] One interpretation of

[38]The reliability and validity of these responses are not known. But since only a comparative use is being made of the responses, the problem is not serious as it would be if a measure of absolute regularity were required.

the greater contraceptive regularity of mobile couples is to say that the reaction to mobility is to increase the effort toward fertility management but not necessarily to make these efforts successful.[39] As we shall see later, mobile couples do succeed in reducing the size of their families and their greater contraceptive regularity may be the mechanism by which this is accomplished. It is interesting to note that this greater effort to control fertility on the part of mobile couples is characteristic even of the Q. P.'s who, if any group, might be expected to complacently duplicate old patterns. These percentages are shown in Table 15. They have been standardized for occupation of husband, i.e. the effect of differences in occupational distribution between the two groups on the distribution by regularity of contraception is eliminated by weighting both groups in such a way as to make their occupational distributions similar. The percentages thus have no absolute meaning.

Table 16 indicates that when all types of contraception which may reasonably be called regular are taken together the mobile couples equal or surpass nonmobile couples.

The findings relative to the regularity of contraception have some implications for the two hypotheses. Hypothesis 2 does not lead to an expectation of such results. One would not expect to find up mobile couples practising contraception with greater regularity (even though ineffectively) than NM_d. From Hypothesis 1, however, one might predict

[39]The relationships in Table 14 are not altered if N.S.P. couples and the small number of couples not using contraception are included in the total.

Table 14. Regularity of Contraception by Occupation and Mobility Status of Husband.

Regularity[1] of Contraception	Occupation of Husband									
	Prof.		Prop.		Clerical		Skilled		Semi-Sk.	
	Up Mob.	NMD	Up Mob.	NMD	Up Mob.	NMD	Up. Mob.	NMD	Up Mob.	NMD
"Always and Usually"	44.7	0.0	52.4	21.4	28.2	23.5	35.4	28.6	40.3	18.9
Irregular and "Sometimes"	55.3	100.0	47.6	78.6	71.8	76.5	64.6	71.4	59.7	81.1
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Couples	47	11	42	28	174	17	65	56	77	53
No Contraception	4.1	15.4	10.6	6.7	2.2	19.0	1.4	6.7	8.3	10.2

1. During months of conception

greater regularity since, except among N.S.P. couples, regularity is, presumably, a necessary condition for effectiveness. It may be that persistent efforts to control pregnancy with ineffective means is a first phase in the development of effective fertility management.

Summary and Interpretation - Social Mobility and Fertility Planning. Up mobile couples appear to be intermediate in fertility planning effectiveness between their orientation and destination groups. This may mean that the two opposing tendencies underlying Hypotheses 1 and 2 result in an intermediate position on the planning effectiveness scale for up mobile couples.

Down mobile couples similarly are intermediate between orientation and destination groups. Although both hypotheses are consistent with these findings the similarity in fertility planning of up and down mobile couples to the same status level is more consistent with Hypothesis 1 than with Hypothesis 2.

When occupational and physical mobility together are considered, the data are consistent with Hypothesis 1. However when a correction of chi square is made for sample inflation the five percent level of significance is exceeded.

Up mobile couples surpass nonmobile couples in the regularity of their contraceptive habits. This is consistent with the former's lesser effectiveness since their greater regularity is maintained during the months during which conceptions have occured. Nevertheless, it is

Table 15. Regularity of Contraception, of Quasi-Planned by Mobility Status of Husband. (Standardized for Occupation of Husband.)

Regularity of Contraception[1]	Percent of Quasi-Planned	
	Up Mobile	Nonmobile D
"Always and Usually"	44.2	18.6
Irregular and "Sometimes"	46.5	58.6
No Contraception	9.3	15.3
Unknown	0.0	7.4
Total	100.0	99.9
Number of Couples	215	57

1. During months of conception.

Table 16. Percentage "Always" and "Usually" Using Contraception or Having Pregnancies as Desired by Mobility and Occupation of Husband.

Occupation of Husband	Up Mobile	Nonmobile D
Prof.	68.2	50.0
Prop.	64.2	55.5
Clerical	49.5	51.2
Skilled	51.3	42.9
Semi-Skilled	50.0	28.8

important to note that up mobile couples do not show the reluctance to employ contraception that might be expected from their low status backgrounds. They do exhibit a greater inefficiency in its use. The role of background (Hypothesis 2) then may be limited to reducing effectiveness rather than preventing recourse to contraception.

The differentiation with respect to fertility planning effectiveness of up mobile and NM_o couples occurs early in marriage. Furthermore, up mobile couples are more homogeneous in fertility planning status than would be expected on the basis of known occupational differentials. This is taken to mean either that certain selective factors or the mobility experience itself rather than post mobility conditions are causally involved. Such early differentiation does not logically favor either hypothesis. However, this finding seems to be more consistent with Hypothesis 1 than with Hypothesis 2. One would expect a time lag in the acceptance of new reproductive habits to be more consistent with Hypothesis 2. Such a time lag would be reflected in a concentration of mobile couples in the N. P. column with no differences in the N.S.P. distributions. Instead dissimilarity in the N.S.P. distributions and fewer than expected mobile N.P. are found.

In general then, Hypothesis 1 is more consistent with the data presented in this chapter. It cannot be clearly established whether selection or the mobility experience itself is causally responsible.

Chapter 3

Social Mobility and Fertility

All Planning Groups. A couple's fertility planning status is not a reliable clue to their fertility. There are possible variations in fertility goals, differences in coital rates and undoubtedly other factors which intervene. To some extent these variables are reflected in the couple's fertility planning status but so imperfectly that fertility becomes a separate problem. Table 17 presents birth rates by mobility status of the husband. Rates for nonmobile couples run diagonally from the upper left corner to the lower right of the table. Below and to the left of this diagonal are the rates for up mobile couples; above, and to the right those for down mobile couples. Except for the clerical group the rates of both up and down mobile couples are generally lower than those of their non-mobile destination groups. This is not surprising in the case of Skilled workers since they were found to be somewhat more effective in planning fertility and throughout the Indianapolis Study, effectiveness and family limitation have gone together. The lower rates for the mobile couples in other occupations could due to the greater regularity of their contraception or perhaps to relatively greater fertility limitation among those who effectively control fertility or both.

To explain the relationship within the clerical group involves accounting for the unusually low rates of clerical nonmobile as much

Table 17. Births per 100 Couples by Occupation of Father and Son.

Occupation of Father	Occupation of Son						
	Prof.	Prop.	Clerical	Skilled	Semi-Skilled	Unsk.	Farmer
Prof.	162	175	145	*	*	*	*
Prop.	145	207	184	202	176	*	*
Clerical	*	*	144	*	180	*	*
Skilled	237	196	160	253	218	*	*
Semi-Skilled	*	*	145	221	256	*	*
Unskilled	*	*	221	212	*	310[a]	*
Farmer or Farm Manager	150	147	182	206	217	*	312[b]
	Number of Couples						
Prof.	26	24	20	11	13	2	1
Prop.	42	54	84	43	38	5	1
Clerical	14	18	39	14	20	2	0
Skilled	24	28	65	77	99	14	0
Semi-Skilled	5	10	44	47	69	15	0
Unskilled	4	7	24	25	13	8	0
Farmer or Farm Manager	28	32	62	62	106	16	1

a. Average of all relatively fecund unskilled workers.
b. Children ever born per 100 wives of Farmer and Farm managers, wife age 30-34; north central states 1940.
* Rates not computed where number of couples is less than 20.

as for the higher rates of mobile couples. To assume that the clerical nonmobile rate is too low would facilitate interpretation but it seems more defensible to take the rate at face value.[40] Employing a broad definition of "planned families" (N.S.P., N.P., and Q.P.) it appears that clerical mobile couples do not plan families as small as those of clerical nonmobile couples. The rates for these three planning groups together are 151.8 for mobile clerical, 110.7 for nonmobile clerical. This suggests that more than superior fertility planning is behind the low rates of nonmobile clerical couples.

Turning to up educational mobility, we find that it is generally associated with reduced fertility except when the husband's father is quite low in educational attainment. The notion of forced mobility is again invoked as a plausible explanation of the exceptions.[41] Table 18 shows that educationally down mobile couples have somewhat higher rates than NM_d in spite of their superior fertility planning status (Table 8). Educational down mobility all takes place below the high school level. Of the thirty-one comparisons (excluding clerical couples) in Tables 17 and 18, twenty-three are consistent with Hypothesis 1. This could occur through chance only five percent of the time.

---

[40]The mean number of children ever born to Native White wives of clerical workers 30-34 years of age, married 10-14 years and living in the North Central States in 1940 is 175. This comparable group which however contains some rural couples is itself "out of line" with expectations.

[41]See page 19 above.

Table 18. Births Per 100 Couples by Education of Father and Son

Education of Father	Education of Son: College 3-4	College 1-2	High School 4	High School 1-3	Grade School 8
College 1-4	193	204	*	257	225
High School 4	152		203	250	
High School 1-3	191	*	164	214	
Grade School 8	162	152	174	216	221
Grade School 6-7	162	*	185	194	188
Grade School 5 or less		*	215	217	252
No Father	*	*	*	187	*
Unknown	*	*	197	214	249
Number of Couples					
College 1-4	42	49	17	28	20
High School 4	27		34	22	
High School 1-3	23	3	25	22	
Grade School 8	58	56	109	187	135
Grade School 6-7	34	11	34	53	49
Grade School 5 or less		2	46	52	61
No Father	10	8	15	31	11
Unknown	8	2	31	55	61

* Rates not computed where number of couples is less than 20.

Table 19. Births Per 100 Couples by Occupational Mobility of Husband and Wife and by Index of Socio-Economic Status.

Index of Socio-Economic Status	Mobility Status of Husband and Wife		
	Husband & Wife NMD	Husband & Wife Up Mobile	Husband & Wife Down Mobile
(High) I	205[a]	187	*
II	187	158	170[b]
III	225	212	175
IV	246[a]	214	209
(Low) V	340	304[c]	344
	Number of Couples		
(High) I	21[a]	40	0
II	24	36	24[b]
III	20	42	40
IV	25[a]	35	57
(Low) V	37	25[c]	64

a. Excluding couples having some career mobility.
b. Includes some couples in which only one member down mobile.
c. Includes some couples in which only one member up mobile.
* Rates not computed where number of couples is less than 20.

The data in Tables 19 and 20 showing occupational and educational mobility with classification on the basis of the mobility of husband and wife are generally consistent with the preceeding findings. The association between down educational mobility and above average fertility appears more clearly in these tables to be a function of low status. Fifteen of the 17 comparisons are consistent with Hypothesis 1. Such a result would be found only one percent of the time from the operation of chance.

In the interpretation of Table 19 it should be recognized that there is generally more career mobility among nonmobile couples[42] so that the differences may be somewhat smaller than if this were not the case. In class I and IV nonmobile couples with career mobility are eliminated. The result is to increase the birth rates in these groups from 197 to 205 and from 235 to 246 respectively.

---

[42]Percent Distribution of Couples in which Husband's First and Longest Occupation Not the Same by Mobility and Socio-Economic Status of Husband and Wife.

Socio-Econ. Status	NM	Up Mobility	Down Mobility
I	47.5	32.5	*
II	62.5	52.8	33.3[a]
III	50.0	42.8	45.0
IV	41.9	68.6	52.6
V	64.9	56.0[b]	57.3

[a]Includes some couples in which only one member is down mobile.

[b]Includes some couples in which only one member is up mobile.

Table 20. Births Per 100 Couples by Educational Mobility Status of Husband and Wife and by Index of Socio-Economic Status.

Index of Socio-Economic Status	Mobility Status of Husband and Wife				
	Husband & Wife NMD (1)	Husband & Wife Up Mobile (2)	Husband Up Wife Non-mobile (3)	Wife Up Husband Nonmobile (4)	Husband & Wife Down Mobile[1] (5)
(High) I, II	173	174	180	165	180
III	239	177	184	191	230
IV	229	190	220[a]	222	268
V	335	310	308[a]	291	404
	Number of Couples				
(High) I, II	26	87	40	26	30
III	28	35	25	35	20
IV	42	30	49[a]	32	25
(Low) V	36	19	35[a]	23	24

1. Includes any instance of down mobility regardless of mobility of spouse.
   a. Columns 3 and 4 combined.

Table 21. Mean Number of Children Per 100 Couples Living at Time of Last Intentional Pregnancy by Mobility Status and by Occupation of Husband: Excluding Childless Couples.

Occupation of Husband	Children Per 100 Couples		Number of Couples	
	Up. Mob.	Nonmob.	Up Mob.	Nonmob.
Prof.	73.7	66.7	38	21
Prop.	46.7	96.8	30	31
Clerical	68.8	*	109	16
Skilled	144.4	69.2	27	26
Semi-Skilled	65.8	83.3	41	24

* Rate not computed where number of couples is less than 20.

As in Chapter 2, it is desirable to again compare up mobile couples with their orientation groups. This can be done by reading horizontally to the left of the diagonals in Tables 17 and 18. Here we find that up mobile couples have smaller families than their groups of orientation (NM_o). A more surprising fact is that in five out of seven cases this is also true of down occupational mobility couples (read to the right of the diagonal in Table 17) even though they are inferior in fertility planning effectiveness. Down mobile couples in Table 18 have larger families than their groups of orientation. But except for this latter group, mobile couples tend to have smaller families than either NM_d or NM_o.[43]

Size of Planned Families. In the first section of this chapter data were presented that tested part (a) of Hypothesis 1 and parts (a) and (d) of Hypothesis 2. In general the data substantiated Hypothesis 1 but as pointed out in the introductory chapter it does not follow that the planned families of mobile couples should be smaller than those of nonmobile couples. In this section part (c) of Hypothesis 1 and parts (c) and (f) of Hypothesis 2 will be tested. Relevant data are given in Table 21 which presents the mean number of children living at the time of the last intentional[44] pregnancy. The data are inconclusive. Among

---

[43]Slightly more mobile than nonmobile women were pregnant at time of interview. When a correction in the number of live births is made for this fact the above conclusions are not altered.

[44]Intentional is defined as stopping contraception in order to conceive or not using contraception. Unless those not using contraception had given previous evidence of being able to control pregnancy (by stopping

Table 22. Mean Number of Children Per 100 Couples Living at Time of Last Intentional Pregnancy by Mobility Status and by Occupation of Husband: Including Childless Couples.

Occupation of Husband	Children Per 100 Couples		Number of Couples	
	Up Mob.	Nonmob. D	Up Mob.	Nonmob D
Prof.	57.1	66.7	49	21
Prop.	34.1	81.1	41	37
Clerical	52.4	22.7	143	22
Skilled	125.8	64.3	31	28
Semi-Skilled	56.2	80.0	48	25
Total	58.6	65.4	312	133

Proprietors and Semi-Skilled workers mobile couples have smaller "intended" families. In other cases, especially among Skilled workers, the reverse is true. However these data may be misleading due to a tendency to declare births intentional that were really not planned. But the chief difficulty with conclusions based on Table 21 is that the couples who plan 0 children are left out. If childless couples are added, as in Table 22, mobile Professional, Proprietor, and Semi-Skilled couples then have smaller intended families than corresponding nonmobile couples. On the other hand Clerical and Skilled mobile couples still have larger "intended" families than do nonmobile couples of like occupation. Clerical nonmobile are considerably below average for their group and Skilled mobile above for theirs. Thus a unitary interpretation of Table 22 is difficult.

The validity of responses that relate to the size of "intended" families is difficult to evaluate. Thus some supplementary measure of the size of planned families is desirable. We can be fairly certain that, among fecund couples, childless families are planned. Also it seems reasonable to make an assumption of linearity and thus to expect that if a group plans smaller families it will also include a disproportionate number of childless couples. Therefore in an attempt to overcome the probable deficiencies in the data in Table 22 due to possible rationalization, mobile and nonmobile couples are shown in Table 23

---

contraception in order to conceive) they were excluded. Six Nonmobile and twelve Mobile couples intentionally pregnant at interview or at beginning of sterility are not included.

according to the percentage childless in each occupational group. Table 24 presents similar data for occupational and educational mobility of husband and wife. In both these tables the extent of childlessness is generally greater among mobile than among nonmobile couples. Down educational mobility and the clerical occupational group again provide the exceptions.

Another approach to the problem of the size of planned families was utilized in the analysis presented in Table 25. Here occupation standardized rates are given, classified by fertility planning status. N. P. and E. F. rates are not given because in six out of ten instances the occupation-planning status specific rates are based on less than twenty couples. Once again the evidence suggests strongly that mobile couples plan smaller families. The same point is made in Table 26 where the first three planning status groups are combined. These are the planning groups in which the couples do not have more children than they want. There are several exceptions to Hypothesis 1 in Table 26 and the number of couples is sometimes dangerously small but in most cases mobile couples have smaller planned families in terms of this measure. If Tables 23 to 26 are considered to be somewhat different measures of the size of planned families, there are twenty-one comparisons of which eighteen are consistent with Hypothesis 1. This could result from chance only one percent of the time.

Thus though the data are sometimes contradictory, and although

Table 23. Percent Childless among Mobile and Nonmobile Couples by Occupation of Husband.

Occupation of Husband	Percent Childless		Number of Couples	
	Up Mobile	NMD	Up Mobile	NMD
Prof.	12.5	0.0	88	26
Prop.	15.7	11.1	70	54
Clerical	13.3	15.4	255	39
Skilled	3.7	2.6	109	77
Semi-Skilled	6.6	1.4	106	69

Table 24. Percent Childless Among Mobile and Nonmobile Couples by Type of Mobility and by Socio-Economic Status

Index of Socio-Economic Status	Percent Childless					
	Occupational Mobility Status			Educational Mobility Status		
	Up Mob.	Down Mob.	NMD	Up Mob.	Down Mob.	NMD
(High)						
I	10.0	*	9.5[b]	17.2	13.3	15.4
II	27.8	*	12.5			
III	11.9	12.5	10.0	17.1	5.0	3.6
IV	11.4	8.8	0.0	10.0	8.0	9.5
(Low) V	4.0	3.1	0.0	*	0.0	2.8
	Total Number of Couples					
(High)						
I	40	0	21[b]	87	30	26
II	36	24[a]	24			
III	42	40	20	35	20	28
IV	35	57	25[b]	30	25	42
(Low) V	25[a]	64	37	19	24	36

a. Includes couples in which only one as well as both members down mobile.

b. Excluding couples having some career mobility.

* Rates not given where number of couples less than 20.

Table 25. Occupation Standardized Birth Rates for Mobile and Non-Mobile Couples by Fertility Planning Status: Up Mobility.

Fertility Planning Status	Births Per 100 Couples		Number of Couples	
	Mobile	Non-Mobile	Mobile	Non-Mobile
Number & Spacing Planned	108.3	121.6	192	77
Number Planned	*	*	79	38
Quasi-Planned	183.2	215.1	215.	57
Excess Fertility	*	*	113	77

* Rates not given because of probable unreliability of occupation specific rates.

definitions of planning are necessarily varied the weight of evidence in Tables 21 through 26 favors the conclusion that the size of planned families of mobile couples is smaller than that of nonmobile couples.

Occupational and Physical Mobility and Fertility. The reduction in fertility among mobile couples is more clearly evident when, as in Table 27, occupational and physical mobility are jointly considered.[45] Attention is again called to the fact that occupationally and physically mobile couples are more likely to be from high fertility levels. In spite of this they have the lowest rates. An ordinary t test does not take account of the regularity in the data in Table 27 nor is it feasible to correct the standard error for the nonindependence of the groups. Nevertheless the t test indicates that only about one time in one hundred would the differences between the extreme mobility groups occur by chance. In making this test both groups were reduced in size by the ratio of the uninflated to the inflated sample.

The relationship in Table 27 perhaps has as an immediate cause the fertility planning superiority of occupationally and physically mobile couples. To inquire whether the size of planned families is also smaller among mobile couples is difficult since the groups are too small

---

[45]A probable relationship between physical mobility and career mobility may help account for some of the differences in Table 27. See Lipset, Seymour M. and Reinhard Bendix "Social Mobility and Occupational Career Patterns I. Stability of Jobholding," American Journal of Sociology, January 1952, pp. 366-74.

Table 26. Births Per 100 to Couples Satisfied[1] with Size of Family by Occupational Mobility Status and by Index of Socio-Economic Status.

Index of Socio-Economic Status	Mobility Status of Husband and Wife		
	Husband & Wife NMD	Husband & Wife Up Mobile	Husband & Wife Down Mobile
(High) I	192	183	*
II	165	139	165[b]
III	169	144	175
IV	191	195	178
(Low) V	294	273	267
	Number of Couples		
(High) I	37	36	0
II	19	27	23[b]
III	13	25	32
IV	21	22	41
(Low) V	18	15[a]	27

1. N. S. P., N. P., and Q. P.
   a. Includes some couples in which only one member is up mobile.
   b. Includes some couples in which only one member is down mobile.
   * Rates not shown where number of couples is less than 20.

Table 27. Births Per 100 Couples by Occupational and Physical Mobility: Mobile and Non mobile Matched for Occupation of Husband.

	Occupationally Nonmobile		Occupationally Mobile	
	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage
Births Per 100 Couples	220.6	211.1	193.3	179.0
Number of Couples	131	54	300	138

Table 28. Percentage Childless by Occupational and Physical Mobility: Mobile and Nonmobile Matched for Husband's Occupation.[1]

Occupationally Nonmobile		Occupationally Mobile	
0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage
3.1%	7.4%	8.3%	13.0%

1. For totals on which percentages are based see Table 27.

to withstand further subdivision. Again using the degree of childlessness as an indicator it seems likely that mobile couples plan relatively small families. (Table 28) The differences between extreme mobility groups would be expected to occur once in every 100 random samples. Complementary to this is the finding in Table 29 which indicates a reduction in high as well as low birth orders. Additional evidence for the smaller size of planned families among mobile couples is the fact that 36.7 percent of mobile N.S.P. couples are childless as compared with only 10.5 percent of nonmobile N.S.P. couples.

Summary - Social Mobility and Total Fertility. In spite of inferior planning ability, mobile couples show a statistically reliable tendency to have smaller families. It seems to be true also that mobile couples plan smaller families. Greater family limitations among mobile couples capable of effective contraception as well as greater regularity of contraception among mobile couples generally, may be responsible for the relatively low rates of mobile couples.

As in chapter 2, the hypothesized effects of mobility are most evident when occupational and physical mobility are jointly considered. The families of couples who are occupationally and physically mobile are approximately 20 percent smaller than those of nonmobile couples of the same socio-economic status. The former also appear to plan smaller families.

Period Analysis of Fertility. The question might now be raised -

Table 29. Percent Distribution by Parity and by Mobility Group.

Parity	Mobility Status Group			
	No Occupational or Physical Mobility Since Marriage		Occupationally Mobile, 3 - 9 Moves Since Marriage	
	Percent	Cumulative	Percent	Cumulative
0	3.1	3.1	15.4	15.4
1	32.8	35.9	25.6	41.0
2	29.0	64.9	30.8	71.8
3	16.7	81.6	25.6	97.4
4	13.6	95.2	2.6	100.0
5	3.1	98.3	0.0	
6	1.5	99.8	0.0	
Total Percent	99.8		100.0	
Number of Couples	131		39	

Table 30. Patterns of Family Growth by Occupational Group - Mobile and Nonmobile (Including Childless Couples).

Number of Births	Occupation of Husband									
	Prof.		Prop		Clerical		Skilled		Semi- Sk.	
	Mob.	NMD	Mob	NMD	Mob.	NMD	Mob.	NMD	Mob.	NMD
	0 - 4 Years of Marriage									
0	47.7	30.8	32.8	33.3	34.9	56.4	31.2	23.4	27.4	17.4
1	40.9	69.2	51.5	33.3	48.6	30.8	40.4	44.2	38.7	44.9
2+	11.4[1]	0.0	15.7	33.3	16.5	12.8	28.4	32.5	34.0	37.7
	4 - 8 Years of Marriage									
0	53.4	46.2	65.7	46.3	52.5	66.7	51.4	39.0	43.4	39.1
1+	46.6	53.8	34.3	53.7	47.4	33.3	48.6	61.0	56.6	60.9
	8 or More Years of Marriage									
0	61.9	65.4	68.6	70.4	65.3	46.2	59.2	52.0	67.9	47.1
1+	38.1	34.6	31.4	29.6	34.7	53.8	40.8	48.0	32.1	52.9

1. Only one couple Excess Fertility.

do mobile couples from high fertility levels have higher birth rates than their destination groups in the opening years of marriage or do they achieve the reduction noted above later on in marriage? The data so far examined in this chapter support Hypothesis 1 but it is possible that the tendency to carry high fertility patterns (Hypothesis 2) is present early in marriage but is suppressed and nonobservable over a longer marriage interval. To answer this question the reproductive histories of all couples were divided into three periods. The exact number of births in each period is not available but usable approximations can be obtained from the number of women having 0, 1, or 2 or more births in the first four years of marriage and 0, 1 or 2 or more births in subsequent periods. First period fertility is shown in Table 30. Except for the Clerical group there is some tendency for mobile couples to have smaller families even in the period when the inertia of high fertility patterns might be expected to have maximum effect. That the Clerical couples should constitute an exception seems to be due more to the low fertility of Clerical nonmobile than to high reproduction among the Clerical mobile. Virtually the same relationship is found in Table 31 from which childless couples[46] have been removed. This indicates that the effect of mobility on fertility is not confined to couples who are childless in all periods.

As might be expected the relationships in Tables 30 and 31 are

---

[46]Couples who were without children at the time of interview.

Table 31. Fertility During First Four Years of Marriage by Occupational Group - Excluding Childless Couples.

Number of Births	Occupation of Husband									
	Professional		Proprietor		Clerical		Skilled		Semi-Skilled	
	M	NMD	M	NMD	M	NMD	M	NMD	M	NMD
0	40.2	30.8	20.4	25.0	24.8	48.5	28.5	21.3	22.2	16.2
1	46.8	69.2	61.0	37.5	56.3	36.3	41.9	45.4	41.4	45.6
2 +	13.0	0.0	18.6	37.5	18.9	15.2	29.5	33.3	36.4	38.3
Total Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Couples	77	26	59	48	221	33	105	75	99	68

Table 32. Fertility by Period and by Occupational and Physical Mobility.

Number of Births	Occupationally Nonmobile		Occupationally Mobile	
	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage	0 Moves After Marriage	1 or More Moves After Marriage
	0 - 4 Years of Marriage			
0	28.3	31.5	32.0	38.4
1	47.3	37.2	44.4	41.3
2 or More	24.4	31.4	23.7	19.6
	4 - 8 Years of Marriage			
0	44.5	44.5	50.9	53.8
1	55.4	55.5	49.1	45.5
2 or More	0.0	0.0	0.0	.7
	8 or More Years of Marriage			
0	42.1	48.2	56.6	59.8[1]
1	57.9	51.8	43.4	39.6[1]
2 or More	0.0	0.0	0.0	.7

1. Splitting "0 or some" 50/50.

much more clearly brought out when occupational and physical mobility together are the independent variables. In Table 32 mobile couples in the right hand column have both a larger percentage with no births as well as a smaller percentage with two or more. While even the differences between extreme mobility groups are not statistically significant (there are about 10 chances in 100 that they could be due to chance) it is important to point out that these data do not provide any evidence of the effects on fertility predicted by Hypothesis 2 even in the early years of marriage. The data in Table 32 are chiefly valuable as evidence against Hypothesis 2.

There is interesting evidence that a few mobile couples from high fertility levels bring large family patterns with them. This is distinctly a minor theme but nevertheless may call for alterations in the hypothesis. Among Professional and Clerical groups relatively more mobile than nonmobile couples have two or more births in the first period. (See Table 31.) Furthermore the only N.S.P. groups with two or more births in the first four years of marriage are mobile couples. (This group comprises 4.6 percent of the N.S.P. category.) Even among Skilled and Semi-skilled workers where attempts to reduce fertility have been most evident 9.7 and 5.6 percent respectively of the mobile couples who had two or more births in the first period are N.S.P. There are no N.S.P. nonmobile couples in these (or any other) occupations who have two or more births in the first period. These high

Table 33. Percent Distribution of Mobile and Nonmobile Couples Having 2 or More Children in First Four Years of Marriage by Pattern of Subsequent Fertility.

Pattern of Subsequent Fertility	Mobile Couples	Nonmobile D
Sharp Curtailment[1]	73.1	43.2
Gradual Curtailment[2]	26.9	56.8
Total Percent	100.0	100.0
Number of Couples	130	74

1. Patterns 6 and 8 - no births in third period.
2. Patterns 7 and 9 - 1 or more births in third period.

Table 34. Crude and Net Worth Standardized Birth Rate by Mobility Status of Couples Matched for Occupation of Husband and Index of Socio-Economic Status.

	Up Mobile[1]	Nonmobile D[2]
Births Per 100 Couples	181.1	205.4
Standardized Birth Rate	181.1*	202.7
Number of Couples	37	37

*Mobile Couples used as standard.

1. Husband up mobile, 2 or more moves since marriage.
2. Husband nonmobile, no physical mobility since marriage.

fertility patterns of the first period are more rapidly suppressed among mobile couples. The data in Table 33 show a sharper checking of initially high fertility for mobile than for nonmobile couples. Nevertheless this evidence of a tendency toward both small and large family patterns, even though the latter involves few couples is troublesome for it is not easily explained by either hypothesis.

Mobility, Fertility, and Residual Socio-economic Variation. Perhaps mobility is not only associated with fertility reduction but also with residual socio-economic variation even after attempts are made to control this through occupational matching and subclassification by an index of socio-economic status. If it could be shown that up mobile couples enjoy a higher level of living than destination groups it would be difficult to maintain that low fertility is due to mobility. The familiar interpretation in terms of socio-economic differentials could then be made. Therefore it was decided to select a number of couples representing extremes of mobility, to equate them with their destination groups as nearly as possible in terms of controls previously employed and then to look for differences in Net Worth.[47]

---

[47] "This term, as in business and financial usage, relates to the difference between assets and liabilities. It is the sum of each savings, market values of equities in real property, investments, business enterprises, and insurance policies, minus debts outstanding. Net worth was not asked as a single question but was computed on the basis of component data collected specifically for ... such (a) computation." (Kiser, C. V. and P. K. Whelpton, IX, op. cit.)

The nonmobile couples selected were occupationally and physically nonmobile. The mobile couples selected were those in which the husband (and in over half the cases the wife) were up mobile and in which there had been two or more moves since marriage.[48] Table 34 presents the birth rates for these couples. Notice that the mobile couples have lower rates even though they are less effective in planning fertility.[49] (Table 35.)

When tested by t, the differences between mobile and nonmobile rates are not significant (at the five percent level). Since the fertility differentials in Table 34 are comparable to those in Table 27 where the matching is less precise it seems likely that the lack of significance in this case may be due to the small number of couples upon whom the rates in Table 34 are based.

---

[48]Selection of these couples was made from the original 860 couples of the uninflated sample. Mobile and nonmobile couples were first classified by the Index of Socio-economic status, and then subclassified by occupation within each of the five socio-economic groups. The couples within each mobility, socio-economic, occupational group were numbered from 0 to n. In order to have the same occupational distribution among mobile and nonmobile couples, a sufficient number of cases was discarded to make these specific groups of equal size. Selection of cases for discard was made by entering a table of random numbers.

[49]The fact that mobile couples are less effective (smaller percentage N.S.P. in this case) is probably due to "deflation" of the sample. In the uninflated sample couples without children are underrepresented. Of the mobile couples who are N.S.P. relatively more are childless than is true of nonmobile N.S.P. couples. Thirty percent of the mobile N.S.P. are childless; only 15.5 percent of nonmobile N.S.P. are childless. Thus any reduction in the number of childless couples (as by deflation) brings about a disproportionate reduction of those mobile couples in the N.S.P. category.

Table 35. Percent Distribution by Fertility Planning Status of Mobile and Nonmobile Couples Matched for Occupation of Husband and for Index of Socio-Economic Status.

Fertility Planning Status	Up Mobile	Nonmobile D
N. S. P..	28. 6	38. 9
N. P.	14. 3	5. 6
Q. P.	31. 4	25. 0
E. F.	25. 7	30. 6

1. Excluding 3 couples classified as using douche "for cleanliness only."

However, mobile couples are not better off than nonmobile couples. In fact their median net worth is about $1,000 less than the median for nonmobile couples.[50] An interpretation of low fertility then in terms of superior economic position is not possible. Instead mobile couples, despite inferior economic position and with no demonstrable advantages with respect to fertility planning have smaller families. One might feel that the mobile couples have lower rates precisely because of their inferior economic status but when differences in net worth are held constant through standardization, (second row of Table 34) these fertility differentials persist. Thus up[51] mobility is associated with low fertility rates independent of the action of socio-economic differentials.

Summary - Social Mobility and Fertility. Up mobile couples generally have fertility rates that are lower even than those of their destination groups. This is true for families planned as to size as well as for all couples. In part, greater regularity of contraception rather than greater effectiveness may underlie this fact. In addition there is evidence of greater family limitation among N.S.P. mobile couples than among nonmobile couples of equivalent status. Down

---

[50]This is consistent with the findings of studies showing that migrants during the Thirties did not usually improve their lot as a result of movement. See Freedman, Ronald and Amos Hawley, "Unemployment and Migration in the Depression (1930-35)," Journal of the American Statistical Association, June 1949.

[51]Defined in terms of both occupational and physical mobility. There are not enough down mobile couples for this kind of analysis.

occupational mobility is associated with reduced fertility. Down educational mobility is not. This latter fact may be due to the low fertility planning effectiveness of educationally down mobile couples.

The tendency toward reduced fertility among up mobile couples in comparison with their destination groups is most clearly brought out when physical mobility and occupational mobility are jointly considered. Since when classified this way, mobile couples are more effective fertility planners, it is not possible to say whether mobile couples actually plan smaller families, i. e., whether nonmobile couples would not reduce the size of their families to a similar extent if they could. However, the relatively large proportion of childless mobile couples suggests that mobile couples plan smaller families than do nonmobile destination groups.

First period fertility is generally not as high for up mobile as for nonmobile (destination) couples. Thus the high fertility predicted by Hypothesis 2 is not characteristic of mobile couples even during the early years of marriage. There are, however, a few mobile couples who intentionally have two or more children in the first four years of marriage. No nonmobile couple intentionally has this number. Some mobile couples (Skilled and Semi-skilled) appear to have lower rates throughout marriage.

The lower rates of mobile couples are not a function of superior economic position since mobile couples compare unfavorably with their destination groups in this respect. But neither do their rates seem to

be a function of their inferior economic standing for when the rates are standardized for net worth the differences in fertility remain.[52] These differences would doubtless be even larger if the mobile couples in question were not less effective fertility planners.

Throughout the analysis the chief exception to the above conclusions have been the clerical nonmobile. Regardless of how the data have been treated these couples have lower rates of reproduction than mobile couples in their occupational group.

Overall, Hypothesis 1, the rationality hypothesis, is a more satisfactory statement of the relationship between social mobility and fertility than is Hypothesis 2.

---

[52]However the fact is that mobile couples have on the average an inferior economic position. This may well be a crucial consideration in the definition of the situation (with respect to fertility) even for mobile couples who are above average in net worth.

Chapter 4

Evaluation and Reinterpretation of the Hypotheses

This chapter begins with a resume of the main findings in chapters 2 and 3 and then goes on to assess the adequacy of the original hypotheses. The principal finding in chapter 2 was that up mobile couples are more effective fertility planners than their orientation groups but frequently less effective than their destination groups. An interpretation of these results was given in terms of a blending of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2, the latter having the effect of a handicap. This view was preferred after it was found that the lesser effectiveness of mobile couples (when compared with their destination groups) could not be interpreted consistently in terms of differences in socio-economic status.

Up mobile couples were found to be more effective than their destination groups when social and physical mobility together were considered but these differences were not statistically significant. Instead of greater effectiveness in the use of contraception, the effect of social mobility may be merely to bring about greater regularity in its use. A low status background, then, is not associated with a taboo on contraception but apparently is associated with inefficiency in its use.

The findings with respect to down mobility were somewhat more consistent with Hypothesis 1 than with Hypothesis 2. This conclusion is derived from the fact that down mobile couples are not more

effective fertility planners than up mobile couples.

Although Hypothesis 1 fits the data better than Hypothesis 2, it could not be stated categorically that the mobility experience itself was causally involved. The study design could not eliminate the possibility that the selective factors involved in mobility are responsible for the observed effects. It was possible however, to suggest that the search for a causal mechanism might be limited to these two sources rather than to differential experience after mobility. The basis for this claim is the fact that up mobile couples are observed to be more effective in fertility planning at the outset of marriage than their groups of orientation (NM_o).

The relationship between social mobility and fertility is much more apparent than that between social mobility and fertility planning. Up mobile couples have smaller families than their destination groups. They appear also to "plan" smaller families although the evidence for this is a bit indirect. Once again the combination of occupational and physical mobility brings out the sharpest differences between the fertility of mobile and nonmobile couples, differences which are consistent with the results obtained with social mobility alone.

It was impossible to find any convincing evidence for Hypothesis 2 even in the early years of marriage. Up mobile couples generally have lower rates of reproduction in the first four years of marriage than nonmobile couples. Unless one argues that the four year interval

is too broad, this would seem to confirm the conclusion that mobile couples are influenced either through mobility or by selection. The broadness of the interval is not a serious problem since the clearest evidence for the reduced fertility of mobile couples during this four year period comes from the relatively high percentage of childless couples among them. If mobile couples displayed merely a tendency not to approach maximum fertility during the early marital period it could not be inferred that post mobility factors were unimportant.

When those cases which show the clearest differences in fertility, (occupationally and physically mobile and nonmobile), were subjected to refined control for socio-economic position, the differences between these groups in fertility were maintained.

There is, thus, considerable evidence for Hypothesis 1 in the data considered in chapters 2 and 3. In the remainder of this chapter certain deficiencies of Hypothesis 1 will be considered and a substitute formulation proposed.

Particularly in connection with fertility, Hypothesis 1 is more consistent with the facts than Hypothesis 2. However as explanations of variation in fertility planning both hypotheses have their shortcomings. The greater regularity of contraception among mobile couples may in fact represent a blending of the two hypotheses. There are certain instances in which some notion of a median position between the tendencies of Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 is the readiest interpretation.

In other instances this is not true, for example the low fertility of couples in which the husband's father is a farmer. Such a situation calls for some way of predicting when background factors are likely to be effective and when they apparently exert little influence.

Certain other findings are incomprehensible in terms of a straightforward rendering of the original hypotheses. For example, there is the superior fertility planning effectiveness of Skilled workers compared with Clerical workers when both have Unskilled fathers. Nor does either hypothesis throw any light on the low rates of Clerical nonmobile couples.[53] In a way this should not be expected since the hypotheses were designed to describe the reactions of mobile couples but any hypothesis that could include the reactions of nonmobile couples as well is to be preferred.

There are at least two dissimilar fertility planning distributions to be explained. One is illustrated in rows 2 and 4 of Table 5. For example Proprietor to Professional couples are more effective (cf. N.S. P. and E.F. percentages) than Skilled to Professional. However the

---

[53]Hypothesis 1 might be extended to cover this situation. The great influx into the Clerical occupations has produced conditions for nonmobile couples that are tantamount to mobility. One may move or his social milieu may change, in either case there is mobility as defined psychologically. However, one is faced with showing why this should not apply equally to Professional or Semi-Skilled occupations which have also experienced large relative invasions. In addition it is difficult to see why nonmobile clerical should experience mobility to a greater degree than mobile clerical.

more effective group has relatively more Q. P. and relatively fewer N. P. than the less effective group. This pattern is to be observed elsewhere throughout the early tables. A previous suggestion that Q. P. couples are perhaps no less effective than N. P. 's at least in the early period of marriage may help explain this paradox. The difficulty with this solution is that instances are to be found where the more effective couples have relatively greater percentage N. P. and relatively fewer Q. P. than less effective couples (e. g., the nonmobile couples in rows 1 and 3 of Table 5). There are few clues contained in either hypothesis that will aid in differentiating these two patterns.

In addition to these empirical inadequacies both hypotheses are specific for a given historical context. At best they indicate which of the available alternatives (high or low reproduction) will be selected by couples living in a society that is undergoing our particular type of demographic transition. Even Hypothesis 1 which deals with a reaction to mobility that is thought to be rather universal provides no basis for predicting what will be a desirable family size. Presumably mobile, "rational," Chinese might more clearly see the advantages of large families and in consequence rear larger families than nonmobile Chinese. In the next section a hypothesis will be presented that attempts to meet many of the empirical and theoretic objections to the formulations with which this study was begun. It will not be possible to fully explore the new hypothesis with the data at hand. The main task will

be rather to suggest its synthesizing potentialities.

A Tentative Reinterpretation

Studies which point to differences in the character of group membership as a significant explanatory variable[54] provide a clue to a more adequate formulation. These have successfully traced variations in behavior in a variety of situations to variations in the nature of group membership. A suggestion as to the way in which variations in group membership may be related to fertility comes from Lazerfeld's study of voting behavior.[55] He finds there that inconsistent group memberships result in indecision. Voters who are rural-Catholics or low-income Protestants are subjected to certain "cross pressures." Their conflicting group memberships indicate opposed courses of action with the result that decisions are deferred as long as possible.

The analogous situation of nonmobile couples is not hard to see. Mobility often results in plural memberships in groups with different and often opposed life orientations. It remains to show how indecision pertains to fertility. In speculating about this problem, one need not think solely in terms of manifest contradictions in connection with family size or the use of contraception. Rather it is probable that contradictions in a general mode of life which provide the context for reproduction is the form that such conflicting memberships take.

---

[54]See Newcomb, T. M., Personality and Social Change, Dryden Press, 1943.

[55]Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Bernard Berelson, Helen Gaudet, The Peoples Choice, Columbia University.

As applied to the present study one might expect greater regularity of contraception and smaller planned families to result from indecision about life goals. And since status inconsistencies are probably greatest in the early period of marriage it is not unexpected to find low first period fertility among mobile couples. The combination of occupational and physical mobility results in low fertility and enhanced fertility planning perhaps because it tends to increase the proportion having rural backgrounds among mobile couples who ultimately become urban dwellers.

The utility of the cross-ressure hypothesis becomes more evident when some of the unassimilated findings reported earlier are considered. For example it seems reasonable that undecided couples are more likely to be classified as Q. P. than N. P. since the latter classification involves the positive decision to stop contraception in order to conceive or to prevent further pregnancies through illegal abortion. Furthermore it is consistent with the cross-pressure argument to find that when mobile couples are N. S. P. that relatively more of them are childless. Negative rather than positive planning is more characteristic of mobile couples. Classification as E. F. indicates not only ineffective planning but may also reflect the ability to make up one's mind concerning family size. To declare that one's family is too large by some specified number of children requires a crystallization of life goals not to be expected among mobile couples if the cross pressure thesis is

generally valid.

Up mobile couples were found to have as low birth rates in some instances as down mobile couples. An interpretation in terms of the fertility depressing effects of the struggle to succeed was given since it seemed reasonable that this would be greater in the case of up mobility. However, these findings are also consistent with the cross-pressure argument if we assume that in most cases a dual orientation is more likely for up than for down mobile couples. That is, assuming equal attachment to level of orientation for all couples, it seems reasonable that up mobile couples are more prone than down mobile couples to identify themselves with their level of destination. It is interesting to note also (Tables 1 and 7) that down mobile couples to Proprietor and Clerical occupations have relatively greater percentages N. P. and relatively fewer Q. P. than up mobile couples.

The tendency observed in Table 30 for some mobile couples to "catch up" in the third period is also consistent with a probable reduction in cross-pressures with the passage of time.

Certain data not presented in the main analysis add to the plausibility of the cross-pressure hypothesis. These data are in a sense by-products of the analysis of Hypotheses 1 and 2 and were not presented earlier because they were difficult to interpret in terms of either hypothesis. First there is a small number of couples in which both the husband and the wife are mobile but in opposite directions. Thirty-two such couples can be found in classes III, IV and V. Their combined

birth rate is 238 as compared with a birth rate for nonmobile couples in these classes of 275. The percentage childless is 17.6 and 4.0 respectively. These differences are greater than those between nonmobile and other mobile couples in classes III and V. Similarly the fertility planning distribution of the "up and down" mobile couples is impressive when compared with either other mobile or nonmobile couples of the same socio-economic status.[56] Note that nonmobile couples are not only less effective but also that the N. P. and Q. P. distributions are as called for by the cross-pressure hypothesis. "Up and down" mobile couples would seemingly be involved in a situation of maximum cross-pressure. Not only are both partners mobile but their backgrounds may be mutually inconsistent.

In the course of this investigation tabulations were made by the occupational and educational mobility of the husband. It was anticipated that the combination of both types of mobility would bring out the

---

[56]Percentage Distribution by Fertility Planning Status in Classes III, IV, and V.

Fertility Planning Status	Nonmobile D	"Up and Down" Mobile
N.S.P.	11.2	25.0
N.P.	13.5	9.4
Q. P.	28.1	34.4
E.F.	47.0	31.2

differentials expected in Hypothesis 1. This was not the case. The number of births per 100 couples for occupationally and educationally mobile couples is slightly greater than the figure for comparable non-mobile couples. More surprising is the fact that couples who were both educationally and occupationally mobile did not have lower birth rates than couples in which the husband was educationally but not occupationally mobile. It does not seem that the operation of selective factors should favor the latter group. Nevertheless the birth rate for the educationally up mobile is 173.8; for educational and occupational up mobility, 186.2.[57] Too much should not be made of this single difference but when taken together with the other evidence in this section it is suggestive of the fruitfulness of the cross-pressure hypothesis. Educational mobility without occupational mobility may result in a greater status inconsistency for the individual than does educational and occupational mobility. This seems to be a legitimate corollary of the cross-pressure theory. Of course many educationally mobile couples who are classified as nonmobile occupationally may actually have made consistent status changes in terms of both variables since job changes within occupational categories are not considered.

Finally it is conceivable that the low fertility rates of both

---

[57]The low fertility of the educationally mobile couples does not seem to be due to greater fertility planning effectiveness. They are in fact somewhat less effective: N.S.P. educational up mobile - 31.5 percent; 43.6 percent of occupational and educational up mobile are N. S. P.

nonmobile clerical couples and educationally nonmobile couples can be interpreted in terms of cross-pressures. Failure to achieve mobility in either of these situations involves a contradiction between realized and desired behavior. Because of the strong urgings toward "betterment", nonmobile individuals may refer themselves to upper status groups and thus are, in effect, "mobile;".

The data at hand do not permit a more detailed test of the cross-pressure hypothesis to be made. The only item in any way related to variations in group membership pertains to the average frequency of family contact, i. e. to the number of contacts Indianapolis couples have with parents and sibs.[58] The suitability of this item as an index of the extent to which a couple is influenced by their premobility mode of life is questionable. Family size, residence of parents and sibs and the interpretation of what frequent contact indicates about group relationships are the more obvious difficulties with this index. In spite of these faults tabulations were made showing the distribution of various groups of mobile and nonmobile couples by their average frequency of family contact. No systematic differences were found that would help account for differences in fertility between mobile and nonmobile groups. The distribution by fertility planning status is

---

[58] Couples were asked how frequently they have contact with their parents and sibs. Responses were classified as "Frequently," "Occasionally" etc. Numeric codes were assigned to these categories and an average frequency of contact with parents and with sibs computed from these.

interesting since it shows greater frequency of contact for N. S. P. and Q. P. couples. These are the planning groups where relatively great cross-pressures have been presumed. The figures are as follows and refer to percentage having "frequent" contact:

	Percent of Planning Group	Number of Couples
N. S. P.	36.9	198
N. P.	23.8	80
Q. P.	36.0	236
E. F.	26.7	150

These figures are meant to be suggestive and nothing more. The verification of the cross-pressure hypothesis must await more adequate data. However its superiority to the original formulations is evident since it is equally consistent with the facts presented and in addition offers the possibility of absorbing many deviant findings. This investigation therefore ends where another should begin.

One final comment is necessary. The inadequacies of the original hypotheses might be due, in part at least, to the crudeness of measurement of both independent and dependent variables. Future investigations should be as concerned with a re-examination of Hypotheses 1 and 2 using improved measurements of both independent and dependent variables as with testing the cross-pressure hypothesis.

Appendix I

The Index of **S**ocio-**E**conomic **S**tatus is the mean score received by individual couples for the eight items shown in Appendix Table I. With the code numbers used, a couple could receive any score from one to seventy-two. A score of one would mean that a couple has highest status in each of the eight rank systems A score of seventy-two would signify the lowest position in each of the rank systems. The actual range of variation extended from one to sixty-nine. Table 1 shown on the following page indicates the manner in which scores are summed.

Table 1. Scores in each of eight rank systems used for computing the Index of Socio-Economic Status. [1]

Socio Economic Group	Score	Average Annual Earnings of Husband since Marriage	Shelter Rent at Interview	Net Worth	Husband's Longest Occupation [2]
I	0	$4,000	$80	$10,000	Professional
	1	$3,000-3,999	$60-79	$ 6,000-9,999	Proprietors Managers Officials
II	2	$2,400-2,999	$50-59	$ 4,000-5,999	Clerical
III	3	$2,000-2,999	$40-49	$ 2,000-3,999	Skilled
IV	4	$1,800-1,999	$35-39	$ 1,000-1,999	Semi-skilled
V	5	$1,600-1,799	$30-34	$ 500- 999	Personal and Protective Service ....
	6	$1,400-1,599	$25-29	$ 200- 499	
	7	$1,200-1,399	$20-24	$ 0- 199	Other Service Worker ....
	8	$1,000-1,199	$15-19	Net Debt Under $200	
	9	Under $1,000	Under $15	Net Debt $200	Unskilled (Except Farm)

[1] In order to have all couples scored on all eight items, the few cases of "unknowns" were scored on the basis of the couple's average known scores.

[2] An occupational score of "3" was assigned to three husbands coded as "farm owner or farm manager" and a score of "8" was assigned to two coded as "farm laborer or farm foreman."

(Table 1 continued on following page)

Table 1. (Continued)

Socio Economic Group	Score	Purchase Price of Car [3]	Education of Husband	Education of Wife	Chapin's Scale
I	0		College 4	College 4	200
	1	$1,200	College 3	College 3	175-199
II	2	$1,050-1,199	College 2	College 2	150-174
III	3	$ 900-1,049	College 1	College 1	125-149
IV	4	$ 750- 899	High School 4	High School 4	110-124
V	5	$ 600- 749	High School 3	High School 3	100-109
	6	$ 450- 599	High School 2	High School 2	90- 99
	7	$ 300- 499	High School 1	High School 1	75- 89
	8	$ 150- 299	Grade School 8	Grade School 8	60- 74
	9	Under $150	Under Grade School 8	Under Grade School 8	Under 60

[3] The score assigned those owning no car was the average of the scores on the other measures of socio-economic status.

Appendix II

The Chapin Social Status Scale which forms part of the Index of Socio-Economic Status is shown on the following page. In parentheses and to the right of each item the item weight is given. These are added to obtain a total score.

Chapin's Social Status Scale

Part I. Material Equipment and Cultural Expression of the Living Room of the Home.

a. Floor, softwood (6) . . . . . _____

hardwood (10) . . . . . _____

b. Large rug (8) . . . . . _____

c. Windows with drapes (ea. window 2) . . . . . _____

d. Fireplace with 3 or more utensils (8) . . . . . _____

e. Artificial light, electric (8) . . . . . _____

kerosene (-2). . . . . _____

f. Library table (8) . . . . . _____

g. Armchairs (8 each). . . . . _____

h. Piano bench (4) . . . . . _____

i. Desk: personal social (8) . . . . . _____

j. Bookcases with books (8 each) . . . . . _____

k. Sewing machine (-2) . . . . . _____

l. Couch pillows (2 each) . . . . . _____

m. Alarm clock (-2) . . . . . _____

n. Periodicals (8 each) . . . . . _____

o. Newspapers (8 each) . . . . . _____

p. Telephone (8) . . . . . _____

q. Radio (8) . . . . . _____

r. Score on Part I . . . . . _____

Part II. Condition of Articles in Living Room

s. Cleanliness of room and furnishings

1. Spotted or stained and dusty (-6). . . . . _____

2. Spotted or stained (-4). . . . . _____

3. Dusty (-2). . . . . _____

4. Spotless and dustless (2). . . . . _____

u. Condition of repair of articles and furnishings

1. Broken, scratched, frayed, ripped, or torn (-4) . _____

2. Articles or furnishings patched up (-2). . . . . _____

3. Articles or furnishings in good repair and well kept (-2). . . . . _____

t. Orderliness of room and furnishings

1. Articles strewn about in disorder (-2). . . . . _____

2. Articles in place or in usable order (2). . . . . _____

v. Record your general impression of good taste

1. Bizarre, clashing, inharmonious or offensive(-4) _____

2. Drab, monotonous, neutral, inoffensive (-2) . . . _____

3. Attractive in positive way, harmonious, quiet and restful (2) . . . . . _____

w. Score on Part II . . . . . _____

x. Total score, Parts I & II (r w) . . . . . _____

Bibliography

Dixon, W. J. and Mood, A. M. "The Statistical Sign Test", Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 41, No. 236, (December, 1946)

Dumont, Arsene "La Morale Basee sur la Demographie", Schleicher Freres, Paris, 1901.

Freedman, Ronald Recent Migration to Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Freedman, Ronald and Hawley, Amos "Unemployment and Migration in the Depression (1930-35)", Journal of the American Statistical Association, June, 1949.

Freedman, Ronald and Whelpton, P. K. "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility, X. Fertility Planning and Fertility Rates by Religious Interest and Denomination" Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, xxviii, No. 3 (July 1950).

Handlin, Oscar The Uprooted, Little, Brown and Company, 1952.

Hanney, O. L. "A Note on the Frequency of Human Coitus", American Journal of Sociology, 38, 1932.

Kantner, J. F. and Whelpton, P. K. "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility XVI Fertility Rates and Fertility Planning by Character of Migration", Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Vol. No. 2, (April, 1952).

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, and Martin Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, W. B. Saunders Co., 1948.

Kiser, C. V. and Whelpton, P. K. "Social and Psychological Factors Affecting Fertility IV Developing the Schedules and Choosing the Type of Couples and the Area to be Studied", The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, Oct. 1945.

_____. "Ibid., V The Sampling Plan, Selection and Representativeness of Couples in the Inflated Sample" Ibid., January 1946.

_____. "Ibid., VI The Planning of Fertility", Ibid., January, 1947.

_____. "Ibid., IX Fertility Planning and Fertility Rates by Socio-Economic Status", Ibid., April, 1949.

_____. "Ibid., XI The Interrelationship of Fertility, Fertility Planning and Feeling of Economic Security", Ibid., January 1951.

Komorovsky, Mirra The Unemployed Man and His Family, Dryden Press, (1940)

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., Berelson, Bernard and Gaudet, Helen The People's Choice, Columbia University Press (1948).

Lipset, Seymour M. and Bendix, Reinhard "Social Mobility and Occupational Career Patterns I. Stability of Jobholding", American Journal of Sociology, January, 1952.

Newcomb, T. M. Personality and Social Change, Dryden Press, 1943.

Pearl, Raymond "Biological Factors in Fertility", Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, No. 188, November, 1936.

Sibley, E. "Some Demographic Clues to Stratification", American Sociological Review, Vol. VII, 1942.

Sixteenth Census of the United States, 1940, Comparative Occupational Statistics for the United States, 1870 to 1940.

Sorokin, P. A. Social Mobility, Harper and Brothers, 1927.

Stouffer, Samuel A. "Some Observations on Study Design", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 55.

RULES COVERING USE OF MANUSCRIPT THESES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY
AND THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OFFICE

Unpublished theses submitted for the doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of Michigan Library and in the Office of the Graduate School are open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. For this reason it is necessary to require that a manuscript thesis be read within the Library or the Office of the Graduate School. If the thesis is borrowed by another Library, the same rules should be observed by it. Bibliographical references may be noted, but passages may be copied only with the permission of the authors, and proper credit must be given in subsequent written or published work. Extensive copying or publication of the thesis in whole or in part must have the consent of the author as well as of the Dean of the Graduate School.

This thesis by .....
has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

A Library which borrows this thesis for use by its readers is expected to secure the signature of each user.

NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE

Form 6327 12-50 1M