

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

A STUDY ON VOLUNTARY CHILDLESSNESS: EXTENSION AND  
REPLICATION

BY

BARBARA J. HENDRICKSON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE  
OF MASTERS OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

AUGUST, 1977

A STUDY ON VOLUNTARY CHILDLESSNESS: EXTENSION AND  
REPLICATION

BY

BARBARA J. HENDRICKSON

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1977

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-  
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to  
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this  
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY  
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the  
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-  
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION .....	1
I	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	4
	Demographic Studies on Childlessness ..	4
	Demographic Characteristics .....	6
	Studies on Voluntary Childlessness ....	10
	Motivational Factors .....	16
	Summary .....	23
	Evaluation of the Research .....	24
II	METHODOLOGY .....	29
	Definition of 'Childfree' .....	29
	Propositions and Hypotheses .....	29
	Sample Design .....	33
	Data Analysis .....	36
	Instruments .....	37
III	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION .....	43
	Sample Characteristics .....	43
	Homogeneity of 'Childfree' and Parental Samples .....	50
IV	FINDINGS .....	53
	Hypothesis I .....	53
	Hypothesis II .....	54
	Hypothesis III .....	55
	Hypothesis IV .....	56
	Hypothesis V .....	58
	Hypothesis VI .....	63
	Hypothesis VII .....	66
	Hypothesis VIII .....	68
V	CONCLUDING COMMENTS .....	77
	Summary .....	77
	Discussion .....	79
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	85
	APPENDIX A .....	89
	APPENDIX B .....	125

	PAGE
APPENDIX C .....	129
APPENDIX D .....	134
APPENDIX E .....	139
APPENDIX F .....	142
APPENDIX G .....	144

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Incidence of Working Mothers .....	53
2	Parents' Marital Happiness .....	55
3	Family Size .....	56
4	Birth Order .....	57
5	Marital Happiness .....	59
6	Satisfaction with Degree of Affection ...	60
7	Level of Conflict .....	61
8	Outside Recreational Activities .....	62
9	Job Satisfaction .....	64
10	Social Mobility .....	65
11	Egalitarian Attitudes Toward Role Relations .....	67
12	Continuing Education .....	69
13	Number of Trips .....	71
14	Business Trips .....	73
15	Attitudes Toward New Experiences .....	75
16	Geographical Mobility .....	76

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance of all who contributed to this thesis is gratefully acknowledged. Particular thanks are extended to Professor G. N. Ramu (Main Advisor) for the use of his data and Professor D. Miller and Professor D. Berg who served on the Thesis Committee.

## ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to compare a group of voluntarily childless couples with a group of couples with children on factors related to lifestyle and family of orientation. Fifty-eight couples with children and fifty-seven childless couples were selected from the City of Winnipeg. The childless couples were solicited by advertisements and various public service announcements. The parental couples were selected from the same neighbourhoods as the childless couples in an attempt to keep the two groups as comparable as possible. Data concerning family of orientation and lifestyle were collected by self-mailing questionnaires. Gamma was used as the statistical measure of association and the chi-square statistic was used as a test of significance.

A review of the literature on voluntary childlessness suggested four major propositions from which testable hypotheses were derived. On analyzing the data it was found that none of the propositions were valid generalizations of the background or motivations of the voluntarily childless in the present study. The four propositions were derived almost entirely from the work of Veevers.

The analysis revealed no major differences between the parental and childfree sample in terms of the incidence

of working mothers, being the eldest of a large family or the only child and the happiness of the parents' marriage. A 'childfree' lifestyle characterized by intense marital relations, egalitarian role relations, a desire for new experiences and occupational commitment was not found to be the prevalent form of lifestyle in the present sample of voluntarily childless couples.

The inconsistency between the present study and the literature demonstrated the need for further research on the question of why certain individuals do not want children. It was suggested that further research should concentrate on studying representative samples of voluntarily childless couples and should determine the genuineness of the voluntarily childless sample under examination.



## INTRODUCTION

The family unit in some form is a universal characteristic of all societies. In North American society the nuclear family form is the modal type. It consists of at least two adults of the opposite sex living in a socially approved sexual relationship with their own or adopted children (Murdock, 1949). The nuclear family unit operates to meet the sexual needs of adults and to provide a basic unit of reproduction, socialization and economic cooperation (Nye and Berarado, 1973). The functions of the nuclear family have not been constant over time and currently there is debate over its viability in post-industrial society (Cooper, 1970). However, no real alternative to the conventional nuclear family has emerged which can assume the essential responsibilities of reproduction and socialization. It thus remains an integral part of North American society.

The importance of the nuclear family unit in the maintenance and continuation of society is reflected in the social meaning that has been attributed to it. Veever (1973a) has elaborated on this meaning which depicts family life and parenthood in positive terms. She maintains that the pro-family orientation in society has given rise to a general

conception of parenthood as moral, responsible and natural behaviour.

In most societies, including ours, to want to be a parent and to become one is defined as a moral and responsible recognition of communal and religious duties. The desire for children is interpreted as a sign of normal mental health and parenthood is seen as contributing to social maturity and personal stability. Parents are also seen as being more sexually competent and are characterized as having healthier marital relations than their non-parental peers (Veever, 1973a).

Despite the general pervasiveness of the normative orientation supporting the family institution, a minority of couples choose not to have children. It has been estimated that of the 10% of married couples in Canada who never have children (1961 Canadian Census), one-half are childless for voluntary rather than involuntary reasons (Veevers, 1972c). Involuntary reasons for childlessness include subfecundity and various physiological impairments which would prevent the successful completion of a pregnancy. Voluntary childlessness requires a conscious decision not to have children and involves a variety of motivational factors.

The reluctance of certain individuals to bear and rear children poses an important and interesting area of inquiry. In order to formulate a clearer understanding of why these individuals choose to forsake traditional behaviour

patterns and remain permanently childless, certain questions must be answered. Who are the voluntary childless? And what are their motivations for not wanting children? The present study is designed to explore the answers to these questions through a study of 114 childless individuals in the City of Winnipeg.

## CHAPTER I

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In the foregoing discussion an attempt has been made to provide a brief review of the literature in order to identify the present state of knowledge on voluntary childlessness and to critically assess its strengths and weaknesses.

#### Demographic Studies on Childlessness

Most prior studies in the area of childlessness have failed to differentiate between voluntary and involuntary forms. These studies relied heavily on census material and produced data of a demographic nature.

The most extensive demographic study done on childlessness was conducted by Grabill and Glick in 1959. They analyzed childlessness from the reports of the 1960 U.S. Census. No attempt was made to explain the causes of childlessness, instead the demographic characteristics of the women who were childless at the time of the census were presented.

Grabill and Glick found that the rates of childlessness were largest among "urban white women, among women living

apart from their husbands, among those whose marriages occur above the average age, among women with broken marriages who subsequently remarry and among those who delay childbearing during the first ten years of marriage." (1959:86). They also reported that the rates of childlessness was somewhat above average for college educated women, women who are in the labour force and women whose husbands are in the lower income groups.

A second demographic study on childlessness was conducted by Rice in 1964 in an attempt to derive a composite of the economic life cycle applicable to childless couples. Rice examined the statistical records of representative samples for the U. S. (U. S. Bureau of the Census (1960) and the National Survey of Consumer Finance (1963)). The sample consisted of 950 white childless families and 5,162 white parent families with both the husband and wife present. Rice found that the childless couples in comparison to the parental couples, married at a later age, had a higher education and were more socially mobile.

Kunz and Brinkerhoff conducted two studies in the area of childlessness. The first was done in 1969 and it examined the relationship between childlessness and race. The authors sought to dispute the belief that childlessness is higher for whites than for nonwhites. Data for this study were derived from the 1960 U. S. Census. Kunz

and Brinkerhoff found that the percentage of childlessness is much higher among nonwhite couples even when various controls are employed (for example, age cohort, age married and husband's education).

Kunz and Brinkerhoff's second study in the area of childlessness was done in 1973 and examined the relationship between childlessness and income. Here an exploration was made of what they consider to be a second stereotype - " . . . that of the poverty stricken family always having more children than they can afford." They found, as expected, a higher incidence of childlessness among couples where the husbands have a lower than average income.

### Demographic Characteristics

From the studies cited above several common demographic characteristics of the childless couple emerge. The characteristics are in the areas of education, occupation, income, religion, age at marriage, residence patterns and race.

### Education

There is little indication in the literature of the educational attainment of husbands. Instead the primary focus is on the education of the wives. There is also little

documentation of the educational status of the voluntarily childless, with the major focus on the childless in general.

Childless wives were found to have at least some post-secondary education. Education is an important variable in that it influences among other variables age at marriage, propensity to be in the labour force and position in the occupational hierarchy. Studies done by Gustavus and Henley (1971) and J. E. Veevers (1973b) found that the educational attainment for childless wives was considerably higher than for the general population. Gustavus and Henley's study was the only one that looked at the educational levels of the voluntarily childless husband. They found that 62% of childless husbands had college degrees or more, compared to 10% of the male population in the U. S.

Several demographic studies on childlessness came to similar conclusions (Grabill and Glick, 1959; Rice, 1966; Bogue, 1969 and Rao, 1974). These studies confirmed the finding that the median educational attainment for childless wives is significantly higher than for the general population.

### Occupation

There is little documentation of the occupational status of the voluntarily childless in the literature. Gustavus and Henley (1971) found that the childless husbands in their sample were much more likely to be of the highest

occupational status. They also reported that the childless wives had higher occupational statuses than U. S. family heads. Grabill and Glick (1959) found similar patterns in their sample of childless wives.

### Income

The high educational level of the childless couple would indicate a correspondingly high level of income. There is some evidence to support a contention of this nature but it is far from adequate. Gustavus and Henley (1971) and Veevers (1973b) found that in their samples of child-free, the couples displayed a higher mean income than the general population. But the studies by Kunz and Brinkerhoff (1973) and Grabill and Glick (1959) demonstrate a different relation between income and childlessness. They reported a higher incidence of childlessness among couples where the husbands had a lower income.

### Religion

From the literature on childlessness, a nonreligious tendency emerges. Childless couples generally do not profess strong religious affiliations or sentiments. If they do identify with a religious group, it is usually a Protestant one. Gustavus and Henley (1971) and Veevers (1973b) found a tendency for childfree couples to be atheists or agnostics from a Protestant background. Rice (1966) and Rao (1974) came to similar conclusions.



### Age at Marriage

Childless couples tend to marry at a later age than do couples with children. Veevers' (1973b) data support the relationship between childlessness and later age at marriage. She argues that the predispositions that prevent early marriages are also associated with decreased inclinations to parenthood. Grabill and Glick (1959), Whelpton, Campbell and Patterson (1966), Rice (1966), Kunz and Brinkerhoff and Kuczynski (1938) also reported that later age at marriage is positively correlated with childlessness.

### Residence Patterns

Childless couples tend to be concentrated in urban centres rather than rural areas. Both studies based on samples of childfree couples (Popenoe, 1936 and Veevers, 1971c) and demographic studies on childlessness (Grabill and Glick, 1959) found that the probability that a married woman will become a mother is higher in rural areas than in urban areas. Popenoe stated that this is not surprising since farmers are generally recognized as being more family oriented than other parts of the population and a childless home among them is usually undesired.

### Race

Grabill and Glick (1959), Kunz and Brinkerhoff (1969) and Bogue (1969) found that the rates of childlessness were higher among nonwhites than white populations. However,

Veevers (1971) has disputed this contention and reported that among the younger cohorts, childlessness is actually more common among whites than nonwhites.

### Studies on Voluntary Childlessness

Studies on voluntary childlessness have been spread over a forty year period. In these studies researchers have typically utilized nonprobabilistic samples, omitted husbands from their analyses and have failed to use control groups for comparative purposes.

The first study on voluntary childlessness was done by Popenoe in 1936 and is the only description of the motivations of the voluntarily childless based on the questioning of close friends and relatives of the childless couple. He asked students at the University of Southern California to list all cases of permanent childlessness among their closest friends and relatives. The students contributed the histories of 862 couples without children, of which 67% were voluntarily childless and 33% were involuntarily childless. This classification was made on the basis of the students' perception of the couples' reasons for childlessness.

Popenoe cautioned that his sample is representative of only one socioeconomic level of the population - the professional group - and therefore cannot be compared to other sectors. He further cautioned that the proportions of voluntary and invol-

untary childlessness are not entirely accurate because his students might have selected cases in which they knew the couples did not want children. On the basis of a "detailed enumeration", Popenoe came to the conclusion that the "great bulk of the voluntarily childless marriages are motivated by individualism, competitive consumption economically and an infantile, self-indulgent, frequently neurotic attitude toward life " (1936:472).

A second study which indirectly examined some aspects of voluntary childlessness was done by Strong in 1967. She did an exploratory investigation of the meaning of voluntary childlessness to black childless couples and sought to determine how this meaning influenced their decisions to adopt. She hypothesized that their attitudes toward children would be related to their earlier family experiences.

The Deasy-Quin study of 1959-1960 was used by Strong as the source of her sample group. A follow-up study was conducted with sixty-five of the couples who were found to be still childless. On the basis of interview and questionnaire data, Strong concluded that the attitudes of the black childless couples toward adoption were related to their beliefs about the meaning of childlessness. Childlessness was viewed as a desirable state and children were viewed as a hindrance in upward mobility and the maintenance of their status quo.

In 1968 Kiefert and Dixon conducted a study on childlessness and hypothesized that women who decide not to have children will exhibit some regret. The sample for their study was drawn randomly from women living in an urban centre and who had been married for at least three years. Their final experimental group consisted of thirty-three childless wives and their control group consisted of seventy-two wives with children. Out of the group of childless, five involuntarily childless and eleven voluntarily childless were selected to be interviewed. (The remainder of the control and experimental groups filled in questionnaires.) Kiefert and Dixon came to the conclusion that "if childless females recognize the societal norm that children are an essential part of marriage some manifestation of dissonance will result." (1969:78). Further they reported that the childless female did believe that children are an essential part of marriage, that most childless females desire children and that some dissonance was noted in the childless female group.

In 1971 Gustavus and Henley conducted a study which dealt with the motivations of the voluntarily childless. Their sample consisted of seventy-two couples who, during a two year span, applied to the Association of Voluntary Sterilization for assistance in obtaining surgical sterilizations. Of the seventy-two chosen, four intended to adopt and the rest were committed to a childless state.

The most common reason given by Gustavus and Henley's respondents for wanting to be sterilized was a concern for the population problem. The authors cautioned that this may not be a sincere reason, but only given because it is a socially acceptable response. Other reasons given were health, career, age, dislike for children, economic concerns, fear of pregnancy and unfavourable world conditions. (1971:283).

Veevers has written a series of articles (1971-1975) in the area of childlessness and her work is the most analytical and extensive to date. In an early demographic study, Veevers (1972c) attempted to establish the incidence of voluntary childlessness in Canada by using a 20% sample from the 1961 Canadian Census. The percentage of urban women who remained childless was selected as indicating the maximum percentage of women childless for psychological reasons. The percentage of childlessness among rural Quebec was then subtracted from the percentage of childlessness among urban Canadian women. The resulting percentage was said to indicate the percentage of voluntary childless in Canada (56.71% of all childless or 5% of the total population). Veevers also found a general decline in the incidence of childlessness. Among postmenopausal women an estimated 8.6% of those ever married did not become mothers as a result of psychological factors. Among younger women in the age group 30-44, the comparative percentage is estimated to be 6.2%.

In a 1971 paper, Veevers attempted to determine the

relationship between age at marriage and childlessness. Veevers sought to dispute the generally accepted contention that the positive relationship between childlessness and age at first marriage stems from biological factors. She hypothesized that if the variation in the incidence of childlessness by age at first marriage was the result of the loss of fecundity with advancing age, it would follow that in all populations approximately equal proportions of women who had been married at a given age would be childless.

In order to illustrate this point, a group of women was selected among whom virtually all childlessness could be attributed to natural sterility or subfecundity (rural Quebec) and compared with a group of women among whom voluntary childlessness could be expected to be more common (urban British Columbia). Veevers found that in the Quebec sample, women who postponed marriage until their late thirties still had a 76.2% chance of bearing at least one child, whereas in the British Columbia sample, the probability dropped to about 50%. From this she concluded that the relationship between childlessness and age at first marriage could not be explained exclusively in terms of subfecundity with advancing age and that psychological factors must also be considered.

Veevers has also examined the rural-urban variation in the incidence of childlessness (1971c). Veevers demonstrated that the relationship of urbanity to childlessness

(higher rates for urban areas) is constant even when a control is made for age, province, age at first marriage, duration of marriage and religion.

In another 1971 paper Veevers sought to dispute a conclusion arrived at by Kunz and Brinkerhoff (1969) concerning the correlates of race and childlessness. (They found higher rates of childlessness among nonwhites.) Veevers argued that because Kunz and Brinkerhoff controlled for age (only women in the 35-54 age group were included) they distorted their analysis. Veevers posits that when rates of childlessness among younger women are considered, Kunz and Brinkerhoff's conclusions cannot be generalized to all age cohorts and if current trends continue, rates of white childlessness may exceed that for nonwhites.

In 1973, Veevers did an interview study of fifty-two childfree wives. The wives were solicited by newspaper advertisements in Toronto and London, Ontario. The interviews were unstructured, averaged about four hours in length and included a discussion of the woman's life history, details of her marriage and her attitude toward the maternal role.

Veevers found that the wives in her sample were mostly middle class, upwardly mobile, had some university experience, were non-religious and came from homes where their mothers were full-time housewives. Veevers also found a high incidence of first born of large families and only children in her sample.

In addition, Veevers has written a series of papers on theoretical issues related to voluntary childlessness. These are on topics such as the social meanings of parenthood (1973), voluntary childlessness as deviant behaviour (1972), the neglect of the childfree phenomenon in sociological literature (1973), the life style of the voluntary childless couple (1974) and parenthood and suicide (1973).

#### Motivational Factors

From the preceding studies several factors emerge as being influential in the decision not to have children. These factors involve the following issues: economic concerns, career development, dislike of children, concern about quality of future life, life style and family of orientation.

#### Economic Concerns

In formulating rationales for not wanting children many couples expressed a concern over the cost of bearing and rearing children. In many cases couples desired economic security and felt that children would jeopardize their chances of achieving this (Strong, 1967 ; Veevers, 1973b; Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Kiefert and Dixon, 1968; Popenoe, 1936 and Burgess and Wallin, 1954). Betty Rollins (1971:214) in her article "Motherhood Who Needs It?", discusses the importance of economic considerations in opting for the childless state. "The high cost of living means not just giving up a new dress



or something in order to provide for the children - it means giving up a whole lot of things, changing your lifestyle."

### Dislike of Children

In several studies, couples when asked why they did not want children, reported simply that they did not like children. (Gustavus and Henley, 1971 and Veevers, 1973b). Veevers argues that a dislike of children is simply reflective of a dislike or disinterest in childish things in general. Her sample of childfree wives expressed a preference for an adult-centered lifestyle where the stress was on adult pleasures and recreation rather than a child-centered one.

### Quality of Future Life

In the literature reviewed childless couples sometimes expressed doubts about the quality of future life and felt hesitant about bringing children 'into a world like this'. Respondents were concerned with war, pollution, overpopulation, crime and similar problems (Burgess and Wallin, 1954 and Gustavus and Henley, 1971).

### Family of Orientation

Veevers has proposed three hypotheses concerning the family of orientation which might be expected to predispose women to reject parenthood before marriage (1973b): first, the quality of the parents' marriage may be a predisposing factor; second, sibling interaction may influence women to

opt out of motherhood and third, whether individuals had mothers who worked outside of the home may influence their perception of the maternal role.

#### Quality of Parents' Marriage

Veevers found that almost all the wives in her sample reported that their parents had never been divorced or separated and that their mothers had never worked outside of the home. However, they reported that their mothers were basically dissatisfied with their domestic roles and that their parents' marriages were unhappy. Veevers surmised that from these experiences the wives learned that having children does not necessarily contribute to marital happiness and may even prevent the dissolution of an unhappy marriage.

#### Sibling Interaction

Veevers found a high tendency for women in her sample to be eldest in a large family (six or more children) or an only child. In cases where wives were only children they reported that they had never observed their mothers involved in mothering roles with anyone but themselves. Because of their perceived lack of role models they were concerned about their own ability to care for a child. In cases where the wives were the oldest in the large families, they were required to help their mothers in domestic and childcare chores and developed a realistic idea of what

it meant to be a mother. Because these women became quite familiar with childrearing, they harboured no romantic illusions concerning motherhood and were reluctant to have children of their own.

### Working Mothers

Veevers found that almost all of the mothers of the childless wives in her sample were full-time housewives. Veevers reported that although their daughters rejected many aspects of this life-style, they retained their commitment to the belief that a baby needs full-time attention. She hypothesized that the girl whose mother was a housewife is more predisposed to think in terms of a dichotomous choice of working or having children. She believes that the forced-choice situation increases the probability of opting for the "childfree alternative."

### Lifestyle

Although no one factor can be said to predicate the childless state, the preference for a particular style of life which excludes children emerges from the literature as being of special import. Lifestyle in this context refers to a certain style of life which is adult-centered and oriented. The emphasis is on being fully adult, being childfree and being relatively successful and affluent. This style of life has been characterized by Veevers as involving

intense marital relations, occupational commitment, egalitarianism and a desire for new experiences (Veevers, 1974).

The relationship between permanent childlessness and a childfree lifestyle is not altogether clear. Veevers suggests that during the time couples postpone having children they experience the many social, personal, and economic advantages associated with being childless. During this period they are able to compare their lives to the lives of their peers who have children and decide whether or not they want children. Veevers believes that the factors involved in the initial decision to postpone having children may be quite different from those involved in the final decision not to have children. The first set of factors according to Veevers relates to the disadvantages of being a parent and the second relate to the advantages of being childless. She states that in these cases it is unlikely that couples avoid children because they want to travel, spend money, and so on, but rather they become accustomed to these and other advantages and are reluctant to give them up.

#### Intense Marital Relations

Many couples reported that they preferred not to have children because they felt that children would have a negative effect on their marital happiness. Veevers

(1974) reported that many of the couples in her sample were childless, not because they were against children, but because they were for marriage. They viewed children as a disruptive force that would alter both the intensity and the quality of the husband-wife relationship. Veivers describes the childless couple as being engaged in a dyadic withdrawal, where they look to each other for the satisfaction of most of their social and psychological needs to the gradual exclusion of others.

The conception of childless marriages as being characterized by extremely happy marital relations is inconsistent with the general social expectation of childless marital relations. Because of social norms prescribing the importance of having children, it is often assumed that people without children have unhappy marriages.

While there is little evidence in the literature of the actual degree of marital happiness experienced by the childfree couple, there is a plethora of literature documenting the adverse effects of children on marital relations (Pohlman, 1969; Veroff and Feld, 1970; Angus Campbell, 1970; LeMasters, 1958; Dyer, 1963; Rollins and Feldman, 1970; and Karen Renee, 1970). The general conclusion is that parents far more than nonparents find marriage restrictive and unrewarding and report dissatisfaction in their marital relationship.

### Occupational Commitment

Childless couples, especially childless wives, consistently expressed the belief that children would interfere with their career development and cite this as being influential in the initial postponement and eventual decision not to have children. Childless couples mentioned deep and time consuming involvement with careers and were not willing to give these up or postpone these in order to have children (Gustavus and Henley, 1971 and Popenoe, 1936). The childless wives in Veevers (1974) sample felt that motherhood would have a negative effect on their chances of achievement in the work world and their ability to be occupationally mobile. Some of the wives said that their careers occupied much the same place in their lives as children did in the lives of mothers.

### Egalitarian Role Relations

There is little documentaiton in the literature of the nature of the relationship between the childless husband and wife. What there is, however, points to a relationship characterized by egalitarianism. Veevers (1974) found that the couples in her sample had relatively egalitarian relationships and equal levels of authority and competence were evident. Similarly, Carr (1963) found in her study of fertile and infertile marriages that the dominance patterns reported by the infertile couples were more likely to reveal a democratic pattern and less likely to display disagreement than that of fertile couples. The childless couples in Veevers'

sample expressed the fear that the birth of a child would disrupt the division of labour and the egalitarian role relations in their marriages and therefore were reluctant to have children.

### New Experiences

Veevers (1974) found a strong emphasis being placed on the importance of new experiences by the respondents in her study. The wives in her sample were quite concerned about avoiding routines, maintaining few ties and doing things on the spur of the moment. They travelled extensively, were involved in continuing education, were geographically mobile and had a wide variety of leisure pursuits. This was interpreted by Veevers as an indication of the wives' "quest for new experiences". The wives in Veevers' sample were also concerned with being free to improve, to express and to actualize themselves. They believed that children would be an inhibiting factor in these processes.

In several other studies, childless couples expressed a concern over children interfering with their ability to undergo new experiences (Gustavus and Henley, 1971; Popenoe, 1936; and Kiefert and Dixon, 1969). Couples said that they wanted to travel and needed the freedom to follow their own inclinations or make future plans without having to consider a child.

### Summary

The literature reviewed here indicates that the

voluntarily childless exhibit several common characteristics. They have high levels of education, high occupational statuses, higher than average incomes, are nonreligious or Protestant, are concentrated in urban areas and marry at a later than normal age.

Childless individuals report being motivated in their decision not to have children by a variety of factors. A general concern over the cost of bearing and rearing children and the future quality of life is expressed. Some individuals also reported a general dislike for children.

Generally childless individuals expressed a fear that children would interfere in their career plans, restrict their ability to undergo new experiences, threaten their marital happiness and disrupt the egalitarian role relations in their marriages. Three possible predisposing factors: sibling interaction, the marital happiness of parents of childless individuals and the incidence of working mothers were also mentioned. Lifestyle emerges as an especially relevant factor in the decision not to have children in that it encompasses several issues and receives the most theoretical support.

#### Evaluation of the Research

The preceding review of the literature provides some indication of the socio-demographic characteristics of the voluntarily childless and the motivational factors associated with the decision not to have children. However, due to the



general lack of focused research and the serious deficiencies that plague available research on voluntary childlessness, the findings are far from conclusive. For this reason a critical analysis of the major studies in the field is in order.

The most serious deficiency of the literature is its incompleteness. Little attention has been focused on voluntary childlessness in the study of family or fertility. This neglect is unusual considering the extensive research done in other areas of family and fertility matters. Researchers have attributed this lack of research to a variety of factors. Among them are the 'selective inattention' of sociologists (Veevers, 1973d), the rarity of childlessness whether voluntary or involuntary, a tendency to view childlessness as just another 'quantitative state of parity', and the difficulty in designing a systematic study of childlessness (Gustavus and Henley, 1971).

Second, in the research on voluntary childlessness there is an absence of an objective and universally accepted definition of the term 'voluntary childlessness'. The definitions of voluntary childlessness vary from study to study and are largely dependent on the availability of the sample group. As a consequence comparisons leading to valid generalizations are almost impossible.

Further adding to the confusion, in much of the literature no distinction is made between voluntary and involuntary forms of childlessness. This is especially evident in studies that relied on census data. In these studies dichotomizing child-

lessness was not usually attempted. This poses some limitations on the generalizability of these studies. A childless marriage as recorded in the census may be one where one or both of the marital pair are biologically sterile, where childbirth is merely postponed, or where couples have decided not to have children.

Third, there is a virtual absence of probability sampling. Since research on voluntary childlessness is still in the exploratory stages, few attempts have been made to derive representative samples of childless couples. Instead availability sampling has been used. This necessarily presents serious limitations on the generalizability of the research.

Fourth, there is a general failure of researchers to use a 'control' group for comparative purposes. With few exceptions studies have not compared findings to those of a parental control group. The use of a control group would have ensured that findings were related to voluntary childlessness rather than a host of other factors.

Fifth, there is a conspicuous absence of childless husbands in research on voluntary childlessness. The decision to remain permanently childless is obviously one that is made in consultation and is not an independent decision made by one spouse. However, researchers typically question wives and ignore husbands. By omitting husbands from research on childlessness, social scientists are neglecting a potential source of information and restricting their analysis to one side of the issue.

One final criticism can be made of a portion of the literature that has dealt with childlessness - that of a pro-parental bias. At times, researchers have viewed childlessness as pathological and childless couples as unstable. This criticism is particularly relevant to earlier studies (Popenoe, 1936 and Burgess and Wallin, 1953) but is important to recognize because of its potentially deleterious effects.

The above criticisms can also be applied to Veevers' 1973 study. In this study Veevers employed a nonprobability sampling technique, omitted husbands from analysis and did not compare findings to a control group. Considering these deficiencies, the heavy reliance on Veevers' research as a major source of information on voluntary childlessness is disturbing. Clearly a strong case exists for the retesting of Veevers' findings under improved research conditions.

The research described in this thesis was designed with that intent. An attempt has been made to improve upon the sampling problems evident in the research of Veevers and others by including husbands in the analysis and the use of a control group of couples with children. Veevers' research will be reconsidered in that several of the critical variables used in her study will be re-examined in light of new data. Because the previous studies have arrived at few reliable conclusions, the present study is exploratory and consequently there is no theoretical framework to guide

the research.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

#### Definition of 'Childfree'

For the purposes of this thesis the childfree couple is one who has made a conscious decision not to have children. The term 'childfree' will be used with reference to the decision not to have children and a preference for the childless state (Veevers, 1973b). Correspondingly, parental couples are those who because of a deliberate decision or unconscious effort, have had children. The term 'childless status' refers to the dependent variable in the study and is composed of the two categories, parental and childfree.

#### Propositions and Hypotheses

For the purposes of clarity the present study has been divided into two main parts. The first concerns the family of orientation of the childfree couple and the second concerns their lifestyle. The aim of the first part of the present study is to test the validity of the following three general propositions:

There will be a tendency for the childfree to come from families where their parents' marriages are unhappy.

. . . PROPOSITION I

There will be a tendency for the childfree to come from families where they are the eldest sibling of a large family or are the only child.

. . . PROPOSITION II

There will be a tendency for the childfree to come from families where their mothers were full-time housewives.

. . . PROPOSITION III

The first three propositions are derived from the work of Veivers (1973b). Veivers has suggested that individuals who were raised in the context of an unhappy marriage, who had had atypical sibling experiences in their childhood or whose mothers were full-time housewives may be predisposed to childlessness. Four hypotheses were constructed on the basis of the three propositions in order to judge whether Veivers' characterization was a valid generalization of the family of orientation of the childfree couples. It was suggested that:

- Hypothesis 1 . . . The incidence of working mothers will be lower in the childfree sample than in the parental sample.
- Hypothesis 2 . . . The level of parents' marital happiness will be lower in the childfree sample than in the parental sample.
- Hypothesis 3 . . . The incidence of only children will be higher in the childfree sample than in the parental sample.
- Hypothesis 4 . . . The incidence of eldest siblings of large families (six or more) will be higher in the childfree sample than the parental sample.

The aim of the second part of the study was to test the validity of the general proposition that:

The involvement of a couple in a childfree lifestyle facilitates the redefinition of nonparenthood as a desirable marital state.

. . . PROPOSITION IV

Proposition four is derived from the work of a variety of researchers but relies heavily on Veevers (1974) for its formulation. According to Veevers, many couples have no definite feelings about children at the time of marriage, and simply assume that they will have children eventually. However, for one reason or another, they postpone having children and become involved in an adult-centered lifestyle. Veevers states that there is seldom a direct decision to avoid having children in these cases. Rather, after a period of time it becomes obvious that they never will have children. In examining the validity of this proposition special attention will be paid to Veevers' characterization of the childfree lifestyle as involving intense marital relations, occupational commitment, egalitarian role relations and a desire for new experiences (1974).

Four hypotheses and several subhypotheses were derived from proposition four in order to judge whether it was a valid generalization of the lifestyle of the voluntarily childless couple. These are the following:

Hypothesis 5 . . . The childfree sample will exhibit more intense marital relations than the parental sample.

In order to examine the validity of hypothesis five the following subhypotheses were constructed:

The childfree sample will express a higher degree of marital satisfaction than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 5-1

The childfree sample will report more satisfaction with the degree of affection received from their spouses than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 5-2

The childfree sample will report less conflict in their marriages than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 5-3

The childfree couples will be engaged in more recreational activities together than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 5-4

Hypothesis 6 . . . The childfree sample will be more 'occupationally committed' than the parental sample.

In order to examine the validity of hypothesis six the following subhypotheses were constructed:

The childfree sample will report a higher level of job satisfaction than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 6-1

The childfree sample will be more upwardly mobile than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 6-2



Hypothesis 7 . . . The childfree sample will report a more egalitarian attitude toward sex role relations than the parental sample.

Hypothesis 8 . . . The childfree sample will exhibit a stronger desire for new experiences than the parental sample.

In order to examine the validity of hypothesis eight the following subhypotheses were constructed:

The childfree sample will be more involved in continuing education than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 8-1

The childfree sample will have a wider variety of leisure pursuits than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 8-2

The childfree sample will travel more extensively and more frequently than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 8-3

The childfree couples will belong to fewer formal groups and organizations than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 8-4

The childfree sample will have a more favourable attitude toward the 'desirability of new experiences' than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 8-5

The childfree sample will be more geographically mobile than the parental sample.

. . . Subhypothesis 8-6

### Sampling Design

A sample of voluntarily childless couples was solicited

by news articles in Winnipeg newspapers and other public announcements in the Winnipeg area\*. One hundred couples responded to these notices and were mailed questionnaires for both husbands and wives. Of the original one hundred couples, fifty-seven returned completed questionnaires. (A large portion of the forty-three individuals who failed to complete the questionnaires did so because they misunderstood the purpose of the study. They thought that a formal group would be formed as a result of the study and withdrew their support when they found that this was not to happen.)

The sampling technique used to obtain the sample of childfree couples is a nonprobability one, or more specifically one that involved the use of a voluntary sample. The use of nonprobability sampling is as a rule undesirable since it cannot be assumed to be representative of the total population. The childless couples who volunteered for the study group undoubtedly did so for some reason which can only be speculated on at this point. However, the use of nonprobability sampling in the present research was felt to be justified for essentially two reasons.

First, selecting a probability sample of voluntarily childless couples would have been prohibitively expensive. Childless couples are difficult to locate because they

\* The data for this study were made available by Dr. G. N. Ramu, Department of Sociology, University of Manitoba.

represent a very small proportion of the total population. In addition they are a largely invisible population - they do not belong to any special groups or clubs, have no physically identifying characteristics and are not concentrated in any area of a city or in any specific occupational classification. Upon locating a sample of voluntary childless couples the difficult task of determining whether their childlessness is genuine or merely a stage in their fertility careers is still at hand. In order to determine this, extensive pretesting aimed at determining the physiological capabilities and psychological motivations of the childless couple is necessary.

Second, precise representativeness was not considered crucial for the purposes of the present study. The primary aim of the present research is retesting findings that were originally based on a nonprobability sample. Therefore a similar sampling technique was considered to be adequate.

For comparative purposes a second stage in the study was necessary in which childless couples could be compared to couples with children. In order to accomplish this, a sample of fifty-eight couples with children was drawn from the neighbourhoods of the childless couples. For analytical purposes, this group was treated as a control group.

The sample of parental couples was selected in the following manner. The street and street numbers of the childless group were listed and with the use of Henderson's

Directory, approximately five households in close proximity to the childless households were selected. The households on this list were telephoned and asked if they would fill in questionnaires on parenthood. Telephoning was continued until one hundred households consented to do the questionnaire\*. Or the original one hundred couples, fifty-eight returned completed questionnaires. The parental group was selected from the same neighbourhoods as the childfree couples in an attempt to keep the two samples as similar as possible. This form of sampling has received theoretical support in the literature (Shevky and Bell, 1955; Bell and Boat, 1957; Greer, 1962 and Reiss, 1955).

#### Data Analysis

In analyzing the data two general steps were taken. In order to determine the basic distributional characteristics of each of the variables, one way frequency distribution tables were constructed. Contingency tables were then constructed to investigate the relationship between variables.

Since the research design involved ordinal data, nonparametric statistic Gamma was used as a measure of the strength of association between variables. A chi-square test of statistical significance was used in conjunction with the Gamma statistic in order to determine the significance

\* Approximately one hundred and fifty households were telephoned in all.

of associations between variables. In cases where the measures of association and the test of significance conflicted, the chi-square was taken as the ultimate indicator of the reliability of the findings.

Gamma may have values between -1.0 and +1.0, with -1.0 indicating a perfect negative relationship and +1.0 indicating a perfect positive relationship. For the Gamma statistic a value of  $\pm 0.45$  to  $\pm 0.9$  was selected as indicating a very strong association, a value of  $\pm 0.25$  to  $\pm 0.45$  a moderately strong association and a value of  $\pm 0.1$  to  $\pm 0.25$  a weak association\*. The level of significance used for the chi-square statistic was .05\*. A chi-square value of .05 or less indicates that an association represents a genuine relationship in the sample population.

## Instruments

### Conflict Scales

The respondents were asked by means of a fifteen item Likert scale whether there was a great deal of conflict, quite a bit of conflict, some conflict, little conflict, or no conflict in their marriages on the following items: being tired, irritating personal habits, household expenditures, being away from home, how to spend leisure time, how

\* These levels were considered appropriate given the relatively small size of the sample.

to share jobs around the house, time spent with friends, how to behave toward in-laws, how much affection and love to show toward each other, each other's religious beliefs, frequency of sexual relations, each other's political beliefs, each other's choice of friends, their spouse's job and their own job.

The individual's final score was the sum of the responses to the fifteen items. Scores could range from 15-75 with a score of 75 reflecting the highest score in the direction of no conflict and a score of 15 reflecting the lowest score in the direction of a great deal of conflict. The actual scores ranged from 15 to 75 with a mean of 65.240 and a standard deviation of 9.110. The scores were grouped into the following three categories: 15-61, 62-71 and 72-75\*.

#### New Experience Scale

Respondents were asked to state by means of a four item Likert scale whether they agreed or disagreed with the desirability of new experiences. The items that the individuals were asked to respond to are the following:

1. "One should be trying continually to improve oneself."
2. "One should try to avoid new routines."
3. "Each individual has an obligation to utilize

\* All grouping of scores for the scales in this study were constructed so as to avoid empty cells.

his or her full capabilities."

4. "One should be striving continually for new experiences."

The individuals final score was the sum of the responses to the four items. Scores could range from 4-20 with a score of 4 reflecting the highest score in the direction of favourable attitudes toward the importance of new experiences and a score of 20 reflecting the lowest score in the direction of the least favourable attitudes toward the importance of new experiences. The actual scores ranged from 4 to 20 with a mean score of 8.42 and a standard deviation of 2.712. The scores on this scale were grouped into three categories: 4-6, 7-10 and 11-20.

#### Egalitarianism Scale

The respondents were asked to state by means of a nine item Likert scale whether they agreed or disagreed with the concept of egalitarianism. The items that the individuals were asked to respond to are the following:

1. "Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main sayso in family matters."
2. "It goes against human nature to place women in positions of authority over men."
3. "A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things."
4. "Except in special cases, the wife should do the cooking and housecleaning and the husband should provide the family with money."

5. "Men should make the really important decisions in the family."
6. "A man who helps around the house is doing more than should be expected."
7. "A woman has naturally stronger feelings than a man toward small children."
8. "The male should always be the aggressor in regards to the sex act."
9. "If the man is working his wife has no right to expect him to work when he is at home."

The individual's final score was the sum of the responses nine questions. Scores could range from 9 to 45 with a score of 45 reflecting the highest score in the direction of most favourable attitudes toward egalitarianism and a score of 9 reflecting the lowest score in the direction of the least favourable attitude toward egalitarianism. The actual scores ranged from 9 to 45 with a mean of 36.676 and a standard deviation of 6.510. Scores were grouped into the following three categories: 9-32, 33-41 and 42-45.

#### Upward Mobility Scale

In the present study, upward mobility was determined by comparing changes in social positions of individuals with that of their fathers. The socio-economic scores\* of fathers were subtracted from that of their children and a positive number was viewed as an indicator of upward mobility. The

\* (Blishen, B. and A. McRoberts, 1976)



mobility scores were grouped into categories of downward, low or static, medium and high. A downward score was one where a negative remainder was calculated from the subtraction. A low or static score was one where the remainder was from 0-10, 11-20 qualified as a medium score, and 21+ qualified as a high score.

All scales were subjected to the "criterion for internal consistency" method suggested by Likert (1967) to measure validity (i.e. that the test actually measures what it is designed to measure). When the criterion for internal consistency was applied for childless couples and parents separately, the results indicate that in all instances with the exception of one item, the differences in the means between the upper and lower deciles were greater than one. While the difference on the one item was equal to one, it was included in the scale because it was felt the effect would be minimal on the validity of the scale. (See Appendix B for the analysis of the items.)

The reliability (i.e. that the same test applied to the same population would consistently get the same results) of the scales was tested by means of an alpha coefficient. An alpha coefficient gives the means of the correlations resulting from all possible ways of splitting a given test into halves and gives the proportions of first factor variance extracted from the intercorrelations of the test items (Baggaley, 1964:64). Alpha coefficients were calculated

for all scales for childless and parents separately. The resulting coefficients were uniformly high with only one falling below the 0.7 level. The scale for which the low coefficient was calculated was only four items long and therefore the lower than normal coefficient was not considered to be serious. (See Appendix B for the analysis of the items.)



## CHAPTER III

### SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

Included in this section are data pertaining to the social and demographic characteristics of the childfree respondents with respect to age, age at marriage, length of marriage, socio-economic status, education, religion, religious influence and ethnic background. The childfree sample was compared where appropriate to the general population in order to acquire a more complete picture of the childfree sample examined in the present study.

#### Sample Characteristics

##### Age

The mean age of the childfree respondents was 27.37 years with a range from 20 to 48. The modal age was 25 to 29 years. The mean age for the husbands and wives were similar: 27.02 for wives and 29.31 for husbands. The distribution of ages for wives, husbands and the total group is reported in Appendix C - Table 1. According to the 1971 Canadian Census, the childfree wives are well into the normative

childbearing period. Of all Canadian women in the 25 to 29 year ago group, only 20.7% were still without children.

(Similar data were not available for men.)

### Length of Marriage

The mean length of marriage for the childfree respondents is 5.71 years with a range from 2 to 19. The modal length of marriage is 3 to 4 years. The distribution of years married for the childfree sample is reported in Appendix C - Table 2.

Data from the 1971 Canadian Census indicate that of all wives who become mothers, the mean interval from marriage to birth of the first child is less than two years. The childfree wives in the present study have been married for almost three times as long as the normal interval before the birth of the first child.

### Age of Marriage

Ages at marriage were recorded for the childfree respondents. Normative data on age at marriage were obtained from the 1971 Canadian Census for Manitoba. Sample and population distributions for age at marriage are reported in Appendix C - Table 3. The mean age at marriage for the childfree respondents was 22.61 years. The modal age at marriage was 20 to 24 years. The modal age at marriage for the husbands and wives was 21.91 for wives and 23.31 for husbands.

The distribution of respondents by age at marriage does not correspond to the age at marriage of all Manitobans in the same age group (24 to 35). The mean age at marriage for the childfree wives and husbands is lower than that of the males and females in the general population. In Manitoba the mean age at marriage for females and males is 22.6 and 24.7 respectively. In the childfree sample, the mean age at marriage is 21.91 for the wives and 23.31 for husbands.

The lower than normal age at marriage is surprising in light of previous research in the area which has reported a positive correlation between later age at marriage and childlessness.

#### Socio-Economic Status

This term is applied to the status of the individual in terms of the individual's occupation as assessed by its numerical rating on "A Revised Socio-Economic Index for Occupations in Canada" developed by Bernard Blishen and A. McRoberts (1976). Ratings on this scale are based on two factors felt to be important in determining an individual's social standing: the average years of education that their occupation requires and the average income it demands.

The mean rating for the childless couple on Blishen's Socio-Economic Index (1971) is 57.58. The modal category

is 50 to 59. The distributions of ratings on the index are reported in Appendix C - Table 4. Normative data on Blishen's socio-economic ratings were not available, however, an inspection of the data reveals that the child-free sample scores high on this index.

Both husbands and wives show a preponderance of high occupational categories with 70.4% having scores of 50 or higher. These categories include professional, semi-professional, managers, and industry owners. There is also an absence of childfree couples in the lowest, 30 and under category. The high numbers of childfree in the 50+ categories can be partially accounted for in terms of high proportions of working childfree wives. Eighty-two percent of the childfree wives worked compared to only 39.8% of all married Canadian women in the 25 to 34 year old category (Facts and Figures, 1974:33). The high participation rate of the childfree wives is undoubtedly related to the fact that they are not engaged in childcare duties and therefore have the time to pursue occupational careers.

### Education

Data on the amount of schooling were tabulated for the childfree couples and are reported in Appendix C - Table 5. The distribution of childfree couples by educational attainment does not correspond to the distribution by

educational attainment for all Manitoba residents. The childfree sample clearly exceeds the general population in terms of university experience. The modal category for the childfree sample is "university degree" as compared to "some high school" for the Manitoba population. Only 5.56% of the general population have completed university degrees as compared to 28.1% of the childfree sample, and only 5.87% of the general population have reported "some university" as compared to 22.8% of the childfree population.

#### Ethnic Background

Ethnic origins were tabulated for the childfree sample. Normative data were obtained from the 1971 Canadian Census for Manitoba. Sample and population distributions are reported in Appendix C - Table 6. The distribution by ethnic origin for childfree couples does not correspond to the distribution by ethnic origin for all Manitoba residents. Under represented among the childfree sample are those of British, Slavic and German ancestry and over represented are those occupying the "other" category. Because of the varying ethnic groups included in the "other" category, no conclusions can be drawn regarding over representation of individual ethnic groups.

## Religion

Religious affiliations were determined for the child-free sample. Normative data on religion were obtained from the 1971 Canadian Census for Manitoba. Sample and population distributions are reported in Appendix C - Table 7. The data illustrate quite clearly the differences in distribution between the childfree and general population by religious affiliations. There is a higher incidence of Protestant affiliations and a lower incidence of Catholic affiliations for the childfree sample and a significant difference between those reporting "no religion". Of the childfree sample, 45.6% reported no religion as compared to only 4.3% of the general Manitoba population. Similarly, a substantial majority of the childfree sample (78.9%) stated that religion has only a slight or nonexistent influence on their lives. For more detailed data on the influence of religion, see Appendix C - Table 8.

The above findings indicate a definite nonreligious tendency in the childfree sample. Explaining the relationship between religiosity and voluntary childlessness is difficult in light of the limited investigation done on religiosity in the present study. It is unlikely that individuals refrain from parenthood because of poor religious indoctrination. However, low levels of religiosity may make the decision not to have children easier. The low levels of religiosity indicated



by these data are likely related to a more general non-traditional attitude which may be instrumental in the non-traditional and nonreligious route childfree couples take by not having children.

### Summary

The childfree sample described here is similar to that of J. E. Veevers (1973b). (This may be a function of the similar sampling techniques more than anything else.) Similarities between the two samples can be seen in terms of age, the mean age in Veevers' sample was 29 years compared to 28 years in this sample; length of marriage, the mean duration of marriage in Veevers' sample was 7 years compared to 6 in this sample; social class; in both samples the majority of the individuals had at least some university education; religiosity, in both samples individuals reported low levels of religiosity; and religious affiliation, in both samples there was a propensity for individuals to be of a Protestant persuasion.

It should be noted that within the parental and childfree sample no major differences in findings were observed for husbands and wives. Husbands and wives followed the general trends of the larger group. As a result a sexual distinction is not made in the analysis.

### Homogeneity of the Childfree and Parental Samples

In order to insure that the differences in responses between the childfree and parental samples were due to the presence or absence of children it was considered necessary to keep the two groups as similar in other aspects of their lives as possible. (See Appendix G for relevant tables.)

On analyzing the data for the two groups it was found that the parental sample was older than the childfree sample. The mean age of the parental sample was 39.97, compared to 27.37 for the childfree sample. In an attempt to accommodate the difference in age between the two samples, all individuals over the age of 45 were omitted from statistical analysis. The remaining sample consisted of 76 parental and 113 childfree couples. With individuals over the age of 45 omitted from analysis, the mean age became 28.17 for the childfree sample and 30.97 for the parental sample. The mean length of marriage became 8.6 years for the parental sample and 5.4 years for the childfree sample.

The control had the effect of altering two associations out of a total of thirty. The variables affected by the control were "family size" and "continuing education". The implications of these changes are discussed with findings for the appropriate hypotheses.

A second major difference between the two groups occurred in the area of religion. The childfree sample proved to be

considerably less religious than the parental sample. This is evidenced by both the religious affiliation of the child-free sample and their expressed levels of religiosity. Of the childfree sample, 45.6% reported no religion compared to only 8.2% of the parental sample. The modal category of religious affiliation was 'Protestant' for the parental group with 72.2% falling into that category. Only one-third of the childfree sample was of a Protestant religious background. Correspondingly 48.3% of the childless couples reported that religion had no influence in their lives compared to 17.4% of the parental sample.

A third difference between the childfree and parental samples was found in the area of education. The parental sample is somewhat less educated than the childfree sample. While similar proportions of the childfree and parental samples have graduate or professional degrees, twice as many of the childfree sample have undergraduate university degrees. Of the parental sample 15.5% had a professional or graduate degree compared to 20.2% of the childfree sample. However, only 14.5% of the parental sample had an undergraduate university degree compared to 28.1% of the childfree sample.

The effect of the differences in education on the validity of comparisons between the two groups is difficult to estimate. Education is a factor that has not been adequately examined in the study of voluntary childless couples. It has received some attention in other areas of

fertility and is reported as a factor in reduced family size (Veevers:1972). It is possible that higher education also promotes a higher incidence of childlessness by affecting one's perspectives on the importance of family life.

The difference in education does not have a major effect on the socio-economic status of the parental sample. No substantial differences were found between the parental and childfree samples in terms of their socio-economic scores. The modal category for socio-economic scores was 60-69 for the parental sample and 50-59 for the childfree sample. The mean score of the childfree sample was 57.58 compared to 52.21 for the parental sample.

The childfree and parental samples both reported approximately the same age at marriage. The mean age at marriage was 22.77 for the parental sample and 22.61 for the childfree sample. The modal category for age at marriage was 20-24 for both groups. This finding corresponds to earlier comparisons with the general Manitoba population.

The ethnic background of both groups was also quite similar. The modal category for both samples was 'British', with 41.2% of the childfree sample and 37.3% of the parental sample reporting British ethnic backgrounds.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

#### Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that the incidence of working mothers would be lower for the childfree sample than for the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a weak, positive association, was found between the variables childless status and 'incidence of working mothers'. The chi-square value for the association was not significant at the .05 level. (See Table 1.) Sixty-five point eight percent of the childfree sample and 74.3% of the parental sample reported that their mothers had never worked outside of home while they were under the age of eight.

TABLE 1

INCIDENCE OF WORKING MOTHERS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Incidence	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Yes always	12.3	(14)	12.8	(14)
Frequently	8.8	(10)	9.2	(10)
Seldom	12.3	(14)	3.7	(4)
Never	65.8	(75)	74.3	(81)
Total	100.0	(113)	100.0	(109)

$G = -0.12530$ ,  $X^2 = 5.71610$ , d.f. = 3, p. = 0.1263

The suggestion made in the literature that the childfree would be more likely to have mothers who were full-time housewives is not born out by the present study. It was argued that having a mother who was a full-time housewife would encourage their children to think in terms of a dichotomous choice of either working or having children. However, this trend was not evident in the present sample and if anything, the findings indicate that the childfree are more likely to have mothers who worked outside of the home while they were under the age of eight.

#### Hypothesis 2

It was hypothesized that the levels of parents' marital happiness would be lower for the childfree sample than it would be for the parental sample. On analyzing the data no association was found between the variables, childless status and 'parents' marital happiness'. The chi-square value for the association was not significant at the .05 level. (See Table 2.) Of the childfree couples, 25.7% reported that their parents' marriages were unhappy to varying degrees compared to 23.9% of the parental sample.

The findings do not support the contention that childless individuals are raised in the context of unhappy marriages. In the present study the modal category for 'parents' marital happiness' was 'happy' for parents and non-parents alike, and almost identical proportions of both samples

reported unhappy marriages among their parents.

TABLE 2

## PARENTS' MARITAL HAPPINESS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Level of Happiness	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
Extremely happy	11.5	(13)	18.3	(20)
Decidedly happy	27.4	(31)	22.9	(25)
Happy	35.4	(40)	34.9	(38)
Unhappy	14.2	(16)	16.5	(18)
Decidedly unhappy	6.2	(7)	3.7	(4)
Extremely unhappy	5.3	(6)	3.7	(4)
Total	100.0	(113)	100.0	(109)

$G = 0.07939$ ,  $X^2 = 3.44386$ , d.f. = 5, p. = 0.6319

Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that the incidence of only children would be higher in the childfree sample than in the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a significant, moderately strong, negative association was found between the variables, childless status and 'family size'. However, when age is controlled for, the relationship disappears. (See Table 3.) Nine point eight percent of the childfree sample compared to 1.4% of the parental sample were only children. While there are differences between the two samples in the direction predicted by the hypothesis, they were not

statistically significant. Therefore, hypothesis three was not supported.

TABLE 3

FAMILY SIZE: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES UNDER 45 YEARS

Number of Children	Childfree Sample %	Childfree Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Parental Sample No.
Only child	9.8	(11)	1.4	(1)
2	29.5	(33)	20.3	(14)
3	24.1	(27)	24.6	(17)
4	13.4	(15)	15.9	(11)
5	13.4	(15)	14.5	(10)
6	2.7	(3)	4.3	(3)
7	4.5	(5)	10.1	(7)
8	0.9	(1)	1.4	(1)
9+	1.8	(2)	5.8	(5)
Total	100.0	(112)	100.0	(69)

$G = -0.31831$ ,  $X^2 = 15.21204$ , d.f. = 9, p. = 0.0853

#### Hypothesis 4

It was hypothesized that there would be a higher incidence of eldest siblings from large families (six or more) in the childfree than in the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a moderately strong, negative association was found between the variables childless status and 'birth order'. The chi-square value for the association was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 4.) Of the childfree sample, 54.9%



fell into the eldest category compared to 38.5% of the parental sample. When only children are removed from the eldest category, 44.7% of the childfree sample and 35.5% of the parental sample were the eldest in their family of orientation.

TABLE 4  
BIRTH ORDER: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Birth Order	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Oldest	54.9	(62)	38.5	(40)
2nd	23.9	(27)	25.0	(26)
3rd	10.6	(12)	14.4	(15)
4th	3.5	(4)	9.6	(10)
5th	3.5	(4)	0.9	(1)
6th	1.8	(2)	1.9	(2)
7th	-	-	2.9	(3)
8th	0.9	(1)	0.9	(1)
9th	0.9	(1)	5.8	(6)
Total	100.0	(113)	100.0	(104)

$$G = -.29520, X^2 = 17.12489, d.f. = 20, p. = 0.0468$$

While the childfree tend to be the eldest, their families are not larger than the families of the parental sample. The mean family size of the parental sample is 5.439 compared to 4.317 for the childfree sample. The larger family size of the parental sample might be expected

considering the older mean age of the parental sample. However, even when age is controlled for, the proportions of the childfree coming from families of six or more is still lower than for the parental sample. Of the parental sample under 45, 37.5% came from families of six or more compared to 23.3% of the childfree sample. Therefore, on the basis of the sample data, hypothesis four is not supported. Childfree couples may be more likely to be the eldest, but not as suggested in the literature from large families.

#### Hypothesis 5

It was hypothesized that the childfree couples would experience more 'intense marital relations' than the parental sample. Hypothesis five was tested by means of the following four subhypotheses.

#### Subhypothesis 5-1

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would express a higher level of marital happiness than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a moderately strong, negative association was found between the variables childless status and 'marital happiness'. The chi-square value for the association was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 5.) Forty-seven point four percent of the childfree sample and 33.9% of the parental sample reported

extremely happy marital relations. This finding is not surprising. Research on the effect of children on marital happiness has generally found a positive correlation between the presence of children and marital dissatisfaction (Bernard, 1972).

TABLE 5

## MARITAL HAPPINESS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Degree of Happiness	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Extremely happy	47.4	(54)	33.9	(37)
Decidedly happy	41.2	(47)	33.0	(36)
Happy	11.4	(13)	25.7	(28)
Unhappy	-	-	2.8	(3)
Decidedly unhappy	-	-	1.8	(2)
Extremely unhappy	-	-	2.8	(3)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(109)

$$G = -0.35786, X^2 = 8.01842, d.f. = 5, p. = 0.0029$$

Subhypothesis 5-2

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would be more satisfied with the degree of affection received from their spouses than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data no association was found between the variables childless status and 'satisfaction with degree of affection'.

The chi-square value for the association was not significant at the .05 level. (See Table 6.) Of the childfree sample, 78.9% reported being satisfied with the degree of affection received from their spouses compared to 79.4% of the parental sample. Therefore, on the basis of the sample data, subhypothesis 5-2 is not supported.

TABLE 6  
SATISFACTION WITH AFFECTION: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Satisfaction with Affection	Childfree Sample %	Childfree Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Parental Sample No.
Satisfied	78.9	(90)	79.4	(85)
No - more	20.2	(23)	19.6	(21)
No - less	0.9	(1)	0.9	(1)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(107)

$G = 0.01427$ ,  $X^2 = 0.01206$ , d.f. = 2, p. = 0.9940

Subhypothesis 5-3

It was hypothesized that the childfree couple would report a lower level of conflict than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data no association was found between the variables, childless status and 'degree of conflict'. The chi-square value for the association was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 7.)

A significant relationship was found between the two variables, childless status and 'degree of conflict', but it was not in the direction predicted by the subhypothesis. Of the parental sample, 27.4% reported low levels of conflict in their marriages compared to 17.1% of the childfree sample. Therefore, on the basis of the sample data, subhypothesis 5-3 is not supported.

TABLE 7

## LEVELS OF CONFLICT: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Level of conflict	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Low	17.1	(18)	27.4	(26)
Medium	65.7	(69)	42.4	(40)
High	17.1	(18)	30.5	(29)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(95)

$G = 0.05243$ ,  $X^2 = 16.72873$ , d.f. = 3, p. = 0.008

Subhypothesis 5-4

It was hypothesized that the childfree would engage in more recreational activities with their spouses than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a moderately strong, negative association, was found

between the variables, childless status and 'recreational activities'. The chi-square value for the association was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 8.) Sixty-six point seven percent of the childfree and 32.1% of the parental sample reported always or frequently being involved in recreational activities with their spouses. Therefore, on the basis of the sample data, subhypothesis 5-4 is supported.

TABLE 8  
OUTSIDE RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES WITH SPOUSE: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Outside Recreation	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Yes always	16.7	(19)	5.7	(6)
Frequently	50.0	(57)	26.4	(28)
Sometimes	21.1	(24)	35.8	(38)
Seldom	10.5	(12)	21.7	(23)
Never	1.8	(2)	10.4	(11)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(106)

$$G = -0.51724, X^2 = 29.25107, d.f. = 4, p. = 0.0000$$

No definite conclusion can be arrived at concerning the validity of hypothesis five on the basis of the present sample data. Of the subhypotheses used to test the validity of hypothesis five, two were supported and two were refuted. The childfree respondents in the present sample, while

reporting higher levels of marital satisfaction, and being engaged in more recreational activities together, also reported higher levels of marital conflict and similar levels of satisfaction with marital affection to the parental sample. Therefore, the sample data indicate that while the marriages of the childfree may not be as 'intense' as indicated in the literature, such marriages tend to be slightly happier than those of parental couples.

#### Hypothesis 6

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would display a higher commitment to their careers than would the parental sample. In order to test the validity of hypothesis six, the following subhypotheses were examined.

#### Subhypothesis 6-1

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would display a higher degree of job satisfaction than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a weak, positive association, was found between the variables, childless status and 'job satisfaction'. The chi-square value for the association was not significant at the .05 level. (See Table 9.) Sixty-six point two percent of the parental sample and 58.1% of the childfree sample reported being extremely or very satisfied with their jobs.

It is interesting to note that 10.4% of the child-free couples compared to 2.8% of the parental sample reported somewhat unsatisfying and very unsatisfying jobs. Neither of the groups reported extremely unsatisfying jobs. The sample data indicate that the childfree do not have more satisfying jobs than their parental peers and if simple percentages are considered, actually have less satisfying jobs.

TABLE 9

## JOB SATISFACTION: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Degree of Satisfaction	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
Extremely satisfying	10.5	(11)	16.2	(12)
Very satisfying	47.6	(50)	50.0	(27)
Somewhat satisfying	30.5	(32)	31.1	(23)
Somewhat unsatisfying	9.5	(10)	1.4	(1)
Very unsatisfying	1.9	(2)	1.4	(1)
Extremely unsatisfying	-	-	-	-
Total	100.0	(105)	100.0	(72)

$G = 0.20396$ ,  $X^2 = 5.96592$ , d.f. = 4, p. 0.2017

Subhypothesis 6-2

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would be more upwardly mobile than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a weak, positive association was found



between the variables, childless status and 'upward mobility'. The chi-square value for the association was not significant at the .05 level. (See Table 10.) Twenty-eight point six percent of the parental sample and 33.0% of the childfree sample experienced a high level of mobility. Therefore, on the basis of the sample data, subhypothesis 6-2 is not supported.

TABLE 10  
SOCIAL MOBILITY: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Mobility	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Down	25.0	(25)	33.7	(33)
Low	17.0	(17)	20.4	(20)
Medium	25.0	(25)	17.3	(17)
High	33.0	(33)	28.6	(28)
Total	100.0	(100)	100.0	(98)

$G = 0.15180$ ,  $X^2 = 3.26046$ , d.f. = 3, p. = 0.3532

It should be noted that Veevers (1974) saw affluence, educational attainment and occupational success as further indicators of occupational commitment. The childfree sample examined here did in fact score high on all three of these variables. (For further information see sample description.) However, since the sample of childfree

used here is not a representative one, it was not considered appropriate to discuss these indices in the examination of the sixth hypothesis. In addition, because the childfree and parental samples are similar in terms of these three variables any attempts at constructing hypotheticals would be meaningless.

The suggestion made in the literature that the childfree would have a strong sense of occupational commitment was not found in the present sample of childfree. It is recognized that a basis for absolute refutation of the occupational commitment of the childfree is not found in the present study.

#### Hypothesis 7

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would display a more egalitarian attitude toward sex role relations than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a moderately strong, positive association, was found between the variables, childless status and 'egalitarianism'. The chi-square value for the association was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 11.) Of the childfree sample, 41.2% reported highly favourable attitudes toward the concept of egalitarian role relations compared to 14.3% of the parental sample.

TABLE 11

EGALITARIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD ROLE RELATIONS: CHILDFREE  
AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Attitudes	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Highly favourable	41.2	(47)	14.3	(15)
Moderately favourable	47.4	(54)	44.7	(47)
Not favourable	11.4	(13)	41.0	(43)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(105)

$G = 0.60613$  ,  $X^2 = 44.69724$ , d.f. = 3, p. = 0.0000

The childfree couples in the present study have a more 'egalitarian' attitude toward sex role relations than do the parental sample. The relationship between childlessness and egalitarianism is difficult to interpret. Do individuals decide not to have children because they fear that children would disrupt the democratic role relations in their marriages? Or do couples not have children for a variety of reasons and develop an egalitarian outlook in the process? Egalitarianism, like religion, is likely related to a more general nontraditional attitude which is supportive of unconventional behaviour such as not having children.

### Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would have a stronger desire for new experiences than the parental sample. In order to test hypothesis eight, the following subhypotheses were examined.

#### Subhypothesis 8-1

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would be more involved in continuing education than the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a significant, moderately strong, negative association, was found between the variables, childless status and 'courses'. However, when a control for age was instituted, the relationship disappeared. (See Table 12.) When age is controlled for, 42.9% of the parental sample and 53.1% of the childfree sample report taking courses of an academic, technical or hobby nature. The data show that while a higher proportion of the childfree are taking courses, the differences are not statistically significant. Therefore, subhypothesis 8-1 is not supported.

TABLE 12  
 CONTINUING EDUCATION: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES  
 UNDER 45

Taking Courses	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
Yes	53.1	(60)	42.9	(30)
No	46.9	(53)	57.1	(40)
Total	100.0	(113)	100.0	(70)

$G = -0.20301$ ,  $X^2 = 1.42693$ , d.f. = 1, p. = 0.2323

Subhypothesis 8-2

It was hypothesized that the childfree couples would have a wider variety of leisure activities than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, rather weak associations were found between the variable childless status and the following categories of the variable 'leisure pursuits': visiting, sports, TV, crafts or hobbies and 'other'. A significant, moderately strong association, was found between the variable childless status and the categories: theatre and reading. (For further information see Appendix E.)

Variety of leisure pursuits was determined by examining those respondents that fell into the 'other' category. Since there was a weak relationship between the variable childless status and the category 'other',

it must be concluded that the childfree do not have a wider range of leisure pursuits. The moderately strong relationship between childless status and the categories 'theatre' and 'reading' indicates that there are differences between the two groups in the direction of the childfree being more involved in reading and going to the movies and theatre.

#### Subhypothesis 8-3

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would travel more extensively and more frequently than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a weak, negative association was found between the variables childless status and 'number of trips'. The chi-square value was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 13.) The chi-square value for the association indicates that there is a relationship between the variables. However, it is not in the direction predicted by the subhypothesis. Thirty-two percent of the childless sample and 55.3% of the parental sample had taken ten or more trips other than strictly business since they were married. The modal category for the childfree sample was '1-5' trips and the modal category for the parental sample was '10+' trips. Even when age and correspondingly length of marriage is controlled for, 45.2% of the parental sample compared to 31.4% of the childfree sample had taken ten or more trips since they were married.

On analyzing the data on the extent of travelling, negative relationships were found between the variables

childfree status and the following categories of the variable 'destinations': Manitoba, United States, Europe and 'other'. A significant, moderately strong association was found between the variable childless status and the category 'Canada'. (For further information see Appendix E.) Seventy-seven point four percent of the parental sample and 93.3% of the childfree couples travelled within Canada.

TABLE 13

## NUMBER OF TRIPS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Number of Trips	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
1-5	60.1	(62)	34.1	(16)
6-9	7.7	(8)	10.7	(5)
10+	32.1	(33)	55.3	(26)
Total	100.0	(108)	100.0	(47)

$G = -0.26202$  ,  $X^2 = 24.26469$  , d.f. = 7 , p. = 0.0010

Of the parental sample, 64.2% travelled throughout the United States compared to 29.8% of the childfree sample. Eighteen point two percent of the parental sample and 18.3% of the childfree sample travelled outside of the North American and European continents. Of the parental group,

20.8% travelled in Europe compared to 29.1% of the childfree sample, and 91.3% of the childfree sample and 94.3% of the parental sample travelled within Manitoba.

The childfree couples have not travelled more extensively and have actually travelled less frequently than the parental couples. The only major difference between the two groups in terms of extensiveness of travel is that the childfree travelled more in Canada. Therefore, subhypothesis 8-3 is not supported.

#### Subhypothesis 8-4

It was suggested in the literature that the child-free would travel more frequently on the job than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a weak, positive association was found between the variables childless status and 'business trips'. The chi-square value for the association was not significant at the .05 level. (See Table 14.) Very similar proportions of childfree and parents travelled on the job. Thirty-eight point nine percent of the childfree sample and 43.4% of the parental sample reported going on business trips in connection with their employment. Therefore, subhypothesis 8-4 is not supported.



TABLE 14  
 BUSINESS TRIPS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Business Trips	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
Yes	38.9	(42)	43.4	(36)
No	61.1	(66)	56.6	(47)
Total	100.0	(108)	100.0	(83)

$G = 0.09241, X^2 = 0.22710, d.f. = 1, p. 016337$

It is interesting to note that contrary to what was suggested in the literature (Veevers, 1974), a non-significant, weak association was found between the variable childless status and the variable concerning whether spouses accompanied their mates on business trips. Of the childfree wives, 17.6% accompanied their spouses on business trips, compared to 24.1% of the parental wives. It was suggested in the literature that the childfree wives would be more likely to accompany their spouses on business trips because they didn't have childcare duties to tie them down.

#### Subhypothesis 8-5

It was hypothesized in the literature that the childfree sample would belong to fewer groups and organizations than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a non-significant, weak association was found between the variables

childless status and 'group membership', and between the variables childfree status and 'meetings'. (For further information see Appendix E.) Forty-three point nine percent of the childfree sample and 36.7% of the parental sample did not belong to any social, athletic, hobby or comparable group. Similarly 46.5% of the childfree sample and 38.3% of the parental sample did not attend any meetings of a social, athletic, hobby or similar nature in a month. It was suggested in the literature that the childfree would be less likely to belong to formal groups because membership would 'violate values of spontaneity and freedom'. However, this trend was not found in the present study.

#### Subhypothesis 8-6

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would have a more favourable attitude toward the desirability of new experiences than would the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a moderately strong, negative association was found between the variables childfree status and 'desirability of new experiences'. The chi-square value for the correlation was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 15.) Of the childfree sample 31.5% had a highly favourable attitude toward the desirability of new experiences compared to 14.8% of the parental sample. The subhypothesis is therefore supported.

TABLE 15

ATTITUDES TOWARD NEW EXPERIENCES: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL  
SAMPLES

Attitudes	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
Very favourable	31.5	(35)	14.8	(16)
Moderately favourable	55.8	(62)	63.0	(68)
Not favourable	12.6	(14)	22.2	(24)
Total	100.0	(111)	100.0	(110)

$G = -0.31212$  ,  $X^2 = 10.46359$  , d.f. = 3, p. = 0.0150

Subhypothesis 8-7

It was hypothesized that the childfree sample would be more geographically mobile than the parental sample. On analyzing the data, a moderately strong, positive association, was found between the variables, childless status and 'geographical mobility'. The chi-square value for the correlation was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 16.) Fifty-three point eight percent of the childfree sample and 4.2% of the parental sample who had moved, moved eight times or more. Therefore, subhypothesis 8-7 is supported by the sample data.

TABLE 16

## GEOGRAPHICAL MOBILITY: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Times Moved	Childfree %	Childfree Sample No.	Parental %	Parental Sample No.
1	14.4	(15)	18.8	(9)
2	10.6	(11)	18.8	(9)
3	8.7	(9)	12.5	(6)
4	2.9	(3)	14.6	(7)
5	4.8	(5)	12.5	(6)
6	1.9	(2)	10.4	(5)
7	2.9	(3)	8.3	(4)
8+	53.8	(56)	4.2	(2)
Total	100.0	(104)	100.0	(48)

$$G = 0.44457, X^2 = 40.57053, d.f. = 7, p. = 0.0000$$

A major emphasis in Veevers' characterization of the 'lifestyle of the childfree' was on the importance of new experiences. She depicted the childfree lifestyle as a constant 'quest' for new experiences - "In the child-free lifestyle a recurrent theme is the value on new experiences: on seeing new places, feeling new sensations, performing new tasks, coping with new situations" (1974). This rather idyllic tendency was not found in the present study.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUDING COMMENTS

#### Summary

The present study was designed to compare a group of voluntarily childless couples with a group of their parental counterparts on factors related to lifestyle and family of orientation. Fifty-eight parental couples and fifty-seven childless couples were selected from the City of Winnipeg. The childless couples were solicited by means of advertisements and various public service announcements. The parental couples were selected from the same neighbourhoods as the childless couples in an attempt to keep the two groups as similar as possible. Data concerning the family of orientation and lifestyle were collected by self-mailing questionnaires. Gamma was used as the statistical measure of association. The chi-square statistic was used as a test of significance.

Four hypotheses were examined to determine the validity of the propositions derived from the literature concerning the family of orientation of the childfree couple. None of the propositions were supported by the data. No major differences were found between the childfree and parental couples in terms of the following variables: incidence of only children, family

size, parents' marital happiness and incidence of working mothers. A greater proportion of the childfree couples tended to be the eldest sibling but not of unusually large families as suggested in the literature.

Four hypotheses were examined to determine the validity of the proposition derived from the literature concerning the presence of a 'childfree' lifestyle. Of these, two were refuted, one was supported, and one was neither supported nor refuted. No major differences were found between the childfree and parental samples in terms of the following variables: satisfaction with marital affection, marital conflict, job satisfaction, upward mobility, continuing education, variety of leisure pursuits, frequency of travel, extensiveness of travel, business travel and membership in formal groups and organizations.

Differences were found between the childfree and parental samples in terms of the following variables: marital satisfaction, recreational activities, geographical mobility, attitudes toward new experiences and attitudes toward egalitarian role relations. These differences were in the direction stipulated in the hypotheses, with the childfree expressing higher levels of marital satisfaction, being more involved in recreational activities with their spouses, having a more positive attitude toward new experiences, having a more egalitarian attitude toward sex role relations and being more geographically mobile. However, the differences found here were

insufficient to support the original proposition concerning the presence of a childfree lifestyle.

### Discussion

A review of the literature on voluntary childlessness suggested four major propositions from which testable hypotheses were derived. On analyzing the data, it was found that none of the propositions were valid generalizations of the background or motivations of the voluntary childless in the present study. The four propositions were derived almost almost entirely from the work of Veivers. The lack of corroboration for Veivers findings in the present study is surprising. In considering why this inconsistency resulted, it is important to acknowledge specific differences between the two studies.

In Veivers' research study, the principal data collection technique was interviewing. In the present study, survey research was the primary source of data. The possible effect of the differences in research design is closely linked to weaknesses inherent in all survey research. A main requirement and weakness of survey research is standardization - the need to ask the same questions of all respondents and impute the same meaning to all of the answers. This may result in missing important issues and failing to understand the 'total life situation' (Babbie, 1973:277). Veivers' use of an interviewing technique may have enabled her to unearth issues

not easily accessible to the survey researcher.

However, the present study was not aimed at delineating new issues in the area of voluntary childlessness. It was designed to quantify those variables cited by Veevers as important in the decision not to have children. Therefore, any influence the differences in research design might have on the quality of data produced will be minimal.

A second difference between the two studies is found in the area of sample characteristics. The present study incorporated both childless husbands and wives into its analysis. Veevers' sample consisted of childless wives only. The two different samples may have produced qualitatively different data. However, this was not the case. Sample data was available for wives in the present study, and an examination of the relationships between variables revealed findings similar to those for the whole group. (For further information see Appendix F.) Considering that wives follow the general trends of the whole group, findings reported in the present study are comparable to those of Veevers.

Aside from the two aforementioned differences, other aspects of Veevers and the present study are similar. In both studies nonprobability volunteer sampling was practised. The demographic characteristics of the two resulting samples are remarkably similar. In both samples, the childfree and parental couples are of the same mean age, have been married for approximately the same length of time, are of the same social class and educational background and have comparable



religious outlooks. However, despite the above similarities in sample characteristics, comparisons of the findings of the two studies reveal some fairly striking differences.

The inconsistency in findings between the two studies is difficult to interpret. One possible explanation might be related to Veevers' failure to consider her data in its proper context. The sample from which Veevers derived her data was not a representative one and therefore could not be contrasted to the general population for comparative purposes. However, it appears that Veevers did consider her sample to be a representative one. She characterizes childfree couples as being affluent, upwardly mobile, well travelled, well educated and so on. All of these conclusions would necessarily entail a comparison to a normative standard. The present study has demonstrated that when nonrepresentativeness is taken into consideration and childless samples compared to similar population samples of couples with children, the trends identified in Veevers' data are not found. It is also possible that Veevers' findings are merely over emphasized weak trends. Unfortunately the qualitative nature in which she presents her findings makes it difficult to determine the strength or weakness of the empirical basis for her conclusions.

Whatever the reasons for the inconsistency in findings between the two studies it is obvious that a general rethinking of the voluntarily childless issue is necessary at this point for any progress in the area to occur. It is probable that

the defects in Veevers' research design distorted her analysis and contributed to her negative portrayal of the family background of the childfree individuals and her particularly positive characterization of the childfree lifestyle. To continue to rely on Veevers' work as a reliable and valid representation of the motivations of the voluntarily childless couple would be an error.

Before the issue of why certain individuals opt out of parenthood can be resolved, considerable research must be done. An important requirement of future research is the use of representative samples. Such use would encourage the development of an accurate composite of voluntarily childless couples. In future research an attempt should also be made to ensure that samples studied are genuine ones of permanently childless individuals and not couples who are merely going through a stage in their fertility careers. This could be accomplished by either selecting individuals who are well past their childbearing years or selecting those who have taken definite steps to affirm their childlessness (for example sterilization). In examining the motivations of childless individuals special attention should be paid to their experiences in family situations. These experiences will likely influence their perception of the importance of family life. Consideration should also be paid to their attitudes toward the female role as well as traditional forces in society such as religion, the family and marriage.

As previously stated, the present thesis was designed with the intent of retesting Veevers' findings. To this end the thesis has accomplished its purpose. To attempt to derive a theory of voluntary childlessness from the thesis would be taking it a step too far. The research on which this thesis is based is far from conclusive and to attempt to organize a theory around it would be to commit the error of which others in the area are guilty.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

1. Babbie, Earl. The Practice of Social Research. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
2. Baggaley, Andrew. Intermediate Correlational Methods. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
3. Bernard, Jessie. The Future of Marriage. New York: Bantam Books, 1973.
4. Bogue, Donald. The Principles of Demography. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
5. Canada. Women in the Labour Force - Facts and Figures. Labour Canada Women's Bureau, 1975 edition.
6. Burgess, Ernest W. and Leonard S. Cottrell Jr. Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1939.
7. Burgess, E. W. and P. Wallin. Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1953.
8. Cooper, David. The Death of the Family. New York: Random House, 1970.
9. Murdock, George. Social Structure. New York: The McMillan Co., 1949.
10. Nye F. Ivan and Felix M. Berardo. The Family: Its Structure and Interaction. New York: The McMillan Co., 1973.
11. Peck, Ellen. The Baby Trap. New York: Bernard Geis Associates, 1971.
12. Shevky, Eshref and Wendall Bell. Social Area Analysis. California: Handford University Press, 1955.
13. Silverman, Anna and Arnold Silverman. The Case Against Having Children. New York: David McKay, 1971.
14. Veroff, Joseph and Sheila Feld. Marriage and Work in America. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1970.
15. Whelpton, P., Cambell, A., and Patterson, J. Fertility and Family Planning in the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

ARTICLES

1. Alberta, Ethel M. "The Unmothered Woman," Roles Women Play: Readings Toward Women's Liberation. Michele Hoffnung Gardkof (ed.) California: Brooks Cole Publishing Co., 1971.
2. Barnett, Larry and Shirley Radl. "High School Attitudes Toward Parenthood/Non-parenthood," California, 1972.
3. Blishen, F. and A. McRobers. "A Revised Socio-economic Index for Occupations in Canada," Canadian Review of Anthropology and Sociology, Vol. 13, 1, 1976.
4. Burr, Wesley. "Satisfaction with Various Aspects of Marriage over the Life Cycle," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, Feb. 1970.
5. Cambell, Angus. "Are Women's Lives More Frustrating and Less Rewarding than Men's," Psychology Today, May, 1975.
6. Carr, Genevieve Delta. "A Psychosociological Study of Fertile and Infertile Marriages," Dissertation Abstracts, 24:5598, 1963.
7. Chester, Roberts. "Is There a Relationship Between Childlessness and Marriage Breakdown?," Journal of Biosocial Science, 4, 1972.
8. Dyer, Everett D. "Parenthood as Crisis," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 25, 1963.
9. Grabill, Wilson H. and Paul C. Glick, "Demographic and Social Aspects of Childlessness: Census Data," Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly, 37, 1959.
10. Gustavus, Susan and James Henley Jr. "Correlates of Voluntarily Childlessness in a Select Population," Social Biology, 18, 1971.
11. Hobbs, Daniel F. "Parenthood as Crisis: A Third Study," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27, 1965.
12. Kleinman, Larry. "Childfree Couples Choosing Not to Have Children Tell Why," Womens News Service.
13. Keifert, R. M. and G. I. Dixon, "A Preliminary Study of the Childless Couple," Rocky Mountain Social Science Journal, S, 1968.

14. Kuczynski, R. R. "Childless Marriages," Sociological Review, 30, 1938.
15. Kunz, P., and M. B. Brinkerhoff. "Differential Childlessness by Color: The Destruction of a Cultural Belief," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31, 1969.
16. Kunz, p., M. B. Brinkerhoff and V. Hundley. "Relationship of Income and Childlessness," Social Biology, 20, 1973.
17. LeMasters, E. K., "Parenthood as Crisis," Marriage and Family Living, 19, 1957.
18. Monahan, T., "Is Childlessness Related Marital Instability?," American Sociological Review, 20, 1955.
19. Pohlman, Edward. "Changes in Views Toward Childlessness 1965-1970," Summary of a preliminary report.
20. Popenoe, Paul. "Motivations of Childless Marriages," Journal of Heredity, 27, 1936.
21. Renne, Karen. "Correlates of Dissatisfaction in Marriages," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 1970.
22. Rice, Ann Smith. "An Economic Life Cycle of Childless Families," Dissertation Abstracts, 27;7292, 1966.
23. Ritchey, P. Neal and C. Shannon Stokes. "Correlates of Childlessness and Expectations to Remain Childless," Social Forces, 52, 1974.
24. Rollins, Betty. "Motherhood Who Needs It?," Look, 34, Sept. 22, 1974.
25. Rollins, Boyd C. and Harold Feldman. "Marital Satisfaction over the Family Life Cycle," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 1970.
26. Rao, S. L. N. "A Comparative Study of Childlessness and Never-Pregnant Status," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Feb. 1974.
27. Strong, Ethelyn Radcliff. "The Meaning of Childlessness to Childless Negro Couples," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3236-37, 1967.
28. Veevers, J. E. "Childlessness and Age at First Marriage," Social Biology, 18, 1971a.

29. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Differential Childlessness by Color:  
A Further Examination," Social Biology, 18, 1971b.
30. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Rural-Urban Variation in the Incidence  
of Childlessness," Social Biology, 16, 1971c.
31. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Sample Size and the Interpretation of  
Census Data," Social Biology, 18, 1971d.
32. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Declining Childlessness and Age at  
Marriage: A Test of a Hypothesis," Social Biology,  
19, 1972a.
33. \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Violation of Fertility Mores:  
Voluntary Childlessness as Deviant Behavior,"  
Deviant Behaviour and Societal Reaction, Boydell,  
Grindstaff and Whitehead, (eds.) 1972b.
34. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Factors in the Incidence of Childlessness  
in Canada: An Analysis of Census Data," Social  
Biology, 19, 1972c.
35. \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Childfree Alternative: Rejection of  
the Motherhood Mystique," Women in Canada, Marylee  
Stephenson (ed.), 1973a.
36. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Voluntary Childless Wives: An Exploratory  
Study," Sociology and Social Research, 57, 1973b.
37. \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Social Meanings of Parenthood,"  
Psychiatry, 36, 1973c.
38. \_\_\_\_\_ . "Voluntary Childlessness: A Neglected  
Area of Family Study," The Family Coordinator,  
57, 1973d.
39. \_\_\_\_\_ . "The Lifestyle of Voluntarily Childless  
Couples," The Canadian Family in Comparative  
Perspective, Lyle Larson, (ed.), 1974.



APPENDIX A

COPIES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED  
TO THE PARENTAL AND CHILDLESS RESPONDENTS

EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES OF VOLUNTARILY CHILD-  
LESS COUPLES IN WINNIPEG

1. a) What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ elementary school  
 \_\_\_\_\_ some high school  
 \_\_\_\_\_ high school  
 \_\_\_\_\_ technical/vocational training  
 \_\_\_\_\_ some university  
 \_\_\_\_\_ university degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ graduate degree/professional degree

- b) How many years of schooling did this involve?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

2. What is your ethnic background in terms of your national origins? (If you were born in Canada, indicate the ethnic background of your parents or grandparents.) (Check one)

_____ American	_____ Jewish
_____ English	_____ Netherlands
_____ French	_____ Polish
_____ German	_____ Scottish
_____ Icelandic	_____ Ukrainian
_____ Irish	_____ Other: Please specify _____
_____ Italian	

3. a) What is your religion? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ Anglican  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Baptist  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Greek Orthodox  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Jewish  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Lutheran  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Presbyterian  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Roman Catholic  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Ukrainian (Greek) Orthodox  
 \_\_\_\_\_ United Church  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other: Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ None

- b) To what degree would you say that religion now has an influence on your life? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ very strong  
 \_\_\_\_\_ quite strong  
 \_\_\_\_\_ some  
 \_\_\_\_\_ slight  
 \_\_\_\_\_ none

4. We are interested in your family background. Please list all of your brothers and sisters in the spaces provided, in order of their birth. Start with the eldest brother or sister (if you are the eldest, start with yourself) and then list the next eldest and so on. If you are not the eldest, include yourself at the appropriate position in this table. (Continue on blank page at end of questionnaire if necessary.)

	Sex (circle)	Age
1.	M            F	
2.	M            F	
3.	M            F	
4.	M            F	
5.	M            F	
6.	M            F	
7.	M            F	

5. Does anyone else live with you besides your wife?

\_\_\_\_\_ no one  
 \_\_\_\_\_ wife's parents  
 \_\_\_\_\_ your parents  
 \_\_\_\_\_ another relative of your wife  
 \_\_\_\_\_ another relative of yours  
 \_\_\_\_\_ others: Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

6. a) What is your job title?

\_\_\_\_\_

- b) Describe the main duties involved in this job.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. a) Would you say that your job was (Check one)

- extremely satisfying  
 very satisfying  
 somewhat satisfying  
 somewhat unsatisfying  
 very unsatisfying  
 extremely unsatisfying

b) Do you feel that the degree of your job satisfaction is related to your child-free status?

- yes (Go on to Question 7c)  
 no (Skip to Question 8)

c) If yes, in what way is it related?

\_\_\_\_\_

8. Would you please indicate which of these categories best represents your own yearly income (before deductions)?

- under \$1,500.00  
 \$1,500 - \$2,999  
 \$3,000 - \$4,999  
 \$5,000 - \$6,999  
 \$7,000 - \$8,999  
 \$9,000 - \$10,999  
 \$11,000 - \$12,999  
 \$13,000 - \$14,999  
 \$15,000 - \$20,000  
 over \$20,000

9. What was your father's occupation when you were young (around eight years old)?

\_\_\_\_\_ My father's occupation was \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Fill in the Blank)

- I don't remember  
 He was not alive then  
 Other: Specify \_\_\_\_\_

10. a) What was the highest grade or level of education that your father completed? (Check one)

- elementary school  
 some high school  
 high school graduate  
 technical/vocational training  
 some university  
 university degree  
 graduate degree/professional degree

- b) If your mother was employed while you were young, what was the nature of her job at that time?  
(Please be specific)
- 

12. Were your parents ever separated or divorced?

\_\_\_\_\_ separated  
 \_\_\_\_\_ divorced  
 \_\_\_\_\_ neither

13. How long have you and your spouse been married?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

14. a) At what age did you marry? (If married more than once give age at first marriage).

\_\_\_\_\_ years

b) If married more than once, did your previous marriage(s) end by divorce or death? (Check appropriate space)

\_\_\_\_\_ divorce  
 \_\_\_\_\_ death  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other; please specify \_\_\_\_\_

15. Everything considered, how happy has your marriage been for you?

\_\_\_\_\_ extremely happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ decidedly happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ unhappy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ decidedly unhappy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ extremely unhappy

16. How happy would you say that your parent's marriage was?  
(Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ extremely happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ decidedly happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ unhappy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ decidedly unhappy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ extremely unhappy

17. Are you satisfied with the degree of affection your wife shows towards you? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ yes, I'm satisfied  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no, I desire more affection  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no, I desire less affection

18. a) Have you changed your place of residence since you were first married?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

- b) If yes, how many times have you moved?

\_\_\_\_\_ times

19. a) How many social, athletic, hobby, or similar groups do you belong to? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ none  
 \_\_\_\_\_ one or two  
 \_\_\_\_\_ three to five  
 \_\_\_\_\_ six or more

- b) How many meetings of social, athletic, hobby, or similar groups do you usually go to in a month? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ none  
 \_\_\_\_\_ one or two  
 \_\_\_\_\_ three or four  
 \_\_\_\_\_ five to ten  
 \_\_\_\_\_ more than ten

- c) Do you feel that your ability to belong to these groups and attend their meetings is related to your childfree status?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes (To on to Question 19d)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no (Skip to Question 20)

- d) If yes, in what way is it related?
- \_\_\_\_\_

20. Are you involved with any activities involving young children (e.g. Scouts, Guides, CGIT etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

21. a) Are you at present taking any educational courses (e.g. of an academic, technical, or hobby nature)?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

- b) Are you at present enrolled in any educational institution?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes, as a full time student  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, as a part time student  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes, as an occasional student  
 \_\_\_\_\_ No, I am not enrolled in any educational institution  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other; specify \_\_\_\_\_

- c) In which of the following institutions are you enrolled?

\_\_\_\_\_ University of Manitoba  
 \_\_\_\_\_ University of Winnipeg  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Red River Community College  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other; specify \_\_\_\_\_

- d) If you are taking any educational courses are they for interest only or are they toward a degree/diploma?

\_\_\_\_\_ toward a degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ toward a diploma  
 \_\_\_\_\_ for interest only  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other; specify \_\_\_\_\_

- e) Do you feel that your ability to take these courses is related to your childfree status?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes (Go on to Question 21f)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no (Skil to Question 22)

- f) If yes, in what way is it related?

\_\_\_\_\_

22. How do you usually spend your leisure time during evenings: and weekends?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

23. a) What did you do for your last holiday?

---

---

---

---

b) On your last holiday, did you and your wife holiday together or apart? (Check one)

together  
 apart  
 other: specify \_\_\_\_\_

24. a) How often have you been on a trip (other than strictly business trip) since you were married?

---

b) Where have these trips taken you? (Please list)

---

---

---

c) Do you feel that these type(s) of trips you have taken is related to your childfree status?

yes (Go on to Question 24d)  
 no (Skip to Question 25)

d) If yes, in what way are they related?

---

---

---

---

---

---



25. a) Do you every go on business trips in connection with your employment?

- yes (Go on to Question 25b)
- No (skip to Question 26)

b) How often does your wife accompany you on your business trips? (Check one)

- always (Go on to Question 25c)
- frequently (Go on to Question 25c)
- sometimes (Go on to Question 26)
- seldom (Skip to Question 26)
- never (Skip to Question 26)

c) Do you feel that your ability to take these trips together is related to your childfree status?

- yes (Go on to Question 25d)
- no (Skip to Question 26)

d) If yes, in what way are they related?

---

---

---

---

---

---

26. Here is a list of some things about which husbands and wives sometimes agree or sometimes disagree. How much conflict have you experienced over the following items in the last few weeks? (Circle the appropriate number along the continuum.)

	A Great Deal of Conflict				None Whatsoever
a) Being Tired	1	2	3	4	5
b) Irritating Personal Habits	1	2	3	4	5
c) Household Expenditures	1	2	3	4	5
d) Being away from home	1	2	3	4	5
e) How to spend leisure time	1	2	3	4	5
f) How to share the jobs around the house	1	2	3	4	5
g) Time spent with friends	1	2	3	4	5
h) How to behave toward in-laws	1	2	3	4	5
i) How much affection and love to show toward each other	1	2	3	4	5
j) Frequency of sexual relations	1	2	3	4	5
k) Each other's religious beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
l) Each other's political beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
m) Each other's choice of friends	1	2	3	4	5
n) Your wife's job	1	2	3	4	5
o) Your job	1	2	3	4	5

27. How often do you and your wife engage in outside recreational activities (e.g. theatre, bowling, curling, etc.) together.

always  
 frequently  
 sometimes  
 seldom  
 never

28. a) In the five blanks below please list the five most important obligations that you think a wife has in fulfilling her duties as a wife?

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
 3. \_\_\_\_\_  
 4. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5. \_\_\_\_\_

- b) In the five blanks below please list the five most important obligations that you have in fulfilling yours duties as a husband.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. \_\_\_\_\_  
 3. \_\_\_\_\_  
 4. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5. \_\_\_\_\_

29. Have you ever seriously considered divorcing your present spouse? (Check one)

yes  
 no

30. On the whole how satisfactory would you say your sex life is?

extremely satisfactory  
 moderately satisfactory  
 slightly satisfactory  
 slightly unsatisfactory  
 moderately unsatisfactory  
 extremely unsatisfactory

31. On the average, how often do you and your spouse engage in sexual intercourse? (Check one)

- daily  
 two or three times a week  
 once a week  
 once every two weeks  
 once a month  
 less than once a month

32. a) What method of contraception are you currently using?

- oral contraceptive  
 loop (IUD)  
 diaphragm or jellies  
 voluntary sterilization of male (skip to Question 35)  
 voluntary sterilization of female (skip to Question 35)  
 other: Specify \_\_\_\_\_

b) If you have not undergone voluntary sterilization have you ever seriously considered it?

- yes, I have seriously considered it  
 no, I have not seriously considered it

33. a) How long, from today, do you wish to remain childless?

- five years or less  
 6 to 10 years  
 over ten years  
 indefinitely

b) At the time of your marriage, how long did you wish to remain childless?

- five years or less  
 6 to 10 years  
 over ten years  
 indefinitely

c) Was your decision to remain childless a joint decision or did a decision made by one partner influence the other?

- decision was joint  
 husband influenced the wife  
 wife influenced the husband

34. a) Have you ever considered adopting a child?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

b) Have you ever taken any steps in this direction (e.g. investigating necessary qualifications, submitting your name, etc.)?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

35. Are your parents in support of your decision to remain childless?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no; if not why not? (Check appropriate space(s))

\_\_\_\_\_ they want grandchildren  
 \_\_\_\_\_ they think that we are missing out  
 on something  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other; specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

36. a) Are you ever criticized by people that you know (e.g. relatives, friends, colleagues on the job) for your decision to remain childless?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

b) Indicate which of the following are critical of your position by ranking them in order of the severity of their criticism.

\_\_\_\_\_ relatives  
 \_\_\_\_\_ friends  
 \_\_\_\_\_ neighbours  
 \_\_\_\_\_ colleagues on the job  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other; specify \_\_\_\_\_

c) Have any of your friends, neighbours, or relatives characterized your decision to remain childless as any or all of the following?

\_\_\_\_\_ individualistic  
 \_\_\_\_\_ irresponsible  
 \_\_\_\_\_ selfish  
 \_\_\_\_\_ immoral  
 \_\_\_\_\_ child-hater  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other; specify \_\_\_\_\_

- d) What other comments would you wish to make on social criticism you have encountered concerning your childfree marriage?

Please write here \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- e) Do you have friends who have also decided to remain childless?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

37. Were you influenced in your decision to remain childfree by a concern that you might be unable to care for a child and its day to day needs?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no  
 \_\_\_\_\_ partly

38. Was your decision to remain childfree based on a concern that you might be unable to afford to raise a child?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no  
 \_\_\_\_\_ partly

39. Did the movement for Zero Population Growth or any similar population group influence you in your decision to remain childfree?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes, it influenced me greatly  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes, it influenced me to some extent  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no, it had no influence on me

40. Did the Women's Liberation Movement or feminist ideology in general have an influence on your decision to remain childfree?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes, it influenced me greatly  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes, it influenced me to some extent  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no, it had no influence on me

41. Have you at any time felt shame or guilt because you have no children?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ no

42. What was your age at your last birthday?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

43. In the space below, state why you chose to voluntarily childless?

For each of the following statements, you are asked to circle the number which best represents your own position with regard to that particular statement. The possible alternative will be:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Undecided
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Children are a gift from God.	1	2	3	4	5
Some equality in marriage is a good thing but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.	1	2	3	4	5
Bringing up children in today's society is often a strain on the emotional capacities of parents.	1	2	3	4	5
Having children prevents social isolation and loneliness in one's old age.	1	2	3	4	5
It goes against human nature to place women in places of authority over men.	1	2	3	4	5
My spouse satisfies most of my social and psychological needs.	1	2	3	4	5
It is natural for one to want to have a part in the guiding of the next generation.	1	2	3	4	5
Having children can prevent one from using or exploiting one's talents.	1	2	3	4	5
Voluntary sterilization should be given more encouragement as a means of birth control.	1	2	3	4	5
A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things.	1	2	3	4	5



	SA	A	U	D	SD
Except in special cases, the wife should do the cooking and house cleaning, and the husband should provide the family with money.	1	2	3	4	5
The government should limit the number of children a person can have.	1	2	3	4	5
The removal of the fear of pregnancy contributes to a fuller enjoyment of sexual relations.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a good source of pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5
Men should make the really important decisions in the family.	1	2	3	4	5
My spouse is my best friend.	1	2	3	4	5
One should try to avoid predictable routines.	1	2	3	4	5
Sexual intercourse is its own reward as an intense sensual experience.	1	2	3	4	5
A man who helps around the kitchen is doing more than should be expected.	1	2	3	4	5
Life is so good right now that I hesitate to change it in any way.	1	2	3	4	5
A women has naturally stronger feelings than a man toward small children.	1	2	3	4	5
The male should always be the initiator or agressor in regards to the sex act.	1	2	3	4	5
People have a civic responsibility to procreate and reproduce their own kind.	1	2	3	4	5
One should be trying continually to improve oneself.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	A	U	D	SD
A women should have the right to terminate an unwanted pregnancy.	1	2	3	4	5
If the man is working to support the family, his wife has no right to expect him to work when he's at home.	1	2	3	4	5
Each individual has an obligation to utilize his or her full capabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
There are too many children in the world already.	1	2	3	4	5
One should be striving continuously for new experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
The traditional family, that is, the husband, the wife, and their young children, is the basic unity of society.	1	2	3	4	5
A man ought to feel free to relax when he gets home from work.	1	2	3	4	5
The reproductive drive is part of the sex drive.	1	2	3	4	5
Each person has the right to decide the number of children he or she wants.	1	2	3	4	5
Life is either a daring adventure of nothing.	1	2	3	4	5
Avoiding parenthood is a sign of irresponsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
Society today is no place in which to bring children.	1	2	3	4	5
There is no such thing as the maternal instinct.	1	2	3	4	5
Half of the world's children were accidents.	1	2	3	4	5
Raising children is more a mother's job than a father's.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a good source of relaxation.	1	2	3	4	5

## EXPERIENCES AND ATTITUDES OF PARENTS IN WINNIPEG

1. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (Check one)

elementary school  
 some high school  
 high school  
 technical-vocational training  
 some university  
 university degree  
 graduate degree/professional degree

2. How many years of schooling did this involve?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

3. What was your age at your last birthday?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

4. What is your ethnic background in terms of your natural origins? (If you were born in Canada, indicate the ethnic background of your parents or grandparents.)

<input type="checkbox"/> American	<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish
<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Netherlands
<input type="checkbox"/> French	<input type="checkbox"/> Polish
<input type="checkbox"/> German	<input type="checkbox"/> Scottish
<input type="checkbox"/> Icelandic	<input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian
<input type="checkbox"/> Irish	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: Please specify:
<input type="checkbox"/> Italian	_____

5. To what degree would you say that your ethnic background has had an influence on your life?

very strong  
 quite strong  
 some  
 slight  
 none

6. What is your religion? (Check one)

- Anglican  
 Baptist  
 Greek Orthodox  
 Jewish  
 Lutheran  
 Presbyterian  
 Roman Catholic  
 Ukrainian (Greek) Orthodox  
 United Church  
 Other: Please specify \_\_\_\_\_  
 None

7. To what degree would you say that religion now has an influence on your life? (Check one)

- very strong  
 quite strong  
 some  
 slight  
 none

8. We are interested in your family background. Please list all of your brothers and sisters in the spaces provided, in order of their birth. Start with the eldest brother or sister (if you are the eldest, start with yourself) and then list the next eldest and so on. If you are not the eldest, include yourself at the appropriate position in this table. (Continue on blank page at end of questionnaire if necessary.)

	Sex (circle)	Age
1.	M                  F	
2.	M                  F	
3.	M                  F	
4.	M                  F	
5.	M                  F	
6.	M                  F	
7.	M                  F	

9. Does anyone else live with you besides your wife?

- no one  
 wife's parents  
 your parents  
 another relative of your wife  
 another relative of yours  
 others: Please specify \_\_\_\_\_

10. What is your job title?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

11. Describe the main duties involved in this job:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

12. Would you say that your job is: (Check one)

- extremely satisfying  
 very satisfying  
 somewhat satisfying  
 somewhat unsatisfying  
 very unsatisfying  
 extremely unsatisfying

13. Do you feel that your degree of job satisfaction influenced your decision to have children?

- yes (go on to Question 14)  
 no (skip to Question 15)

14. If yes, how?

\_\_\_\_\_

15. Would you please indicate which of these categories best represents you and your wife's income before deductions?

Question 15 continued

under \$1,500  
 \$1,500 - \$2,999  
 \$3,000 - \$4,999  
 \$5,000 - \$6,999  
 \$7,000 - \$8,999  
 \$9,000 - \$10,999  
 \$11,000 - \$12,999  
 \$13,000 - \$14,999  
 \$15,000 - \$20,000  
 over \$20,000

16. What was your father's occupation when you were young (around eight years old)?

My father's occupation was \_\_\_\_\_  
 I don't remember  
 He was not alive then  
 Other: Specify \_\_\_\_\_

17. What was the highest grade or level of education that your father completed? (Check one)

elementary school  
 some high school  
 high school graduate  
 technical/vocational training  
 some university  
 university degree  
 graduate degree/professional degree

18. This involved how many years of schooling.

\_\_\_\_\_ years

19. Did you mother work outside of the home when you were young (under eight years old)?

yes, always  
 yes, frequently  
 yes, but seldom  
 never

20. If your mother was employed outside the home while you were young, what was the nature of her job at that time? (Please be specific.)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

21. Were your parents ever separated or divorced?

\_\_\_\_\_ separated  
 \_\_\_\_\_ divorced  
 \_\_\_\_\_ neither

22. How long have you and your spouse been married?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

23. At what age did you marry? (If married more than once give age at first marriage.)

\_\_\_\_\_ years

24. If married more than once, did your previous marriages end by divorce or death?

\_\_\_\_\_ divorce  
 \_\_\_\_\_ death

25. At what age did you have your first child?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

26. Was the pregnancy planned?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

27. Everything considered, how happy has your present marriage been for you?

\_\_\_\_\_ extremely happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ decidedly happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ happy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ unhappy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ decidedly unhappy  
 \_\_\_\_\_ extremely unhappy

28. How would you characterize your feelings concerning children before you had your own?

\_\_\_\_\_ disliked children always  
 \_\_\_\_\_ liked children always  
 \_\_\_\_\_ indifferent toward children always  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other (please explain)

---



---

29. Were your parents in support of your decision to have children?
- \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ no
30. How happy would you say that your parent's marriage was: (Check one)
- \_\_\_\_\_ extremely happy  
\_\_\_\_\_ decidedly happy  
\_\_\_\_\_ happy  
\_\_\_\_\_ unhappy  
\_\_\_\_\_ decidedly unhappy  
\_\_\_\_\_ extremely unhappy
31. Are you satisfied with the degree of affection your wife shows towards you? (Check one)
- \_\_\_\_\_ yes, I'm satisfied  
\_\_\_\_\_ no, I desire more affection  
\_\_\_\_\_ no, I desire less affection
32. Have you changed your place of residence since you were first married?
- \_\_\_\_\_ yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ no
33. If yes, how many times have you moved?
- \_\_\_\_\_ times
34. How many social, athletic, hobby, or similar groups do you belong to? (Check one)
- \_\_\_\_\_ none  
\_\_\_\_\_ one or two  
\_\_\_\_\_ three to five  
\_\_\_\_\_ six or more
35. How many meetings of social, athletic, hobby, or similar groups do you usually go to in a month? (Check one)
- \_\_\_\_\_ none  
\_\_\_\_\_ one or two  
\_\_\_\_\_ three or four  
\_\_\_\_\_ five to ten  
\_\_\_\_\_ more than ten



36. Do your children restrict your participation in these activities?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes (go to Question 37)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no (skip to Question 38)

37. If yes, how? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

38. Are you involved with any activities involving young children (e.g.: Scouts, Guides, CGIT, etc.)

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

39. Are you at present taking any educational courses (e.g.: of an academic, technical, or hobby nature)?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes (go on to Question 40)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no (skip to Question 45)

40. Are you at present enrolled in any educational institution?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes, as a full time student  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes, as a part time student  
 \_\_\_\_\_ yes, as an occasional student  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no, I am not enrolled in any educational institution  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other: specify \_\_\_\_\_

41. In which of the following institutions are you enrolled?

\_\_\_\_\_ University of Manitoba  
 \_\_\_\_\_ University of Winnipeg  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Red River Community College  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other: please specify \_\_\_\_\_

42. If you are taking any educational courses are they for interest only or are they toward a degree/diploma?

\_\_\_\_\_ toward a degree  
 \_\_\_\_\_ toward a diploma  
 \_\_\_\_\_ for interest only  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other: specify \_\_\_\_\_

43. Do you feel that your ability to take these courses is restricted by your children?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes (go on to Question 44)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no (skip to Question 45)

44. If yes, how?

---

---

---

45. How do you usually spend your leisure time during evenings and weekends?

---

---

---

---

46. What did you do for your last holiday?

---

---

---

---

47. On your last holiday, did you and your wife holiday together or apart? (Check one)

together  
 apart  
 other: specify \_\_\_\_\_

48. How often have you been on a trip (other than strictly a business trip) since you were married?

---

---

49. Where have these trips taken you? (Please list)

---

---

---

50. Do you feel that having children has influenced the type of trips that you can take?

yes (go on to Question 51)  
 no (skip to Question 52)

51. If yes, how?

---

---

---

52. Do you ever go on business trips in connection with your employment?

- yes (go on to Question 53)
- no (skip to Question 56)

53. How often does your wife accompany you on your business trips? (Check one)

- always
- frequently
- sometimes
- seldom
- never

54. Do you feel that your ability to take these trips together is restricted by having children?

- yes (go on to Question 55)
- no (skip to Question 56)

55. If yes, how?

---

---

---

56. Here is a list of some things about which husbands and wives sometimes agree or sometimes disagree. How much conflict have you experienced over the following items in the last few weeks? (Circle the appropriate number along the continuum.)

	A Great Deal of Conflict				None Whatsoever
a) Being Tired	1	2	3	4	5
b) Irritating Personal Habits	1	2	3	4	5
c) Household Expenditures	1	2	3	4	5
d) Being away from home	1	2	3	4	5
e) How to spend leisure time	1	2	3	4	5
f) How to share the jobs around the house	1	2	3	4	5
g) Time spent with friends	1	2	3	4	5
h) How to behave toward in-laws	1	2	3	4	5
i) How much affection and love to show toward each other	1	2	3	4	5
j) Frequency of sexual relations	1	2	3	4	5
k) Each other's religious beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
l) Each other's political beliefs	1	2	3	4	5
m) Each other's choice of friends	1	2	3	4	5
n) Your wife's job	1	2	3	4	5
o) Your job	1	2	3	4	5
p) Children	1	2	3	4	5

57. How often do you and your wife engage in outside recreational activities (e.g. theatre, bowling, curling, etc.) together?

\_\_\_\_\_ always  
\_\_\_\_\_ frequently  
\_\_\_\_\_ sometimes  
\_\_\_\_\_ seldom  
\_\_\_\_\_ never

58. In the five blanks below please list the five most important obligations that you think a wife in fulfilling her duties as a wife:

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
5. \_\_\_\_\_

59. In the five blanks below please list the five most important obligations that you have in fulfilling your duties as a husband:

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
5. \_\_\_\_\_

60. Have you ever seriously considered divorcing your present spouse? (Check one)

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ no

61. How many more children do you wish to have?

\_\_\_\_\_ one more  
\_\_\_\_\_ two more  
\_\_\_\_\_ more than two  
\_\_\_\_\_ none

62. At the time of your marriage, how many children did you wish to have?

\_\_\_\_\_ one  
 \_\_\_\_\_ two  
 \_\_\_\_\_ three  
 \_\_\_\_\_ more than three  
 \_\_\_\_\_ none

63. Was your decision to have children a joint decision or did one partner influence the other?

\_\_\_\_\_ decision was joint  
 \_\_\_\_\_ husband influenced wife  
 \_\_\_\_\_ wife influenced husband

64. Did you feel pressure from friends, colleagues or relatives to have children?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

65. Indicate whom of the following exerted the most pressure on you to have children.

\_\_\_\_\_ relatives  
 \_\_\_\_\_ friends  
 \_\_\_\_\_ neighbours  
 \_\_\_\_\_ colleagues on the job  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other: specify \_\_\_\_\_

66. Do you feel that those who choose not to have children are any of all of the following?

\_\_\_\_\_ individualistic  
 \_\_\_\_\_ irresponsible  
 \_\_\_\_\_ selfish  
 \_\_\_\_\_ immoral  
 \_\_\_\_\_ child-hater  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other: please specify \_\_\_\_\_

67. What other comments do you wish to make concerning those individuals who choose to remain childless?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

68. Do you have many childless friends?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no

69. Why did you decide to have children?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

70. How much influence does the Women's Liberation Movement have on your marriage and family relations?

\_\_\_\_\_ a lot of influence  
 \_\_\_\_\_ some influence  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no influence

71. In deciding to have children did you consider the care a child requires as well as its day to day needs?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no  
 \_\_\_\_\_ partly

72. In deciding to have children did you consider the money it might cost?

\_\_\_\_\_ yes  
 \_\_\_\_\_ no  
 \_\_\_\_\_ partly

73. Do you feel that having children

\_\_\_\_\_ harmed your marriage  
 \_\_\_\_\_ improved your marriage  
 \_\_\_\_\_ didn't significantly alter it  
 \_\_\_\_\_ other: please explain

74. Who does the majority of the childcaring?

\_\_\_\_\_ husband  
 \_\_\_\_\_ wife  
 \_\_\_\_\_ shared equally

75. Who does the majority of the housework?

- husband
- wife
- shared equally

76. Who does the majority of the household budgeting?

- husband
- wife
- shared equally

77. Have you ever regretted having children?

- yes
- no

78. Please explain:

---

---

---

---

---



For each of the following statements, you are asked to circle the number which best represents your own position with regard to that particular statement. The possible alternatives will be:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Undecided
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Children are a gift from God.	1	2	3	4	5
Some equality in marriage is a good thing but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.	1	2	3	4	5
Bringing up children in today's society is often a strain on the emotional capacities of parents.	1	2	3	4	5
Having children prevents social isolation and loneliness in one's old age.	1	2	3	4	5
It goes against human nature to place women in places of authority over men.	1	2	3	4	5
My spouse satisfies most of my social and psychological needs.	1	2	3	4	5
It is natural for one to want to have a part in the guiding of the next generation.	1	2	3	4	5
Having children can prevent one from using or exploiting one's talents.	1	2	3	4	5
Voluntary sterilization should be given more encouragement as a means of birth control.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	A	U	D	SD
A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things.	1	2	3	4	5
Except in special cases, the wife should do the cooking and house cleaning, and the husband should provide the family with money.	1	2	3	4	5
The government should limit the number of children a person can have.	1	2	3	4	5
The removal of the fear of pregnancy contributes to a fuller enjoyment of sexual relations.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a good source of please.	1	2	3	4	5
Men should make the really important decisions in the family.	1	2	3	4	5
My spouse is my best friend.	1	2	3	4	5
One should try to avoid predictable routines.	1	2	3	4	5
Sexual intercourse is its own reward as an intense sensual experience.	1	2	3	4	5
A man who helps around the kitchen is doing more than should be expected.	1	2	3	4	5
Life is so good right now I hesitate to change it in any way.	1	2	3	4	5
A woman has naturally stronger feelings than a man toward children.	1	2	3	4	5
The male should always be the initiator or aggressor in regards to the sex act.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	A	U	D	SD
People have a civic responsibility to procreate and reproduce their own kind.	1	2	3	4	5
One should be trying continually to improve oneself.	1	2	3	4	5
A woman should have the right to terminate an unwanted pregnancy.	1	2	3	4	5
If the man is working to support the family, his wife has no right to expect him to work when he's at home.	1	2	3	4	5
Each individual has an obligation to utilize his or her full capabilities.	1	2	3	4	5
There are too many children in the world already.	1	2	3	4	5
One should be striving continuously for new experiences.	1	2	3	4	5
The traditional family, that is, the husband, the wife and their young children is the basic unit of society.	1	2	3	4	5
A man ought to feel free to relax when he gets home from work.	1	2	3	4	5
The reproductive drive is part of the sex drive.	1	2	3	4	5
Each person has the right to decide the number of children he or she wants.	1	2	3	4	5
Life is either a daring adventure or nothing.	1	2	3	4	5
Avoiding parenthood is a sign of irresponsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
Society today is no place in which to bring children.	1	2	3	4	5
There is no such thing as the maternal instinct.	1	2	3	4	5

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Half of the world's children were accidents.	1	2	3	4	5
Raising children is more a mother's job than a father's.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a good source of relaxation.	1	2	3	4	5
Women usually derive more satisfaction from a job than marriage.	1	2	3	4	5
I would be just as happy if my daughter chose a career instead of motherhood.	1	2	3	4	5
Children help hold a marriage together.	1	2	3	4	5
Women have children to demonstrate their femininity.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a source of recognition and identity for a woman.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are an important source of marital fulfillment.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a means of expressing a couples hopes and aspirations.	1	2	3	4	5
Children are a blessing in old age.	1	2	3	4	5
Adoption is a poor alternative to having your own children.	1	2	3	4	5
Women have the right to terminate an unwanted pregnancy.	1	2	3	4	5
Bearing and rearing children is a natural process and we have no right to disrupt it.	1	2	3	4	5
Bearing and rearing children is an expression of adult responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
Men often have children to prove their masculinity.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

TESTING OF THE RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF SCALES

## Conflict Scale: Childfree Sample

Item	Mean Scores		Difference
	Upper Decile	Lower Decile	
1	5.0	2.0	3.0
2	5.0	2.1818	2.8182
3	5.0	1.4545	3.5455
4	5.0	1.5454	3.4546
5	5.0	2.5454	2.4546
6	5.0	1.4545	3.5455
7	5.0	2.6363	2.3637
8	5.0	1.9090	3.091
9	5.0	2.0	3.0
10	5.0	2.0	3.0
11	5.0	3.7272	1.2728
12	5.0	3.5454	1.4546
13	5.0	2.7272	2.2728
14	5.0	2.7272	2.2728
15	5.0	2.5454	2.4546

## Conflict Scale: Parental Sample

Item	Mean Scores		Difference
	Upper Decile	Lower Decile	
1	5.0	1.0909	3.9091
2	5.0	1.0909	3.9091
3	5.0	1.4545	3.5455
4	5.0	1.5454	3.4546
5	5.0	1.6363	3.3637
6	5.0	1.3636	3.6364
7	5.0	1.5454	3.4546
8	5.0	1.3636	3.6364
9	5.0	1.4545	3.5455
10	5.0	1.4545	3.5455
11	5.0	1.8181	3.1819
12	5.0	2.5454	2.4546
13	5.0	2.1818	2.8182
14	5.0	2.8181	2.1819
15	5.0	1.7272	3.2728

## New Experience Scale: Parental Sample

Item	Mean Score		Difference
	Upper Decile	Lower Decile	
Q	4.5454	1.0	3.5454
X	4.0	1.0	3.0
AA	4.3636	1.0	3.3636
CC	3.1818	1.0	2.1818

## New Experience Scale: Childfree Sample

Item	Mean Score		Difference
	Upper Decile	Lower Decile	
Q	4.1818	1.0	3.1818
X	3.1818	1.0	2.1818
AA	4.3636	1.0	3.3636
CC	3.8181	1.0	2.8181

## Egalitarianism Scale: Parental Sample

Item	Mean Score		Difference
	Upper Decile	Lower Decile	
B	5.0	1.0	4.0
E	5.0	1.5454	3.4546
J	5.0	1.5454	3.4546
K	5.0	1.0	4.0
O	5.0	1.3636	3.6364
S	5.0	1.5454	3.4546
U	5.0	1.0	4.0
V	5.0	2.2727	2.7273
Z	5.0	2.0	3.0

## Egalitarianism Scale: Childfree Sample

Item	Mean Score		Difference
	Upper Decile	Lower Decile	
B	5.0	1.9090	3.9091
E	5.0	2.4545	2.5455
J	5.0	4.0	1.0
K	5.0	2.2727	2.7273
O	5.0	2.3636	2.6364
S	5.0	3.3636	3.3637
U	5.0	1.6363	1.6364
V	5.0	3.3636	1.6364
Z	5.0	2.2727	2.7273

## Standardized Item: Alpha Coefficients

	Childfree	Parental
Conflict Scale	0.77143	0.90783
Egalitarian Scale	0.79787	0.84699
New Scperience Scale	0.70761	0.54543



APPENDIX C

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VOLUNTARILY CHILDLESS SAMPLES

TABLE 1

## AGE OF CHILDFREE RESPONDENTS

Age	Wives		Husbands		Total	
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.
17-19	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-24	38.59	(22)	19.3	(11)	28.9	(33)
25-34	57.89	(33)	68.2	(40)	63.1	(73)
35-48	3.52	( 2)	12.5	( 6)	8.0	( 8)
Total	100.0	(57)	100.0	(57)	100.0	(114)

TABLE 2

## LENGTH OF CHILDFREE MARRIAGES

Years	Percentages	Number
1-2	8.8	(5)
3-4	38.6	(22)
5-6	22.8	(13)
7-8	8.8	(5)
9-10	7.7	(4)
11-12	8.8	(5)
13-19	3.6	(2)
Total	100.0	(56)

TABLE 3

## AGE AT MARRIAGE: CHILDFREE SAMPLE AND MANITOBA POPULATION

Age	Childfree Sample		Manitoba Population
	%	No.	%
15-19	11.5	(13)	16.6
20-24	68.3	(78)	45.8
25-29	16.6	(19)	23.8
30-34	3.6	(4)	8.2
35+	-	-	5.6
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0

TABLE 4

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS: CHILDFREE SAMPLE

Class	Percentages	Number
70+	17.75	(19)
60-69	27.1	(29)
50-59	31.7	(34)
40-49	14.9	(16)
30-39	8.4	(9)
30 and under	-	-
Total	100.0	(107)

TABLE 5

## EDUCATION: CHILDFREE SAMPLE AND MANITOBA POPULATION

Educational Level	Childfree %	Sample No.	Manitoba Population %
Elementary	-	-	23.02
Some High School	7.0	(8)	58.2
High School	11.4	(13)	*
Technical/Vocational School	10.5	(12)	7.34
Some University	22.8	(26)	5.87
University Degree	28.1	(32)	5.56
Graduate/Professional Degree	20.2	(23)	*
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0

\* No information available

TABLE 6

## ETHNIC ORIGIN OF CHILDFREE SAMPLE AND MANITOBA POPULATION

Ethnic Group	Childfree %	Sample No.	Manitoba Population %
British	41.2	(47)	44.9
Slavic	11.4	(13)	16.4
Scandinavian	4.4	(5)	3.5
Jewish	3.5	(4)	2.9
German	1.8	(2)	11.5
French	5.3	(6)	8.2
Other	32.4	(36)	12.6
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0

TABLE 7

## RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION: CHILDFREE SAMPLE AND MANITOBA POPULATION

Religion	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Manitoba Population %
Protestant	33.3	(38)	48.2
Catholic	14.9	(17)	32.9
Jewish	1.8	(2)	1.9
Other	4.4	(5)	12.7
None	45.6	(52)	4.3
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0

TABLE 8

## INFLUENCE OF RELIGION: CHILDFREE SAMPLE

Influence	Percentage	Number
Very strong	0.9	(1)
Quite strong	2.6	(3)
Some	17.5	(20)
Slight	30.7	(35)
None	48.3	(55)
Total	100.0	(114)

APPENDIX D

A COMPARISON OF VOLUNTARILY CHILDLESS AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

TABLE 1

## AGE: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Age	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
17-19	-	-	1.8	(2)
20-24	28.9	(33)	9.0	(10)
25-34	64.1	(73)	31.5	(35)
35-40	7.0	(8)	31.5	(35)
49-68	-	-	26.2	(29)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(111)

TABLE 2

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Class	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
70+	17.75	(19)	5.4	(4)
60-69	27.10	(29)	35.61	(26)
50-59	31.77	(34)	23.28	(17)
40-49	14.95	(16)	17.80	(13)
30-39	8.41	(9)	9.50	(7)
30-	-	-	8.21	(6)
Total	100.0	(107)	100.0	(73)

TABLE 3

## RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Religion	Childfree Sample		Parental	
	%	No.	%	Sample No.
Protestant	33.3	(38)	72.7	(80)
Catholic	14.9	(17)	16.4	(18)
Jewish	1.8	(2)	2.7	(3)
Other	4.4	(5)	-	-
None	45.6	(52)	8.2	(9)
No answer	-	-	-	-
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(116)

TABLE 4

## INFLUENCE OF RELIGIONS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Influence	Childfree Sample		Parental	
	%	No.	%	Sample No.
Very Strong	0.9	(1)	5.5	(6)
Quite Strong	2.6	(3)	21.1	(23)
Some	17.5	(20)	33.9	(37)
Slight	30.7	(35)	22.0	(24)
None	48.3	(55)	17.4	(19)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(110)



TABLE 5

## ETHNICITY: PARENTAL AND CHILDFREE SAMPLES

Ethnic Group	Childfree Sample		Parental %	Sample No.
	%	No.		
British	41.2	(47)	37.3	(41)
Slavic	11.4	(13)	14.5	(16)
Scandinavian	4.4	(5)	10.9	(12)
Jewish	3.5	(4)	3.6	(4)
German	1.8	(2)	5.5	(6)
French	5.3	(6)	4.5	(5)
Other	32.4	(36)	23.6	(26)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(110)

TABLE 6

## EDUCATION: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Educational Level	Childfree Sample		Parental %	Sample No.
	%	No.		
Elementary	-	-	2.7	(3)
Some High School	7.0	(8)	21.8	(24)
High School	11.4	(13)	24.5	(27)
Technical/Vocational Training	10.5	(12)	10.9	(12)
Some University	22.8	(26)	10.9	(11)
University Degree	28.1	(32)	14.5	(16)
Graduate/Professional Degree	20.2	(23)	15.5	(17)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(110)

TABLE 7

## AGE AT MARRIAGE: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Age	Childfree %	Sample No.	Parental %	Sample No.
15-19	11.5	(13)	18.9	(21)
20-24	68.3	(78)	57.6	(64)
25-29	16.6	(19)	14.4	(16)
30-34	3.6	(4)	7.2	(8)
35+	-	-	1.8	(2)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(111)

APPENDIX E

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA ANALYSIS

TABLE 1

## LEISURE ACTIVITIES: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Leisure Activities	Childfree Sample %	Parental Sample %
Visiting	46.5	47.7
Theatre	31.5	16.5
Sports	42.1	38.5
TV	56.1	61.5
Reading	70.2	48.6
Hobbies	49.1	47.2
'Other'	61.4	52.3

TABLE 2

## DESTINATIONS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Destinations	Childfree Sample %	Parental Sample %
Manitoba	91.3	94.3
Canada	93.3	77.4
America	67.3	64.2
Europe	29.8	20.8
'Other'	18.3	18.2

TABLE 3

## MEMBERSHIP IN FORMAL ORGANIZATIONS: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Group Membership	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
None	43.9	(50)	36.7	(40)
One or Two	45.6	(52)	39.4	(43)
Three to Five	9.6	(11)	21.1	(23)
Six Plus	0.9	(1)	2.8	(3)
Total	100.0	(114)	100.0	(109)

$G = 0.21881$ ,  $X^2 = 7.09050$ , d.f. = 3, p. = 0.0691

TABLE 4

## MEETING ATTENDED PER MONTH: CHILDFREE AND PARENTAL SAMPLES

Meetings Attended	Childfree Sample %	Sample No.	Parental Sample %	Sample No.
None	46.5	(53)	38.3	(41)
One or Two	24.6	(28)	29.0	(31)
Three or Four	13.2	(15)	12.1	(13)
Five to Ten	8.8	(10)	15.0	(16)
Ten Plus	5.3	(6)	5.6	(6)
Total	100.0	(112)	100.0	(107)

$G = -0.13845$ ,  $X^2 = 3.09938$ , d.f. = 4, p. = 0.5413

APPENDIX F

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WIVES ONLY

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR WIVES ONLY

## Childless Status

	G	P.
Visiting	-0.14159	0.5729
Theatre	0.58108	0.0037
Sports	0.04762	0.9611
TV	0.07702	0.8303
Reading	-0.39346	0.0570
Hobby	-0.14067	0.5770
Other	-0.52174	0.0056
Business Trips	0.19512	0.6840
Divorce	0.35287	0.2364
Degree of Affection	-0.11290	0.8042
Incidence of Working Mothers	-0.10407	0.7032
Group Membership	-0.20942	0.4306
Religion	0.45455	0.0000
Religiosity	0.64976	0.0001
Meetings	-0.08025	0.4648
Outside Recreational Activities	-0.50967	0.0081
Job Satisfaction	0.10261	0.7976
Marital Happiness	-0.28697	0.1396
Family Size	-0.30563	0.2016
Birth Order	-0.40196	0.0711
Age at Marriage	0.06611	0.6443
Courses	-0.44526	0.0222

APPENDIX G

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR CHILDFREE AND  
PARENTAL RESPONDENTS UNDER 45



STATISTICAL ANALYSIS FOR CHILDFREE AND  
PARENTAL RESPONDENTS UNDER 45

Childless Status

	All Age Groups Included		Under 45	
	G	P.	G	P.
Job Satisfaction	0.20397	0.2017	0.17470	0.2790
Marital Happiness	-0.35786	0.0029	-0.43778	0.0007
Parents' Marital Happiness	0.07939	0.6319	0.05313	0.6354
Family Size	-0.34451	0.2441	0.41841	0.0853
Birth Order	-0.29520	0.0468	-0.30529	0.0351
Trip Number	-0.26202	0.0010	-0.16129	0.0091
Courses	-0.39098	0.0040	-0.20301	0.2323
Business Trips	0.09241	0.6337	0.02661	0.9771
Divorce	0.22755	0.3201	0.39799	0.0600
Satisfaction with Affection	-0.01427	0.9941	-0.16910	0.6251
Incidence of Working Mothers	-0.12530	0.1263	-0.03024	0.4570
Groups	-0.21881	0.0691	-0.16643	0.2058
Meetings	-0.13845	0.5413	-0.08109	0.9173
Outside Recreational Activities	-0.51724	0.0000	-0.60463	0.0000
Province	-0.22449	0.7264	-0.50785	0.4777
Canada	-0.60441	0.0085	-0.57377	0.0411
United States	-0.06999	0.8281	-0.07393	0.8863
Europe	-0.23705	0.3072	-0.49742	0.0832
Other	-0.00200	0.8397	-0.04455	0.9355
Geographical Mobility	0.44457	0.0000	0.52297	0.0000
Visiting	0.02438	0.9621	0.13381	0.4672
Theatre	-0.53457	0.0003	-0.63043	0.0002

## Childless Status

Sports	-0.07415	0.6839	-0.02041	0.9824
TV	0.10964	0.5017	0.13516	0.4736
Reading	-0.42630	0.0017	-0.45490	0.0027
Hobby	-0.03805	0.8816	-0.06366	0.7920
Other	-0.18329	0.2207	-0.32042	0.0464