DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 092 RC 009 372

AUTHOR White, C. S.
TITLE The Attitudinal-Behavioral Dimension of the Social Mobility-Fertility Hypothesis: An Empirical Examination.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO TAES-H-2811; USDA(CSRS)-S-81
PUB DATE 21 Aug 75
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (San Francisco, California, August 21-24, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aspiration; *Attitudes; *Birth Rate; Caucasians; Comparative Analysis; Education; Educational Mobility; Females; Grade 10; Hypothesis Testing; Longitudinal Studies; Negroes; Occupational Aspiration; Occupational Mobility; *Racial Differences; *Rural Areas; Seniors; Social Class; *Social Mobility; Southern States; Young Adults

ABSTRACT

Data derived from the Southern Youth Study (a six-year, three-wave study of rural youth and young adults) were utilized to examine a version of the Attitudinal Behavioral (A-B) Dimension of the Social Mobility-Fertility Hypothesis wherein it was posited that orientations for upward social mobility would have negative effects upon subsequent early fertility among a panel of 527 females. Racial and socioeconomic class comparisons were made to determine if the effects of social mobility orientations operated differentially on the early fertility of the white lower class vs the white middle class and of the white lower class vs the black lower class. The variables employed were: levels of occupational and educational aspiration; intergenerational occupational and educational mobility; breadwinner's occupation; educational level of mother; and fertility. Results indicated: there were class and racial differences in the effect of education for self and occupation for mate on subsequent fertility; the effects of mobility orientations were the same as those of the aspiration measures but were not significant; the hypothesis was most consistently supported among the white lower class; both educational and occupational aspirations for mate were significantly related inversely to fertility among seniors; there were similarities in the white middle class for educational but not for occupational aspirations for mate and high educational but only middle range occupational aspirations for the black lower class. (JC)

The Attitudinal-Behavioral Dimension of the Social Mobility-Fertility Hypothesis: An Empirical Examination*

by

C.S. White

Texas A&M University

*Project sponsored by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as TAES Research Project H-2811 and contributes to USDA (CSRS) Resional Research Project. This paper was prepared for the annual meetings at the Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, California, August 21-24, 1975.

THE ATTITUDINAL-BEHAVIORAL DIMENSION OF THE SOCIAL MOBILITY-FERTILITY HYPOTHESIS: AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION*

by

C.S. White

INTRODUCTION

Differential fertility is, to use the term loosely, a "social fact". Not only is this phenomenon observed in intersocietal comparisons between urban-industrial countries and "underdeveloped" or "preindustrial" countries differential fertility has been reported within societies among various subgroups of the population -- subgroups based on socioeconomic differences; e.g., religious, residential, racial, income, occupational or educational differences. Recent research suggests that at least some of these differentials are narrowing in the U.S., e.g., between Catholics and Protestants, rural and urban residents. Increasing knowledge, acceptance, and the use of contraceptives is offered as one explanation of the closing of these gaps. That is, excess fertility is decreasing due to increasing contraceptive usage. Peterson (1961) speculated that as contraceptive usage permeates all classes equally the whole problem of class-based fertility differentials will disappear. An underlying assumption of such speculation is that desired family size is the same for all socioeconomic groupings. If this assumption is correct, then class-based fertility differentials can be eliminated through education and the availability of contraceptives. Research has shown,

*Project sponsored by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as TAES Research Project H-2811 and contributes to USDA (CSRS) Regional Research Project. This paper was prepared for the annual meetings at the Rural Sociological Society, San Francisco, California, August 21-24, 1975.

however, that fertility attitudes (desired family size or ideal family size) are not the same for all socioeconomic groupings. This would imply that even if contraceptive usage permeates all classes equally, class based fertility differentials may still persist. Therefore, the question remains, "Why do people of one socioeconomic grouping prefer smaller families, practice family limitation and practice it more effectively, and have smaller families than those of another socioeconomic grouping?"

THE SOCIAL MOBILITY-FERTILITY HYPOTHESIS

The Social Mobility-Fertility (SMF) Hypothesis attempts to explain such differential fertility among SES groupings as either wholly or partially due to the fact that fertility differs among mobile and nonmobile couples. The weak form of the hypothesis postulates:

> Social mobility, both in its subjective and objective dimensions, is directly related to fertility planning and inversely related to the size of planned family -- both relationships persisting within otherwise homogeneous socio-economic groups ... The theoretical extension of these assumptions for differential fertility would be that social class differences in fertility planning and differential fertility itself are related to the differential frequency of socio-economic ambitions and social mobility within and between class levels. (Westoff, 1953:31)

In this statement of the SMF Hypothesis two conceptual dimensions are actually presented since social mobility, as it affects fertility, is viewed as either an attitudinal (subjective) or a behavioral (objective) phenomenon. It is important to note that the aspiration for mobility is hypothesized to affect fertility regardless of whether that mobility occurs or not. In a previous paper (White, 1975) I have proposed that the SMF Hypothesis be viewed as having four distinct conceptual dimensions rather than just the two delineated in Westoff's presentation. These four dimensions have been termed the Behavioral-Behavioral, the Attitudinal-Behavioral, the Behavioral-

Attitudinal, and the Attitudinal-Attitudinal.[1] Figure 1 presents a schematic presentation of these four dimensions and the hypothesis for each. The rationale for doing this is based on the fact that fertility, as well as social mobility, can be viewed as multidimensional. Furthermore, such a conceptual scheme has utility for examining the relationship between social mobility and fertility at different points in the life cycle.

SOCIAL MOBILITY	FERTILITY	
	BEHAVIORAL	ATTITUDINAL
BEHAVIORAL	Social mobility behavior is inversely related to fertility behavior.	Social mobility behavior is inversely related to fertility attitudes.
ATTITUDINAL	Orientations for social mobility are inversely related to fertility behavior	Orientations for social mobility are inversely related to fertility attitudes.

Figure 1: Conceptual dimensions of the SMF Hypothesis.

As explained by Micklin and others who have presented justifications for the SMF Hypothesis, initially the mobility oriented recognize the advantages of a small family (Micklin, 1969:489). The greater the mobility orientations, the greater the concern with limitation of family size. Thus it would appear that the relationship of the A-A Dimension must first exist. Effective methods of contraception may or may not then be employed to actually limit family size. But, the greater the orientations for upward mobility, the smaller the family size. The relationship hypothesized by the A-B

[1] For brevity's sake, these dimensions will be referred to as the B-B, A-B, B-A, and A-A dimensions, respectively.

Dimension would thus appear next in the sequence. Whether objective social mobility is then actually attained is dependent on numerous factors outside the purview of this discussion. Nevertheless, for the fecund, the B-A Dimension necessarily precedes the B-B Dimension.

Viewing the SMF Hypothesis in this manner has certain obvious methodological implications. For instance, one would not usually sample couples who have completed their child bearing period to test the A-A Dimension nor select engaged or newly married couples to test the B-B Dimension.

PROBLEM

The purpose of this paper is to empirically examine a version of the A-B Dimension of the SMF Hypothesis. The version under consideration posits that orientations for upward social mobility have negative effects upon subsequent fertility. Specifically, the study focuses on the relationship between mobility attitudes developed during adolescence and subsequent early fertility among a panel of nonmetropolitan Southern females. Racial and socioeconomic class comparisons are made to determine if the effects of social mobility orientations operate differentially on the early fertility of the white lower class versus the white middle class and of the white lower class versus the black lower class.

The substantive significance of this research is four-fold. First, although the SMF Hypothesis has received considerable empirical testing, the utility of the hypothesis for several critical populations is virtually unassessed. This analysis of the SMF Hypothesis among disadvantaged nonmetropolitan females, both black and white, should provide valuable information concerning a grouping that has historically experienced high rates of fertility and low rates of social mobility. This is particularly important

Table 1. Summary Statements of Empirical Research on the SMF Hypothesis Classified by Behavioral Versus Attitudinal Dimensions.

SOCIAL MOBILITY	FERTILITY: BEHAVIORAL	FERTILITY: ATTITUDINAL
BEHAVIORAL	I. Fisher's Biological Determinism: Inverse relationship (Fisher, 1930) II. Homogeneous Class Groupings: 1 Study found mobility depressing (Baltzell, 1953) 3 Studies found no significant differences (Scott, 1958; Tien, 1961; Boggs, 1957) III. Heterogeneous Class Groupings: 3 Studies found upward mobility depressing; downward, inflating (Berent, 1952; Riemer and Kiser, 1954; Hutchinson, 1961) 2 Studies found mobility depressing regardless of direction (Kantner and Kiser, 1954; Blau and Duncan, 1967) 1 Study found no mobility effect when farm migrants excluded (Goldberg, 1959) IV. Correlation & Regression Techniques: 1 Study found a positive correlation for Catholics (Brooks and Henry, 1958) 1 Study found negative correlations in the total sample, but some positive correlations in planned families; both correlations larger for farm migrants (Goldberg, 1960) 1 Study found no significant intervening effect of fertility on status (Featherman, 1970) 1 Study found slight positive intervening effect on income; slight negative on occupation (Duncan, Featherman and Duncan, 1972)	1 Study found mobility depressing regardless of direction (Marcum and Bean, 1974)
ATTITUDINAL	1 Study found conflicting effects (Riemer and Kiser, 1954) 1 Study found positive relationship (Kiser and Whelpton, 1951) 2 Studies found no relationship (Featherman, 1970; Boggs, 1957)	1 Study - no systematic relationship (Riemer and Kiser, 1954)

when one considers the fact that most of the research in the area of fertility has been conducted with white, middle class, urban samples, while most of the policy programs have been directed toward nonwhite disadvantaged populations (Davis, et al.).

Second, the majority of empirical research on the SMF Hypothesis has been concerned with the B-B Dimension. Table 1 shows the paucity of research in the other conceptual dimensions.[2] As mentioned previously, the weak form of the SMF Hypothesis posits that orientations for social mobility may affect fertility independently of whether the mobility is actually attained. But, the hypothesis assumes some degree of internalization of the "mobility ethos" prior to actual mobility. (See White, 1974 and 1975, for a discussion of these underlying assumptions.) Thus, the effect of objective mobility on fertility is not viewed independently of subjective movement and fertility attitudes. In order to accurately test and knowledgeably modify the SMF Hypothesis, more research is needed in dimensions such as the A-B Dimension, which causally precede the B-B Dimension and are closer to the underlying assumptions.

Third, this study, by nature of the research design, is able to establish a clear causal ordering along an attitudinal-behavioral continuum from mobility attitudes to fertility behavior. It is felt that this clarity in causal ordering should result in a stronger test of the hypothesis.

Fourth, this study uses direct measurements of mobility attitudes rather than the indirect measures employed in other studies in the A-B Dimension. Furthermore, these direct measures are comparable to those presently being

[2] The summary statements in Table 1 are arranged according to general methodological approach in order to facilitate a more meaningful synthesis of the empirical findings. See White (1974) for a more detailed review of the literature.

used in status attainment research. This comparability hopefully enhances the relevance of this research to that of other related specialty areas. Efforts are also made to anchor these attitudes in social origins.

DATA

Data for this analysis was provided by the Southern Youth Study -- a six year, three-wave panel of nonmetropolitan youth from the Deep South. The respondents were originally surveyed in 1966-1967 as high school sophomores. Wave II was conducted in 1968-1969 when the respondents were high school seniors and Wave III, four years after their expected graduation date (1972). This analysis is based on the 527 black and white females included in the Southern Youth Study. Details on the research design, data collection procedures and characteristics of the population considered herein are reported elsewhere (White, 1974).

The Southern Youth Study was not designed specifically to test the SMF Hypothesis; however, several indicators of adolescent social mobility orientations were included. Level of occupational aspirations for desired mate (LOAM) and level of educational aspirations for self (LEA) are constructed as the basic measures of social mobility attitudes for two reasons. First, the review of the literature in the B-B Dimension shows that occupational mobility of the family unit, generally measured in terms of the husband's occupation, and educational mobility of the individual are the two most frequently used measures to test the SMF Hypothesis. It is assumed for heuristic purposes that LOAM and LEA are the logical extensions of these behavioral measures to the attitudinal level. Therefore at the conceptual level, these indicators provide the basis for a partial replication of

studies in the B-B Dimension within the A-B Dimension. In addition, the reported studies in the A-B Dimension consistently use indirect indicators of mobility orientations, most of which are based on attitudes toward income rather than toward occupation or education.

Second, since LOAM is measured for desired mate, the unit of observation is considered to be the future family unit. The use of LEA allows the inclusion of the individual as another unit of observation. This is one of the few tests of the hypothesis employing both of these units; only two studies were found which employed both units (Kanter and Kiser, 1954; Baltzell, 1953).

Two additional variables are constructed by anchoring LOAM and LEA in discrete measures of social origins -- breadwinner's occupation (BRSEI) and educational level of mother (ELM). These constructed variables are termed intergenerational occupational mobility for future family (IGOM) and intergenerational educational mobility for self (IGEM).

The measurement instruments and operationalization for each of these four mobility variables and for fertility are presented in Appendix A. It should be noted that all four of the attitudinal variables -- LOAM, LEA, IGOM, and IGEM -- are constructed for both Wave I and Wave II. Fertility behavior is measured at Wave III.

METHODS

The analysis of this paper is divided into three sections or phases. Phase I examines contingency tables constructed by dichotomizing fertility as "no children" and "some children" and by classifying social mobility attitudes into low, medium, and high categories. Fertility is dichotomized

in this manner because of the skewed distribution of fertility toward the lower parities. Chi squares are computed to determine if there are significant differences in fertility by classification of social mobility attitudes. A probability level less than .05 was considered significant. Phase I is comparable to many of the reported analyses in the A-B Dimension, but provides some control of social origins.

Phase II uses the traditional method of analysis employed in the B-B Dimension -- social mobility tables. The indicators of social mobility attitudes used in Phase I are also used in Phase II (LOAM and LEA), but the analysis is refined somewhat by cross-classifying the attitudinal categories with social origins. The mean fertility is presented for each resulting cell if the number of respondents in that cell is large enough to assure some degree of reliability. Respondents are considered nonmobility oriented if their level of aspiration approximates their status of origin. Likewise, the respondents are considered mobility oriented if their level of aspiration was higher than their status of origin.

Phase III is identical to Phase I except that the intergenerational mobility measures are used. This phase is conducted in an effort to compare the two previous phases, but using more discrete measures of the intergenerational mobility inherent in Phase II.

Racial and class comparisons are made in each phase of the analysis.

RESULTS

Phase I

Class Comparisons. In the white lower class there is a consistent significant relationship in the predicted direction between LEA and fertility.

The significant relationship exists for measures of LEA obtained at Wave I and Wave II. It is interesting to compare the fertility of those wanting only a high school education and those who aspired to at least a college degree. As Table 2 indicates, only 19 percent of the high aspirants at Wave II (1968 high school seniors) had children by Wave III (1972) as compared to a substantially greater 65 percent of those who aspired to a high school degree. Similar results exist in Wave I (high school sophomores) comparisons. If the fertility of those aspiring to a high school education is compared to that of the medium aspirants, different patterns are found between Wave I and Wave II. At Wave I there was a two percent difference in the percent of females in these categories while at Wave II this difference increases to 23 percent.

Similar patterns in percentage distributions for LEA exist in the white middle class, but the differences are not of sufficient magnitude to be judged significant by Chi-square.

An examination of the statistics in Table 3 shows that among the white lower class women there is a significant relationship in the predicted direction for Wave II measures of LOAM, but not for the Wave I measures. The pattern of percentage distributions for LOAM68 is similar to that observed for LEA68. That is, only 20 percent of the senior females with high socioeconomic class aspirations had children at Wave III as compared to 52 percent who wanted to remain in the lower class and 31 percent who wanted to move into the middle class. This pattern is not found for Wave I indicators of LOAM in the white lower classes.

The findings in the white middle class are the reverse of those in the lower class. There is a significant relationship in the predicted direction

Table 2. Bivariate Relationship Between Fertility and Level of Educational Aspirations (LEA).

White Lower Class

	LEA66			LEA68		
	≤ High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥ College	≤ High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥ College
No Children	.47 (9)	.49 (43)	.78 (32)	.35 (6)	.58 (53)	.81 (33)
Some Children	.53 (10)	.51 (45)	.22 (9)	.65 (11)	.42 (39)	.19 (8)
	N = 148 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 10.49 Pr = .01			N = 150 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 11.74 Pr = .01		

White Middle Class

	LEA66			LEA68		
	≤ High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥ College	≤ High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥ College
No Children	.55 (6)	.59 (22)	.73 (29)	.33 (1)	.61 (21)	.77 (36)
Some Children	.45 (5)	.41 (15)	.27 (11)	.67 (2)	.39 (15)	.23 (11)
	N = 88 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 2.01 Pr = .378			N = 88 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 4.74 Pr = .095		

Black Lower Class

	LEA66			LEA68		
	≤ High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥ College	≤ High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥ College
No Children	.45 (5)	.56 (58)	.68 (34)	.64 (7)	.58 (58)	.73 (51)
Some Children	.55 (6)	.44 (45)	.32 (16)	.36 (4)	.42 (42)	.27 (19)
	N = 164 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 2.82 Pr = .249			N = 181 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 3.95 Pr = .147		

Table 3. Bivariate Relationship Between Fertility and Level of Occupation Aspiration of Mate (LOAM).

White Lower Class

	LOAM66			LOAM68		
	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class
No Children	.53 (18)	.52 (30)	.58 (11)	.48 (24)	.69 (52)	.80 (8)
Some Children	.47 (16)	.48 (28)	.42 (8)	.52 (26)	.31 (23)	.20 (2)
	N = 111 d.f. = 2 X^2 = .22 Pr = .896			N = 135 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 7.26 Pr = .029		

White Middle Class

	LOAM66			LOAM68		
	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class
No Children	.44 (8)	.69 (25)	.86 (12)	.71 (5)	.64 (37)	.75 (12)
Some Children	.56 (10)	.31 (11)	.14 (2)	.29 (2)	.36 (21)	.25 (4)
	N = 68 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 6.36 Pr = .044			N = 81 d.f. = 2 X^2 = .79 Pr = .677		

Black Lower Class

	LOAM66			LOAM68		
	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class
No Children	.49 (20)	.61 (41)	.61 (17)	.54 (20)	.67 (69)	.52 (12)
Some Children	.51 (21)	.39 (26)	.39 (11)	.46 (17)	.33 (34)	.48 (11)
	N = 136 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 1.77 Pr = .425			N = 163 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 3.02 Pr = .225		

for Wave I measures of LOAM, but not for Wave II measures. The pattern of percentages for women who had children at Wave III is likewise reversed by wave. The percentage of females with children decreases as LOAM increases at Wave I, but when the Wave II indicators are used the percentage increases and then decreases.

Racial Comparisons. In contrast to the results for the white lower class, there is no significant relationship between LEA and fertility for the black lower class at either Wave I or Wave II (Table 2). A consistent decrease in percentage of females with children by increasing LEA category is observed at Wave I among the black and white lower classes. At Wave II, however, the pattern is inconsistent for the blacks in that the percentage of women who aspired to vocational training or some college is higher than for the low and high aspirants.

There is no significant relationship between LOAM and fertility for the black lower class either (Table 3). Though not significant for either racial group, there is an interesting difference in the pattern of percentage distributions at Wave I. The percentages are similar across LOAM categories for the whites, but there is a 12 percent difference in the percentage of black women desiring to remain in the lower class and those who aspire to be mobile into either the middle or upper classes. While the percentage of white females with children decreases with increasing mobility aspirations among the whites at Wave II, the percentages for high and low aspiring blacks is similar while the percentage of blacks desiring to move into the middle class is smaller.

Phase II

Each indicator of social mobility attitudes -- level of educational aspirations for self (LEA) and level of occupational aspirations for desired

mate (LOAM) -- is cross-classified with a measure of social origins -- educational level of mother (ELM) and class of origin (determined by BRSEI), respectively. The mean fertility of the nonmobility oriented (situated on the diagonal) is compared to the mean fertility of the mobility oriented (located off the diagonal). Because of the skewdness of the social origins toward the lower levels in the Southern Youth Study it is not possible to compare the mean fertility of the mobility oriented with that of the class of origin and the class of destination in all cases. The data is considered supportive of the SMF Hypothesis if the mean fertility of the upward mobility oriented is less than the mean fertility in the status of origin.

It should be noted that class comparisons are not made in the Phase II analysis of LEA since social origins are determined strictly by educational level of mother (ELM) and the distribution of the latter variable is not coincident with that of socioeconomic class origins.

Whites. Among those white females whose mother had at most a high school education there is a consistent decrease in mean fertility as level of educational aspiration increases. This relationship exists at both Wave I and Wave II, but is more prominent at Wave II (Table 4). The relationship is not as consistent for white females whose mother had some post high school education but not a college degree. The mean fertility of the nonmobility oriented in this category is higher than that of the upward mobility oriented at Wave I, while at Wave II the predicted relationship is observed; that is, the mean fertility at Wave II is lower for the mobility oriented than for the nonmobility oriented in the class of origin. In all cases but one the mean fertility of the upward mobility oriented is also greater than the mean fertility of the nonmobility oriented in the class of destination. For example, at Wave I the mean fertility of those in the

lowest origin category who aspire to the highest educational category (.35) is greater than that of the nonmobility oriented in the highest origin category (.19). This finding is consistent with most research in the B-B Dimension using social mobility tables. The exception concerns the upward mobility oriented whose mother's educational level was vocational training or some college.

Comparing the mean fertility of the LOAM mobility oriented to the mean fertility in the class of origin in Table 5, class differences are apparent for whites at Wave I. That is, at Wave I the data supported the SMF Hypothesis in the white middle class but not in the white lower class. In fact, the mean fertility increased in the white lower class as LOAM increased. At Wave II the hypothesis is supported by both classes.

Blacks. It is not possible to evaluate the hypothesis in Phase II using LEA since there is an insufficient number of respondents in the nonmobility category to determine the mean fertility of the educational status of origin. It was also not possible to determine the mean fertility of the nonmobility oriented in the status of destination since the educational level of the black mothers was concentrated in the lowest category. Nonetheless, there is a difference in mean fertility of .15 between those blacks having a medium LEA and a high LEA at Wave I and a .20 difference at Wave II (Table 4).

There is a very interesting pattern in the distribution of the mean fertility by LOAM category among the lower class blacks (Table 5). At both waves the mean fertility for the nonmobility oriented and those with high mobility orientations is similar; the mean fertility for those desiring mobility into the middle class is .14 less than the nonmobility oriented at Wave I and .22 less at Wave II.

Table 4. Social Mobility Tables Comparing Mean Fertility by the Educational Level of Mother (ELM) and the Level of Educational Aspiration (LEA).

White Females

	LEA66			LEA68		
ELM	<High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥College	<High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥College
<High School	.74 (27)	.64 (105)	.35 (51)	.86 (14)	.47 (110)	.29 (63)
Vocational Training or Some College	*	.31 (13)	.37 (19)	*	.40 (10)	.22 (14)
≥College	*	*	.19 (16)	*	*	.23 (17)

Black Females

	LEA66			LEA68		
ELM	<High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥College	<High School	Vocational Training or Some College	≥College
<High School	*	.64 (94)	.45 (39)	*	.59 (81)	.39 (59)
Vocational Training or Some College	*	*	*	*	*	*
>College	*	*	*	*	*	*

* Mean fertility was not calculated if the n was less than 10.

Table 5. Social Mobility Tables Comparing Mean Fertility by the Class of Origin and the Level of Occupational Aspiration for Desired Mate (LOAM).

White Females

	LOAM66			LOAM68		
Class of Origin	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class
Lower Class	.50 (34)	.67 (58)	.79 (19)	.66 (50)	.33 (75)	.20 (10)
Middle Class	.78 (18)	.42 (36)	.14 (14)	*	.45 (58)	.31 (16)

Black Females

	LOAM66			LOAM 68		
Class of Origin	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class	Lower Class	Middle Class	Upper Class
Lower Class	.73 (41)	.59 (67)	.71 (28)	.70 (37)	.48 (103)	.61 (23)

* Mean fertility was not claculated if the n was less than 10.

Phase III

Class Comparisons. In contrast to the results of Phase I where the unanchored variable LEA is used, there are no significant relationships between fertility and intergenerational educational mobility (Table 6). This is true for Wave I and Wave II measures in the white lower class and the white middle class. The percentage of women in the white lower class who had children at Wave III does decrease with each successive increase in IGEM at Wave II; however, the decrease is only four percent between low and medium IGEM scores. At Wave I there is a 12 percent decrease in those having children as the IGEM score increases from medium to high.

Not only are there no significant differences in the white middle class, the percentages are distributed in patterns inconsistent with the hypothesis. For instance, the percentage of middle class females with children slightly increases rather than decreases with each successive increase of IGEM at Wave I. At Wave II there is a 12 percent decrease in the number of females with children as IGEM increases from medium to high but only a one percent decrease as IGEM increases from low to medium. It is interesting to note that these figures are the reverse of those for the white lower class at Wave I.

There are also no significant relationships between fertility and intergenerational occupational mobility in the white lower class or the white middle class at Wave I or Wave II (Table 7). In addition, the distribution of percentages for the white lower class is inconsistent with the hypothesis when Wave I indicators are used; the percentage of females having children is higher for those aspiring to the middle class than for the nonmobility oriented or for those aspiring to the upper class. When Wave II measures

Table 6. Bivariate Relationship Between Fertility and Intergenerational Educational Mobility (IGEM).

White Lower Class

	IGEM66			IGEM68		
	≤ 1	2-3	4-5	≤ 1	2-3	4-5
No Children	.49 (20)	.61 (51)	.62 (10)	.57 (26)	.61 (44)	.86 (18)
Some Children	.51 (21)	.39 (32)	.38 (6)	.43 (20)	.39 (28)	.14 (4)
	N = 140 d.f. = 3 X^2 = 1.97 Pr = .386			N = 140 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 4.27 Pr = .124		

White Middle Class

	IGEM66			IGEM68		
	≤ 1	2-3	4-5	≤ 1	2-3	4-5
No Children	.71 (30)	.61 (19)	.57 (8)	.65 (20)	.66 (23)	.78 (14)
Some Children	.29 (12)	.39 (12)	.43 (6)	.35 (11)	.34 (12)	.22 (4)
	N = 87 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 1.33 Pr = .517			N = 84 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 1.04 Pr = .603		

Black Lower Class

	IGEM66			IGEM68		
	≤ 1	2-3	4-5	≤ 1	2-3	4-5
No Children	.40 (10)	.61 (49)	.66 (33)	.59 (16)	.59 (45)	.70 (44)
Some Children	.60 (15)	.39 (31)	.34 (17)	.41 (11)	.41 (31)	.30 (19)
	N = 155 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 4.92 Pr = .089			N = 166 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 1.9 Pr = .399		

Table 7. Bivariate Relationship Between Fertility and Intergenerational Occupational Mobility (IGOM).

White Lower Class

	IGOM66			IGOM68		
	≤ 30	≤ 60	≤ 90	≤ 30	≤ 60	≤ 90
No Children	.54 (23)	.46 (21)	.68 (15)	.53 (30)	.66 (35)	.77 (20)
Some Children	.46 (20)	.54 (25)	.32 (7)	.47 (27)	.34 (18)	.23 (6)
	N = 11 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 3.04 Pr = .222			N = 136 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 4.96 Pr = .087		

White Middle Class

	IGOM66			IGOM68		
	≤ 30	≤ 60	≤ 90	≤ 30	≤ 60	≤ 90
No Children	.61 (35)	.90 (10)		.68 (44)	.63 (10)	
Some Children	.39 (22)	.10 (1)		.32 (21)	.37 (6)	
	N = 68 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 3.59 Pr = .173			N = 81 d.f. = 2 X^2 = .16 Pr = .924		

Black Lower Class

	IGOM66			IGOM68		
	≤ 30	≤ 60	≤ 90	≤ 30	≤ 60	≤ 90
No Children	.49 (18)	.56 (27)	.65 (33)	.53 (19)	.63 (45)	.67 (37)
Some Children	.51 (19)	.44 (21)	.35 (18)	.47 (17)	.37 (27)	.33 (18)
	N = 136 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 2.3 Pr = .321			N = 163 d.f. = 2 X^2 = 1.96 Pr = .388		

are used, the predicted pattern is observed, i.e., the percentage of females with children decreases as IGOM increases.

The pattern of percentage distributions is also inconsistent in the white middle class. As in the case of Phase I there is a class reversal in these patterns by wave. The predicted pattern is observed at Wave I, but not at Wave II, among the white middle class, while the predicted pattern is only observed at Wave II among the white lower class.

Racial Comparisons. The predicted pattern of percentage distributions is also observed among black lower class females when Wave I indicators of IGEM are used, but again are not of sufficient magnitude to be significant. The pattern is more pronounced for the black than for the white lower class though (Table 6). When Wave II indicators are examined, a smaller percentage of the high aspirants had children than low or medium aspirants.

Although not statistically significant, the predicted pattern of percentages is observed for both wave measures of IGOM among the black lower class females. The percentages for the low and medium IGOM scores are similar for the black and white lower classes, but decrease ten percent more in the white lower class for the highly mobility oriented.

DISCUSSION

In the previous section of this paper, the A-B Dimension of the SMF Hypothesis was tested in three different analytical phases. Class and racial comparisons were made for the results of each phase. In this section an emphasis will be placed on comparing the results across phases within each race-class groupings.

Fertility and Educational Attitudes for Self

In all phases of this analysis increasing adolescent educational attitudes appear to have a depressing effect on early fertility behavior among white lower class females in the Southern Youth Study. In fact, the relationship between LEA and fertility is statistically significant in Phase I. The effect of educational attitudes held at the senior year of high school is consistently larger than the effect of those held at the sophomore year in all phases. When the LEA variable is anchored by social origins in Phase III, the observed relationship of Phase I is attenuated. This is true despite the fact that 53 percent of the mothers in the lower class had less than a high school degree and only 11 percent had gone beyond high school. That is, the educational origins were homogeneously low.

The results are not as consistent across phases for the white middle class. The predicted pattern of decreasing fertility with increasing educational attitudes is observed in Phase I, but is not significant. The expected cell sizes in the lower aspirant categories for seniors are less than three, however. If this category is combined with the "vocational training or some college" category, or dropped entirely, a significant relationship is observed in this phase. Such a manipulation of the sophomore statistics has little effect. When intergenerational educational mobility attitudes are examined in Phase III, the relationship is far from significant. In contrast to the white lower class, 36 percent of the mothers in the middle class had educational training beyond high school, including 13 percent with college degrees.

The fact that the results of Phase I are statistically significant while the results of Phase III are not for both classes of whites would seem to

imply that educational aspirations rather than educational mobility orientations is the primary factor. Nonetheless, class comparisons of the relative, but insignificant, effect on educational mobility orientations may have substantive implications. The relationship is much less in the middle class than in the white lower class. Given that the educational level of middle class mothers is higher and that middle class females can, by definition, more easily afford to realize their educational aspirations than can lower class females, this differential effect of mobility orientations of fertility may reflect perceptions of origin-based differentials in educational opportunity. As a result, greater sacrifices are felt to be required by lower class females to attain the same amount of intergenerational mobility. Sewell et al. (1970) report that lower class males receive less support from significant others than middle class males. If this conclusion applies to females as well, the process of mobility for the lower class females may be centered on personal achievements and sacrifices, such as a delay in fertility, rather than on significant others' expectations or behavior.

Among black females there is no statistically significant relationship between adolescent educational attitudes and fertility in any phase. The developmental pattern observed in the white lower class is not as consistent in the black lower class either. While the relationship between fertility and education aspirations (Phase I) is stronger at the senior year, sophomore mobility orientations are more strongly related to fertility (Phase III). Though the observed relationships are not significant statistically, there is some support for the hypothesis. In Phases I and II the predicted patterns of percentages is observed using sophomore attitudes. That is the percentages of women with children consistently decrease as educational aspirations

increase (Phase I). The decrease appears to be skewed toward short range mobility in Phase III, however. When attitudes held at the senior year of high school are examined, the decrease in fertility appears to be concentrated in high aspirations (Phase I) and long range mobility orientations (Phase III). The results of Phase II confirm that high aspirants have a lower mean fertility than those aspiring for vocational training or some college.

The fact that only high aspirations and long range mobility orientations affect fertility among the black lower class females while there is a consistent decrease in fertility as educational aspirations and mobility orientations increase among the white lower class females needs further examination. It may be that these blacks are merely expressing, with no internalization or motivation, the dominant values of society concerning educational improvement (Thomas, 1970). Or, it may be that attaining a high school degree requires more sacrifices for blacks than whites and therefore the blacks perceive that some educational training beyond high school requires little additional personal sacrifices. Alternately, white lower class females may perceive different levels of sacrifice necessary for different levels of education.

Fertility and Occupational Attitudes for Mate

The relationship between occupational attitudes for mate and fertility consistently provides support for the SMF Hypothesis in the white lower class when attitudes measured at the senior year are examined. This is not the case when sophomore year attitudes are used. At the senior year LOAM is significantly related to fertility (Phase I); the mean fertility decreases as LOAM increases (Phase II); and, the relationship of Phase I is only slightly attenuated when the intergenerational occupational mobility measures

are used in Phase III. In contrast, sophomore measures of LOAM are not related to fertility (Phase I); the mean fertility increases as LOAM increases at the sophomore year (Phase II); and, the predicted pattern is observed in Phase III when intergenerational occupational mobility measures are used, but is not significant.

The situtation is just the opposite in the white middle class. That is, the SMF Hypothesis is consistently supported when the effect of sophomore occupational attitudes on fertility is examined, but not when senior year occupational attitudes are used. At the sophomore year, LOAM is significantly related to fertility (Phase I); the mean fertility decreases as LOAM increase (Phase II); and, the relationship of Phase I is only slightly attenuated when the intergenerational occupational mobility measures are used in Phase III. At the senior year, LOAM is not related to fertility (Phase I), nor is IGOM (Phase III), but the mean fertility does decrease as LOAM increases (Phase II).

It should be pointed out that at the senior year a larger percentage of the white lower class and the white middle class females are willing to accept a mate from their class of origin. In both cases some of this acceptance may reflect anticipated marriage partners. Additionally, middle class females may be reflecting norms against "marrying down" while some of the lower class females may see the limitations to "marrying up". But many of the lower class females appear to have internalized the values of "middle class America" as expressed through the mass media and the educational system. As a result, a gap exists between their value orientations and their objective reality and a concomitant need for mobility develops. In turn, these females appear to be postponing at least childbearing, and

perhaps marriage, in an effort to attain that mobility. The inconsistencies across phases makes explanation of the middle class experience extremely difficult. In addition, regardless of their mobility attitudes, the early fertility of these middle class females is approximately equal; sixty-eight percent had no children while only 56 percent of the lower class females had no children. This could be a reflection of hedonistic values which encourage postponement of children rather than the postponement of children in order to attain mobility. In fact, only 20 percent of the middle class females desired upward mobility. It is possible that these females, reared in the child-centered environments typical of the middle class, are fairly content with their status and are concerned only with obtaining the material objects indicative of that status.

Although none of the statistics are significant, the results of testing the relationship between fertility and occupational attitudes for mate are fairly consistent across phases for the black lower class. For both sophomores and seniors, aspirations for the middle class have a depressing effect on subsequent fertility, while aspirations for the upper class have little effect on fertility (Phase I and II). Increasing mobility orientations for mate are consistently related to lower fertility in Phase III, however. That is, both short and long range mobility have a depressing affect on fertility. In Phase I the relationship is stronger for senior attitudes while in Phase III it is slightly stronger for sophomore attitudes.

The above results for the black lower class may be due to the fact that there are few black upper class role models and most of those blacks who have "made it" to the upper class have been in the glamour profession, e.g. show business, athletics, ministry; access to and maintenance of these

professions may not be seen as requiring the "normal" sacrifices such as postponement or limitation of children. It is also possible that black females place a greater emphasis on their own mobility rather then in their mate's mobility. In fact, 47 percent had never been married at age 22 and 63 percent had no children. If this speculation is correct, then occupational aspirations and mobility orientations for self, rather than future family, should have a significant affect on the fertility of black lower class females.

SUMMARY

In this paper one dimension of the SMF Hypothesis has been empirically examined -- the Attitudinal-Behavioral Dimension. This dimension hypothesizes that social mobility orientations are inversely related to fertility. This examination was conducted using the Southern Youth Study -- a three-wave, six year longitudinal panel of disadvantaged nonmetropolitan Southern females. Though no claims are made as to the representativeness of this panel, and therefore generalizability of the results, it is felt this analysis has considerable substantive importance. Class and racial differences were found in the effect of two types of adolescent aspirations -- education for self and occupation for mate -- on subsequent early fertility. The effects of mobility orientations for self and mate were also examined. In general, the effects of the mobility orientations were the same as those of the aspiration measures, but were not statistically significant.

The hypothesis was most consistently supported among the white lower class, particularly for high school seniors' aspirations. Both educational and occupational aspirations for mate were significantly related inversely to fertility among the seniors. The results were similar in the white

middle class for educational aspirations, but not for occupational aspirations for mate. In the black lower class high educational aspirations, but only middle range occupational aspirations, appear to depress fertility. Neither of these relationships was significant in the black lower class, however.

These results suggest that further qualifications to the SMF Hypothesis are in order. The use of broad distinctions of social origins as a control lends support to the postulate that the relationship between socioeconomic ambitions and fertility varies both between and within class levels. This variation appears to be in degree for educational ambitions and in kind for future family ambitions. The fact that the relationship for education is consistently stronger in the white lower class than in the white middle class and black lower class may reflect differential perception of the means of attaining socioeconomic ambitions rather than just "differential frequency of socio-economic ambitions" as the hypothesis states. That is, middle class females plan to fulfill their ambitions, which may be merely subculturally defined expectations, through utilization of the resources (e.g. parental support) available to them in the stratification hierarchy, while lower class females, lacking these resources, must either forego the personal ambitions or make personal sacrifices to obtain the necessary resources.

Black females may perceive a greater availability of outside resources for use in attaining vocational education than white lower class females and thus personal sacrifices are not as necessary. However, fewer outside resources are available for attaining higher ambitions, such as a college degree. Therefore, the long-range educational effect on fertility is observed for blacks.

A similar qualification can be used to explain the variation of kind in the relationship between ambitions for future family status and fertility. Briefly stated, the means of achieving future family status, as well as ambitions for that status, may vary among these race-class groupings. For instance, black lower class females may view family status as hinging on their own status rather than on their husband's. Thus, occupational aspirations for husband may be invalid as a measure of socioeconomic ambitions for lower-class blacks. The means to marital mobility may be more intricately related to education in the white lower class than in the middle class. For the lower class, and particularly those in non-metropolitan areas, higher education facilitates interaction with middle class and ambitious lower class males that might not otherwise exist. Thus, females with high educational ambitions may perceive a higher probability of actually marrying up than those with lower educational ambitions. Mate choice may be more selective as a result, and marriage and childbearing postponed among the ambitious lower class females. Of course, middle class females also engage in mate selection during the educational process. The difference, however, is that there are fewer within class differences in frequency of socioeconomic ambitions and the means of achieving those ambitions are available with less sacrifice than is necessary in the lower class.

In conclusion, this analysis suggests that the strength and nature of the relationship between socioeconomic ambitions and fertility varies according to the dimension of status examined within and between race-class groupings. Perception of means(resources) available for attaining these ambitions is presented as a possible confounding factor, but the interpretations offered are largely speculative and require empirical testing.

Appendix A Indicators and Measurements

Social Origins

Two indicators of social origins were included in this analysis -- the occupation of the breadwinner in the family of orientation and the educational level of the mother. The breadwinner's occupation was considered as indicator of the general socioeconomic standing of the family of orientation which served as a status placement function for the female respondent. The mother's educational level was considered a base-line for comparison of mobility orientations for self, even though the literature justifying such a position is rather scarce.[1]

Breadwinner's Occupation (BRSEI). The occupations given as open-ended responses to the question:

> What is the major job held by the main breadwinner (money earner) of your home?

were assigned Duncan's (1961) socioeconomic index scores. In order to circumvent the "no response" and uncodeable responses, i.e., social security, retirement, etc., computed means of non-farm occupation scores for each educational level of the breadwinner were computed for blacks and whites.[2]

Educational Level of Mother (ELM). In Wave I and Wave II the respondents were asked:

> What is the highest school grade completed by your mother?

In both waves the responses were structured into an eight level ranking from "Did not go to school" to "College graduate".[3] Less discrete categories of the Wave II (1968) responses were used to indicate origin status.[4]

---

[1] The only study which examined the SMF Hypothesis using female's intergenerational educational mobility, Riemer and Kiser (1954), operationalized educational origins as the average of father's and mother's education.

[2] These means were computed only when the breadwinner was the father or the mother. Seemingly, it was not justifiable to insert these or other means when the breadwinner was someone other than a parent since the problem under consideration was intergenerational mobility (children vis-a-vis parent(s)).

[3] "Don't know" was also a structured response but is considered missing data for this analysis.

[4] The rationale for using Wave II rather than Wave I data was that as the respondents aged, their knowledge of their mother's educational attainment would tend to be more accurate. OF the 331 who responded in Waves I and II, 70 or 21 percent, gave different responses at Wave I and Wave II for mother's education. The majority of the variance was characterized by (1) a "don't know" or "no response" at one time period and a response, usually in one of the categories below "graduated from high school" (2) a one rank move of reported levels in Wave I and Wave II.

Mobility Orientations for Desired Mate.

A review of the literature showed that the mobility of women has frequently been examined through the occupation of her husband, McCrory (1974) explained that this procedure reflects her mobility within the family structure. In order to examine the mobility for the future family of the adolescent females in the Southern Youth Study panel, a composite variable, level of occupational aspiration for desired mate (LOAM), was constructed from responses of occupational aspirations for desired mate (OAM) and occupational expectations for desired mate (OXM).

Haller, et al. do not dispute the quantitative and qualitative differences between aspirations and expectations as presented by researchers such as Kuvlesky and Bealer (1966), but do feel that realistic and idealistic aspirations are "weakly defined" and "highly correlated" and "are overwhelmingly saturated with general LOA [Level of occupational aspirations for self]" (1974:119). For this reason realistic and idealistic aspirations are of interest as contributors to LOA, not as separate variables. Furthermore, they assert that the inclusion of both realistic and idealistic aspirations increase the realiability of LOA, qualified by the fact that LOA appeared to be slightly less reliable for females than males (Haller, et al., 1974: 119).[5]

Occupational Aspiration for Mate (OAM). This variable was operationalized by assigning Duncan (1961) socioeconomic scores to responses obtained in Waves I and II to the question:

> If the man you marry could have any job he wanted, what job would you most desire him to have as a lifetime kind of work?

Occupational Expectations for Mate (OXM). Again, Duncan's socioeconomic scores were assigned to the responses obtained in Waves I and II to the question:

> What kind of job do you really expect the man you will marry or your husband to hold most of his life?

Level of Occupational Aspiration for Mate (LOAM). This composite variable was operationalized by computing the average of OAM and OXM for both Wave I and II.[6]

$$LOAM = \frac{OAM\ (SEI) + OXM\ (SEI)}{2}$$

---

[5]It was felt these remarks about LOA, though not strictly related to LOAM, were pertinent in view of the general lack of rigorous attention extant on LOAM.

[6]In those cases where responses were given for OAM but not OXM in a particular wave, OAM was considered the best estimate of LOAM, and vice versa when a response was given for OXM but not OAM. Among the whites, OAM66 was used as the best estimate 34 times: OXM66, 5 times; OAM68, 23 times; and OXM68, 11 times. Among the blacks, OAM66 was used as the best estimate 12 times; OXM66, 3 times; OAM68, 25 times; and OXM68 only once.

Mobility Orientations for Self

The respondent's mobility orientations for self were operationalized by a composite variable, level of educational aspirations (LEA) (McCrory, 1974). Level of educational aspirations was constructed from structured responses of educational aspirations (EA) and educational expectations (EX) in the same manner as LOAM.

Educational Aspirations (EA). This variable was operationalized by responses to the following questions;

> If you could have as much education as you desired, which of the following would you do?

Six fixed choice responses were offered in Waves I and II ranging from "Quit school now" to "Complete additional studies after graduation from a college for university." Numerical values, ranging from one to five, were assigned to each response.[7]

Educational Expectations (EX). In Waves I and II this variable was measured by fixed choice responses to the following question:

> What do you really expect to do about your education?

The fixed choice responses and numerical value assignment were the same as those for educational aspirations.

Level of Educational Aspiration (LEA). This composite variable was operationalized by computing the average of EA and EX for both Wave I and II.[8]

$$LEA = \frac{EA + EX}{2}$$

Intergenerational Mobility Measures

Two measures of integenerational mobility were constructed from the attitudes given toward occupation of desired mate and education for self, anchored by the social origins of the respondent.

---

[7] Because the panel consists of high school graduates and the infrequency of responses to the first response, the category "Quit school now" was combined with the response to "Graduate from high school".

[8] In those cases where responses were given for EA but not EX in a particular wave, EA was considered the best estimate of LEA, and vice versa when a response was given for EX but not EA. Among the white females, EX66 and EX68 were used as the best estimates twice and once respectively. Among the blacks EA66 was considered the best estimate twice; EX66, 6 times; EA68 and EX68 once each.

Intergenerational Occupational Mobility (IGOM). This variable was constructed by taking the difference in SEI scores of level of occupational aspiration for desired mate (LOAM) and breadwinner's occupation (BRSEI) at Waves I and II.[9]

$$IGOM = LOAM - BRSEI$$

Positive values of IGOM indicate upward mobility orientations, while negative values indicate downward mobility orientations. The resultant numerical values indicate distance of movement desired for the future family from the family of orientation.

Intergenerational Educational Mobility (IGEM). The difference between level of educational aspiration for self (LEA) and educational level of mother (ELM) was constructed as the measure IGEM.

$$IGEM = LEA - ELM$$

Again, the sign of the computed value indicates direction of movement and the numerical value indicates distance of movement.[10]

Early Fertility Behavior[11]

The respondent's early fertility behavior was measured in the following manner from Wave III data:

(1) If the respondent was married, she was asked, "How many children do you have?

(2) If the respondent replied to the above question, the number of children reported was coded.

---

[9] A recent article by Tyree and Treas (1974) refers to intergenerational mobility behavior of females through husband's occupation as "marital mobility".

[10] The eight level ranking of ELM was collapsed into five categories: Less than High School; High School Graduate; High School plus Vocational Training; Some College; College Graduate. LEA rank levels were: Graduate from High School; High School plus Vocational Training; Graduate from a Junior College; Graduate from a College; College plus Additional Training. Therefore an IGEM score approximates a mobility measure of one degree.

[11] The term "early fertility behavior" is used since all respondents were approximately 21 years old and therefore in the early part of their childbearing years.

(3) If the respondent did not reply to the above question and was not married or divorced, then the number of children was coded as zero.[12]

Socioeconomic Class[13]

Kiser and Whelpton (1953) postulated the existence of class specific attitudes and psychological characteristics concerning the "value" of children. Contraceptive behavior is known to vary by class. For these reasons, socioeconomic class comparisons were made for each model in this paper.

The breadwinner's socioeconomic index (BRSEI) was used to operationalize socioeconomic class in the following manner:

(1) If BRSEI was 45 or less, the respondent was considered a member of the lower socioeconomic class.

(2) If BRSEI was greater than 45, the respondent was considered a member of the middle socioeconomic class.[14]

Over 90% of the black females and over 60% of the white females were located in the lower socioeconomic class. Because the number of black females located in the middle class was extremely small (15), those with a SEI score greater than 45 were excluded from the analysis. Therefore comparisons were made between white lower class females, and white middle class females, and between white lower class and black lower class females.

---

[12]In Texas all respondents were asked "How many children do you have?", regardless of marital status and the number of never married females with children was insignificant. Of the 292 white females in the Southern Youth Study, 80 (29%) were considered never married females with no children. Of the 236 black females, 110 (47%) were considered never married females with no children; 14 (6%) of the never married black females reported children, not all of whom were from Texas. Additionally, 30 (13%) of the married black females reported no children.

[13]This term is used herein, as in other empirical research on the SMF Hypothesis, as synonymous with socioeconomic groupings. Though the conceptual distinctions between class and groupings are recognized, it was felt the research in this area was not refined sufficiently to warrant a more discrete distinction.

[14]Haller, Otto, Meier and Ohlendorf (1974) also used this score as the cut-off point between the lower and middle classes. Despite cognizance of the fact that class distinctions may differ between blacks and whites and rural and urban residents, the constant criterion of the above researchers was used for heuristic purposes.

REFERENCES

Baltzell, E. Digby
1953 "Social mobility and fertility within an elite group." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 31, (October):411-20.

Beret, J.
1952 "Fertility and social mobility." Population Studies 5 (March):244-60.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis D. Duncan
1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Boggs, Stephen T.
1957 "Family size and social mobility in a California suburb." Eugenics Quarterly 4 (December):208-13.

Brooks, Hugh E. and Franklin J. Henry.
1958 "An empirical study of the relationships of Catholic pratice and occupational mobility to fertility." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 36 (July):222-81.

Davis, Adam C., W.B. Clifford, R.D. Mustain, and P.L. Tobin
1974 "Fertility Behavior in a tri-racial low income rural county." Progress Report SOC60, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan.
1972 Socioeconomic Background and Achievement. New York: Seminar Press, Inc.

Featherman, D.L.
1970 "Marital fertility and the process of socioeconomic achievement: an examination of the mobility hypothesis." Pp. 104-31 in L.L. Bumpass and C.F. Westoff (eds.), the Later Years of Childbearing. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Fisher, R.A.
1958 The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection. (2nd revised ed.), New York: Dover.

Goldberg, David
1959 "The fertility of two-generation urbanities." Population Studies 12 (March):214-22.

1960 "Another look at the Indianapolis fertility data." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 38 (January):23-36.

Haller, Archibald, L. Otto, R. Meier, and G. Ohlendorf
1974 "Level of occupational aspiration: an empirical analysis." American Sociological Review 39 (February):113-21.

Hutchinson, Bertran
1961 "Fertility, social mobility and urban migration in Brazil." Population Studies 14 (March):182-9.

Kantner, J.F. and C.V. Kiser
1954 "The interrelation of fertility, fertility planning and intergenerational social mobility." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 32 (January):69-103.

Kiser, Clyde V. and P.K. Whelpton
1951 "The interrelationship of fertility, fertility planning and feeling of economic security." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 29 (January): 41-122.

1953 "Resume' of the Indianapolis study of social and psychological factors affecting fertility." Population Studies 7 (November):95-110.

Kuvlesky, W.P. and R.C. Bealer
1966 "A clarification of the concept "occupational choice." Rural Sociology 31 (September):265-76.

McCrory, Nancy K.
1974 "Mobility of women." Paper presented at the SSA meetings, Dallas, Texas (March).

Marcum, John P. and Frank D. Bean
1974 "Intergenerational occupational mobility and fertility among Mexican Americans." Unpublished paper. Department of Sociology and The Population Research Center, the University of Texas at Austin (September).

Micklin, Michael
1969 "Urban life and differential fertility: specification of an aspect of the theory of the demographic transition." Sociological Quarterly 10 (Fall):480-500.

Peterson, William
1969 Population. New York: MacMillian Co.

Riemer, Ruth and Clyde V. Kiser.
1954 "Economic tension and social mobility in relation to fertility planning and size of planned family." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 32 (April):167-231.

Sewell, W.H., A.O. Haller, and G. Ohlendorf
1970 "The educational and early occupational status attainment process: replication and revision. American Sociological Review 35 (December): 1014-27.

Scott, Wolf
1958 "Fertility and social mobility among teachers." Population Studies 11 (March):251-61.

Thomas, Kathern
1970 "Educational orientations of Southern rural youth: an analysis of socioeconomic status and racial differences." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Kentucky.

Tien, H.Yuan
1961 "The social mobility/fertility hypothesis reconsidered: an empirical study." American Sociological Review 26 (April):247-57.

Tyree, Andrea and Judith Treas
1974 "The occupational and marital mobility of women." American Sociological Review 39 (June):293-302.

Westoff, Charles F.
1953 "The changing focus of differential fertility research: the social mobility hypothesis." Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly 31 (January): 24-38.

White, C.S.
1974 "The social mobility-fertility hypothesis: a racial and class comparison among Southern females." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Texas A&M University.

1975 "The social mobility-fertility hypothesis: a synthesis and refinement of theory and research". Proceedings: Rural Sociology Section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists, New Orleans, Louisiana (February).