The Formation of Family Size Ideals[1]

MARKETTA RITAMIES

Introduction

In the pluralistic society of today families have many goals when striving for well-being. In addition to economic goals, advancing in one's career, various interests and hobbies and friends all compete with children as a family's goals. The goals of women, especially, have become more varied as society has developed, due to increasing education and the growth of employment outside the home. Being a mother is no longer considered the only goal open to a woman. It is more common now for women to have careers of their own and to develop themselves by participating in public affairs and pursuing interests of their own.

When seeking these different goals families must plan their lives. They must discuss how large a family they could have without it being in the way of other goals, and when each child should be born, so as to best fit in with the family's other plans.

Planning has been found to be more of a general feature than a specific one. Couples who plan their lives in general also plan how many children they want (for example, Freedman and Whelpton, 1952, 549; Chamberlain, 1976, 1–16). As society develops, people act more according to a plan. The significance of education, especially, has been a major factor in this development. Today functional rationalism is probably taught in the schools more than before, that is the organization of actions so that they lead to preset goals. Students are taught the systematic and long-term pursuit of certain goals (Riihinen 1983).

In the first decades of fertility research relatively little attention was paid to planning and decision making. It was assumed that couples had relatively stable plans concerning family size. Rational comprehensive planning dominated the planning field at that time. Later disjointed incrementalist planning, the planning of one stage at a time, began to replace rational planning (see Camhis, 1979, 30–36; and Braybrooke and Lindholm, 1969, 81–110).

In family planning this change can be understood to mean that today, assumedly, hardly anyone believes that desired family size remains the same as it was at the beginning of the marriage and that it is considered the goal throughout the fertile period. It is considered a more reasonable assumption that the experiences people have in having children as well as changing life circumstances lead in time to a continual examination and correction of fertility ideals (Lightbourne and Macdonald, 1982, 8).

We can assume that people strive to behave rationally, meaning that they make systematic use of the information they have concerning themselves and their environment (Helminen, 1978, 16). However, every family can define rational behavior differently, because family goals differ.

There probably are families who are aware from the outset of how many children they want and also realize this goal despite changing circumstances. In

these families planning mainly seems to resemble rational comprehensive planning. The various options available concerning family size and their results have been clarified at the start and the one best suiting the family has been chosen.

Rational family planning also includes couples whose plans develop gradually as experiences with children accrue and their life situations change. The behavior of the decision maker is fully rational in accordance with the information available at any given moment, but the choices made are not permanent. The values and attitudes people have change as a result of experience they gain from their actions (Helminen 1978, 16). This type could be said mainly to resemble the incrementalist planner type.

Rational behavior is also represented by families who first have all their children and then, when they no longer want any more, take effective measures to limit their family. It is more difficult, however, to consider rational the behavior of women who ask themselves once a month whether they wish to become pregnant or not. These families end up with a certain number of children, but only as a result of temporary decisions (Ryder, 1973, 504). These families are not long-term planners, instead their lives are based on short-term plans.

In some families planning is perhaps not considered sensible, because the couple does not have the necessary resources or belief in the feasibility of their goals. It is irrational even to set any goals, to hope for two children, for example, if one's resources are weak, if one does not have enough information about contraception or any possibility to use reliable methods.

This paper examines, by using family size ideals, how Finnish families form plans concerning family size. Ideals at three different stages of life were compared to form ideal types, which are assumed to measure the varying development of family size ideals in families. Resources for well-being are assumed to be associated with the family's ability to plan family size. Therefore the different ideal types are described according to resource variables found to be significant in the different age groups. Families belonging to the ideal types assumed to act according to a plan are believed to differ, because of their better resources, from families who have not been able to plan their family. However, only among the oldest families have plans concerning family size been realized and we actually know whether the ideal types differ in regard to their resources for well-being.

Formation of the ideal typology

An attempt has been made to analyze how the planning of family size has developed by comparing family size ideals held at the beginning of the marriage, at the time of the interview and when childbearing had ended. First, the following 13 types were formed on the basis of congruence or incongruity between the ideal at the beginning of the marriage and desired and expected family size:

1. B=D AND D=E	949	
2. B=D AND B<E	198	
3. B=D AND B>E	233	
4. B=E AND B<D	111	
5. B=E AND B>D	60	B = ideal at beginning of marriage
6. D=E AND B<D	341	D = desired family size
7. D=E AND B>D	226	E = expected family size
8. B<D AND D<E	63	
9. B>D AND D>E	48	
10. B<D AND D> AND B>E	75	
11. B<D AND D>E AND B<E	56	
12. B>D AND D<E AND B<E	46	
13. B>E AND D<E AND B>E	21	

It was assumed at first that the types measured what they appeared to measure. On this basis we felt that four main types of development of family size ideals could be differentiated.

1) Ideals have remained the same at all stages of life (Type 1).
2) The original ideal has been corrected and this corrected ideal has been realized (Types 6 and 7).
3) The couple has been prevented from realizing their ideal (Types 3, 4, 9, 10 and 11).
4) The couple has been unsuccessful in realizing their ideal (Types 2, 5, 8, 12 and 13).

It was assumed that this classification would not be final, because it was known that in this data some degree of unreliability would be found in the ideals, due to many different factors. Within the limits set by the data, an examination of each group was made by comparing the original types within the group. Special attention was paid to the reliability and the demographic characteristics of the types. The final decisions about uniting the types in the groups were not made until after this separate examination of each type.

The original typology was found to be suitable, even though it was naturally rather crude. Only Type 11, which belonged to the group prevented from realizing their ideal, differed from the other types in the group. Its characteristics mainly resembled those of the types in the unsuccessful group. The number of children, expected family size, number of undesired pregnancies corresponded to those in the unsuccessful group. Therefore Type 11 was transferred to the unsuccessful group.

The final typology formed on the basis of the temporal development of family size ideals was thus composed of the following types:

		N	%
1)	Families whose ideals were congruent	949	39.1
2)	Families who realized a corrected ideal	567	23.4
3)	Families prevented from realizing their ideal	467	19.2
4)	Families unsuccessful in realizing their ideal	444	18.3
		2427	100.0

The reliability of the analysis

The typology formed by comparing the family size ideal at three different stages of life was assumed from the start only to be a trial examination of the development of family size ideals over time. The research data and the family size ideal concepts were known to include unreliability due to many different factors.

The data of this cross-sectional study composed of 19—45-year old women set limits, to begin with, on the study of how ideals developed over time. The ideals did not follow each other in the same temporal sequence in all the families. The ending of the childbearing period in the oldest age groups often preceded the interview and, again, in young families the interview occurred close to the beginning of the marriage.

The women, who were at different stages of life at the time of the interview, were asked to state all their goals at the same time. Thus the actual life situation of the interviewee could not help having an intentional or unintentional effect on the stated ideals. Also, the family size ideals at different stages of life did not measure the couple's desired number of children in exactly the same way. The desired number of children given in the interview may to some extent reflect affection for children in general, in addition to one's own desired number of children. The ideal at the beginning of marriage and the expected family size described the desired number of children at these times, but often these questions could not be

answered at the correct time. The ideals also differed from each other in the way that the questions were stated, which became apparent in the differing »no response» percentages.

Because the analysis describing the development of family size ideals over time included only those interviewees who had given an ideal number of children for all three life stages, only 44 % of the original data could be included. Thus the data is not fully representative. Women belonging to the oldest age groups, who have many children and who are poorly educated are especially underrepresented in the data, because they often did not answer the question concerning their ideal at the beginning of the marriage.

What are the ideal types assumed to measure

The four ideal types are assumed to measure the development of family size ideals over time. It is also assumed that correlations will be found with types representing different kinds of planning existing in general planning theory. When the development of family planning among the families in each ideal type is described according to face validity and their reliability is also focused on, it is assumed that the types will be the following:

Ideal-congruent families are assumed to represent families who act according to a plan and who have kept the same family size ideal they had at the beginning of their marriage and also expect to attain it. This type can be seen mainly to resemble couples carrying out rational comprehensive planning. However, the probability that the women in this type rationalize their answers is great because in the data this type represented the youngest families, on the average. We cannot be certain of the final congruency of the ideals of families who are at the beginning of their childbearing period. The congruency of ideals stated by these women may in some instances be due to inexperience, and for some to a rationalization of their responses. The large number belonging to this type is in itself proof of the unreliability of the ideals, for researchers do not consider it probable today that ideals do not change with time.

Families realizing a corrected ideal can also be considered families who act according to a plan, because they realize their ideal. However, their original ideal has been corrected on the basis of experiences they have had. The families included in this type can mainly be considered to resemble disjointed incrementalist planning, if we again wish to find a link with general planning theory. People belonging to this type may also have rationalized their responses. The ideal held at the beginning of the marriage may not have been corrected until after there already were more children in the family than originally planned or after they found that they had difficulties having children. The small number belonging to this type may also signify that the number of families carrying out disjointed planning is markedly smaller than researchers have assumed. There are probably families how were left out of the research data who also represented disjointed planning. At the beginning of marriage people are not yeat clear about how many children they want, but as their experiences increase their ideal becomes more definite.

Families prevented from achieving their ideal have been unable to carry out their plans for a family, assumedly because factors exist which have led the families to have a smaller family than they had desired. For most, however, the reason preventing desired family size has been one which they themselves have been able to influence. Here, one's own career is probably a central factor leading to a family smaller than one's ideal. This type is assumed as a whole to represent the most active followers of a plan in the study, for only a small portion were found to have had difficulties in getting pregnant, while the others had apparently intentionally planned and had a family smaller than their ideal.

Families who have been unsuccessful in realizing their ideal are assumed to represent families who are weakest in planning family size. They have had more children than was their goal. This type is seen to relatively reliably measure failure to realize one's ideal. Hardly anyone will report the situation as being worse than it really is. On the other hand, the frequence of the type could possibly be higher, because rationalization of responses may have led to some persons belonging to this type being categorized among those with a family congruent with their ideal or those realizing a corrected ideal.

Describing the characteristics of the ideal types

The ability of the couples to plan their family is thus assumed to be associated with their resources for well-being. The resources of families who act according to a plan are assumed to be better than those of families who have been unsuccessful in their family plans. On the other hand, it is difficult to make assumptions concerning comparisons of the level of well-being of families who have planned their families in different ways.

Because of the nature of the research data, it is difficult to demonstrate what direction the correlation between resources for well-being and the ideal types takes. The resources measure well-being at the time of the interview and therefore the situation of the families at different stages of life is different. Among young families the resources mainly reflect the level of well-being prevailing at the beginning of the marriage, but no one can say whether the resources will remain at the same level in the different types in the future also.

Among the oldest persons interviewed the resources demonstrate the well-being reached by the family after all their children have been born. It is only in this group that the actual attainment of ideals can be verified. It is true, of course, that the ideal held at the beginning of the marriage may have been rationalized in the oldest families. It is most difficult to demonstrate the direction of correlation for the middle age group, because this group includes both those whose marriage has just begun and those whose childbearing period is coming to an end.

The well-being resources of the families in the various ideal types are examined according to age group and by using well-being resource variables found to be significant in previous studies and to be most clearly related to family size ideals in this data. In order to keep this report concise we will not include time-consuming tabulations and will examine the characteristics of the ideal types by using factor analysis.

It was originally assumed that discriminant analysis would provide the best description of the ideal types. The discriminant analysis of the entire data and of the various age groups demonstrated, however, that the effect of the number of existing children was so powerful in the analyses that the family size function explained over 70 % of the total discrimination and, in addition, the other variables related to life stage were so powerful that no explanatory power remained for the well-being function.

In factor analysis, however, it was possible to remove the effect of family size from the other factors by using rotation and forcing one factor to take the direction of family size. (Cf. Riihinen 1965, 129.) The other factors could be assumed to express dimensions lying behind the well-being factor. The factor scores could be used to show the value each ideal type obtains on each well-being factor in families at different stages of life.

The variables measuring well-being resources chosen for factor analysis were education, socioeconomic position and occupational status and, in addition, variables related to housing, employment and childhood background. In addition, regional factors were considered resources of well-being for the individuals and

the families. The analysis also included demographic variables, the number of existing children and the duration of marriage. The wife's age was not considered necessary in the analysis, which was made separately for three different age groups. The analysis included a total of 22 variables (see Appendix 1, pp. 68–69).

The factorization was made using correlation matrices describing the relationships between the variables. A principal components solution was chosen. Four factors were included whose eigenvalue was slightly below one. After the first factor had been forced in the direction of the vector representing the family size variable, the rest of the factor space was rotated using the varimax rotation.

In addition to the family size factor describing life stages (the forced factor), the analysis revealed three factors based on well-being resources: dimensions related to regional well-being, family well-being and the wife's employment. These appeared in all three age groups. A comparison with the factor analysis made of the entire data showed that the same factor structure apparent in the whole data was also visible in each age group (see Appendix 1). Thus the age groups do not create problems when interpreting the results.

The life stage factor naturally focused strongly on family size, because rotation had caused this factor to take the direction of family size. In addition to family size, duration of marriage also received a high loading on this factor in all groups. The wife's employment, on the other hand, received a high loading in the youngest and the oldest age group and the wife's income in the two youngest age groups. The effect of regional variables was not visible in the life stage factor in the youngest group, but as age increased their significance also increased. Young people, who probably represent the most mobile and educated portion of the population, apparently have more unified values than the older age groups.

The regional well-being factor proved to be the strongest and also similar in all age groups. The following variables received high loadings on this factor: the portion employed in primary production (a negative loading), the population density, the living standard and the proportion employed in tertiary production in the municipality. Distance variables and the husband's socio-economic position received lower (negative) loadings.

The family's welfare factor was the next strongest factor in the two oldest age groups and its structure was, in addition, relatively similar in all age groups. However, the significance of the occupational status of the wife, the husband and the wife's father increased with age. In the youngest age group the dwelling's size, the wife's education and the form of ownership of the dwelling had the highest loadings, with occupational status variables not coming until after all of these. In the middle age group, however, the variables measuring occupational status came immediately after the wife's education and in the oldest age group the husband's and wife's occupational status received the highest loadings, and only then came the wife's education, the family's income and the occupational status of the wife's father.

The wife's employment factor was similar in all age groups. The following variables had high loadings on this factor: the wife is employed and the wife's and the family's income. Employment and income strengthen the correlation noted because they are technically dependent on each other.

Do the ideal types differ from each other regarding their resources for welfare

Here we will chiefly concentrate on the oldest age group, the 35–45-year-olds, when examining the welfare resources of the ideal types. This group is the only one where the realization of family size ideals can be confirmed. The results will be compared with the younger age groups, however.

The factor scores the ideal types obtained on the welfare factor show what level of welfare has been reached by families who have planned their family size in different ways. These factor scores can be used to determine whether ideal types assumed to be acting according to a plan differ in accordance with the assumptions from families who have been unsuccessful in family planning.

The position of families belonging to the type which had been unsuccessful in realizing their ideal was, as expected, weakest on all welfare factors. Families who had been unsuccessful in family planning lived in poorly developed agricultural areas far from municipal centers. The family's welfare, which especially emphasized the husband's and wife's occupational status and the wife's education, was weakest among the families unsuccessful in family planning and deviated significantly from other types. The wife was also more rarely employed than in the other types and therefore the family's level of income was low, although the differences were not significant (Appendix 2, p. 70).

The life stage of the unsuccessful families also differed markedly from the other types. They had more children than the families assumed to act according to a plan. This also correlated with the wife's lower level of education and the long duration of her marriage and the low developmental level of the municipality.

Among types assumed to act according to a plan those who had been prevented from reaching their ideal were believed to represent families who acted more according to a plan than average and thus their welfare resources were assumed to be better than those of other planning types. The position of the prevented types on the welfare factors showed, however, that the resources of this type were very similar to the resources of persons with congruent ideals. These two types did not differ significantly from each other on any factor. The prevented and the congruent families also did not differ in the stage of life they were in. Both ended up with a rather small family and the educational level of the wife was good.

Realizers of a corrected ideal or families who planned disjointedly differed from the other planning types most clearly on the life stage factor. The families belonging to this type had statistically extremely significantly more children than the congruent and the prevented families. In addition, the realizers of a corrected ideal also differed significantly from the unsuccessful ones. On the basis of regional welfare the type represented families living rather close to the centers in the more developed municipalities, the differences compared to the other types were not significant on this factor.

The results were similar also in younger age groups, although statistically the differences were less significant. In the youngest families, those of women under 25, the welfare resources of the unsuccessful were the weakest: the family's welfare was the poorest and the wife was least often employed although the difference was not significant. Regional welfare was weakest. The congruent families deviated most clearly from the unsuccessful in reaching ideal on the regional welfare factor and the corrected ideal families on the family welfare factor.

The unsuccessful families also differed significantly from the congruent and the prevented families in the stage of life they were in. They also had more children already in the first years of their marriage than did the others and they had married young.

The well-being resources of the youngest families represent a situation prevailing in the families, when family size was first being planned. Women who considered themselves as belonging to the unsuccessful type already at the beginning of their marriage had begun to have children early and at a rapid pace, and they apparently knew their final number of children would be greater than their ideal. Among the types acting according to a plan, the prevented families apparently represented those who knew, already when their marriage began, that they would have trouble having children and thus could assume that they would

end up with less than their desired number of children. Among the corrected ideal types and the congruent ideal types the possibilities for later making changes in their plans were great, because as experiences with children increase and as life circumstances change, the original ideal may seem unrealistic. On the other hand, their good resources at the outset may make it possible for them to realize realistic plans.

Among the middle age group, the 25–34-year-olds, the welfare resources of those who were unsuccessful were also the weakest. On the regional welfare factor the deviation of this type from the prevented type was not significant statistically as was the difference on the family welfare factor from the realizers of corrected ideals. Wife's employment did not differentiate between the types. The life of the unsuccessful families differed from the type of realizers of corrected ideal in that they had fewer children. This result may be due to the fact that the middle group consisted of families at different phases of family building: some were just beginning, for others childbearing was nearing completion. The differences between the groups on some factors may be due to opposite scores received by families at different stages of life.

Conclusions

The picture of the formation of family size ideals in families and the resources for welfare associated with it, made by comparing the family size ideals of people at various stage of life, conformed to expectations. Among families who had completed their childbearing phase, those who had been unsuccessful in reaching their ideal differed from those who had acted according to a plan, in that their resources for welfare were weaker. The family's welfare was weaker in this type, the wife was more rarely employed and the municipality where they lived was less developed and in a more sparsely settled region than among the types who acted according to a plan and especially among the ideal-congruent or the prevented types.

The development of family size ideals over time provided above all a demonstration of how problematic it is to study the formation of ideals when cross-sectional research is used, which includes interviewees at different stages of life. Different aged women were in a different position at the time of the interview, when answering questions concerning their family size ideals. Thus the unreliability factors related to the family size ideals at different stages of life varied according to age group. When, in addition, the well-being resources demonstrate the level of well-being prevailing at the time of the interview, it was more difficult to clarify the correlation between the ideal types and the resources.

Knowledge of the development of family size ideals at the individual level nevertheless gives us information about what is necessary when examining the actual fertility behavior of families. Therefore, further attempts should be made to examine the formation of family size ideals, not by using cross-sectional studies, however, but by following the family size ideals of families at the same stage of life with intensive panel studies. Thus we could decrease the factors causing the most unreliability in family size ideals.

A p p e n d i x 1. The varimax solution of four factors of welfare variables.

	Factor					Factor				
Variable	Regional well-being	Life stage	Wife's employment	Family's well-being		Regional well-being	Life stage	Wife's employment	Family's well-being	
	1	2	3	4	xxxx	1	2	3	4	xxxx
	19–24-olds					25–34-olds				
1.	−.50	.05	−.03	0.17	.28	.02	−.50	.16	.19	.31
2.	−.67	.16	.07	.11	.49	.02	−.62	.09	.25	.46
3.	.92	.22	−.02	.08	.89	−.02	.86	−.06	−.34	.86
4.	−.93	.21	.01	−.06	.92	.03	−.88	.06	.34	.90
5.	.79	−.27	−.06	.04	.71	−.02	.74	−.10	−.38	.71
6.	−.91	.19	.01	.02	.87	.02	−.85	.14	.34	.85
7.	−.17	.25	.17	−.45	.32	−.18	−.08	−.33	.49	.38
8.	−.22	.19	.10	.35	.22	−.05	−.10	.47	.14	.25
9.	−.16	.30	.10	.24	.18	.02	−.13	.28	.15	.12
10.	.07	.36	−.84	.01	.85	.79	.09	−.14	.28	.72
11.	−.02	.41	−.07	.37	.31	.14	.05	.65	.28	.52
12.	−.07	.11	−.01	.37	.15	.02	−.16	.62	.09	.41
13.	.21	−.16	.13	−.21	.13	−.09	.21	−.28	−.09	.14
14.	.06	−.60	−.20	−.39	.55	−.05	−.02	−.70	−.40	.66
15.	−.00	.69	.00	.00	.47	.00	−.00	.00	.63	.40
16.	.05	.58	.20	−.08	.38	−.29	.15	.09	.58	.45
17.										
18.	.24	.00	.01	−.14	.08	−.01	.25	−.12	−.11	.09
19.	.31	−.11	−.04	.20	.15	.01	.31	.06	−.24	.16
20.	−.03	−.07	.63	−.16	.43	−.61	.13	−.31	−.16	.52
21.	.04	−.48	.80	.01	.88	−.76	.04	−.07	−.47	.80
22.	.04	−.16	−.16	.38	.20	.27	−.03	.21	−.31	.21
23.	.12	.40	.10	.11	.20	.10	.19	.16	.22	.12
xxxx	4.12	2.35	1.95	1.16	9.65	1.80	3.78	2.07	2.40	10.04

Variables used in the analysis

1. Distance between municipal center and Helsinki (in kilometres)
2. Distance between municipal center and regional center (in km)
3. Population density in municipality (degree of urbanization in percent)
4. Proportion employed in primary production (in percent)
5. Proportion employed in tertiary production (in percent)
6. Standard of living (low value high standard of living)
7. Size of current dwelling (in sq.m.)
8. Occupational prestige of wife's father (low value high occupational prestige)
9. Number of children of wife's mother
10. Current employment (0 = economically active, 1 = economically inactive)
11. Wife's prestige of occupation (small value, good prestige of occupation, see Rauhala: Suomalaisen yhteiskunnan sosiaalinen kerrostuneisuus, Helsinki 1966)
12. Husband's prestige of occupation (as above)

	Factor					Factor				
Vari-able	Regional well-being	Life stage	Wife's employ-ment	Family's well-being	xxxx	Regional well-being	Life stage	Wife's employ-ment	Family's well-being	xxxx
	1	2	3	4	xxxx	1	2	3	4	xxxx
	35–45-olds					19–45-olds				
1.	−.43	.11	.07	.31	.30	.16	.18	−.49	−.01	.30
2.	−.58	.03	.03	.35	.46	.09	.24	−.63	−.01	.46
3.	.83	−.01	.07	−.42	.86	−.06	−.35	.86	.05	.87
4.	−.84	.02	−.06	.42	.90	.06	.35	−.88	−.05	.90
5.	.75	−.05	.05	−.39	.71	−.09	−.33	.77	.05	.71
6.	−.80	.09	−.02	.44	.85	.13	.33	−.85	−.04	.85
7.	−.01	−.51	.04	.26	.33	−.38	.44	−.06	.12	.36
8.	−.03	.46	.04	.16	.24	.47	.16	−.08	.05	.25
9.	−.05	.28	.07	.21	.13	.29	.19	−.10	.02	.13
10.	.07	−.01	−.72	.07	.52	−.07	.08	.06	−.80	.65
11.	.12	.65	−.09	.24	.50	.66	.18	.05	−.17	.49
12.	−.22	.69	−.03	.09	.53	.64	.06	−.16	−.05	.44
13.	.27	−.34	.15	−.12	.22	−.29	−.14	.21	.11	.16
14.	−.08	−.62	.08	−.48	.62	−.67	−.36	−.00	.11	.60
15.	−.00	.00	−.00	.51	.26	.00	.64	−.00	−.00	.41
16.	.18	.12	.14	.48	.29	.02	.84	.21	.30	.84
17.						−.11	.80	.20	.33	.79
18.	.23	−.11	.05	−.20	.11	−.11	−.23	.21	−.02	.11
19.	.35	.05	.17	−.30	.25	.05	−.31	.32	.06	.21
20.	.22	−.50	.45	−.17	.53	−.38	−.06	.15	.57	.50
21.	.15	−.18	.71	−.39	.70	−.13	−.30	.12	.80	.77
22.	.02	.20	−.04	−.24	.10	.20	−.41	−.02	−.19	.25
23.	.30	−.05	−.09	.29	.19	.11	.16	.17	−.14	.09
xxxx	3.63	2.31	1.34	2.30	9.58	2.14	3.19	3.85	1.95	11.13

13. How well equipped current dwelling is (high value good equipment level)
14. Wife's education (number of years of education)
15. Number of existing children
16. Duration of marriage
17. Wife's age
18. Socioeconomic position of wife's father (0 = farmers on own-account, 1 = other)
19. Husband's socioeconomic position (as above)
20. Family's net total income (marks per month)
21. Wife's net monthly income
22. Ownership of dwelling (0 = owner occupied dwelling, 1 = other)
23. Difference between husband's and wife's education (difference between the number of years of education)
24. Sum of squares

A p p e n d i x 2. Factor scores of ideal types formed on the basis of family size ideals in three different stages of life in factor analyses made according to age group and using welfare variables. The column concerning the wives who did not answer to all questions concerning the ideals is not included.

Factor	Congruent with ideal	Realizers of corrected ideal	Prevented from reaching ideal	Unsuccessful in reaching ideal	Significance	
	1.	2.	3.	4.	1)	2)
19–24-year-olds						
Regional welfare	509	512	511	469	1/6	4/1 x
SD	94	108	95	114		
Life						2/1 xx
stage	469	519	471	533	4/6	3/2 x
SD	93	113	82	83		4/1 xxx
						4/3 xxx
Family welfare	493	482	478	523	1/6	4/2 x
SD	96	101	128	91		
Wife's employment	498	494	484	475	–	
SD	103	100	121	100		
N	167	42	31	48		
25–34-year olds						
Regional welfare	505	503	509	493	–	
SD	96	101	96	104		
Life						2/1 xxx
stage	468	512	466	506	4/6	3/2 xxx
SD	92	111	90	94		4/1 xxx
						4/2 xxx
Family welfare	494	483	488	502	1/6	4/2 x
SD	98	105	120	98		
Wife's employment	502	502	501	500	–	
SD	97	102	101	98		
N	527	300	171	235		
35–45-year olds						
Regional welfare	512	503	511	485	2/6	4/1 xx
						4/3 xx
SD	97	101	92	106		
Life						2/1 xxx
stage	471	498	461	533	5/6	3/2 xxx
SD	89	98	90	91		4/1 xxx
						4/2 xxx
						4/3 xxx
Family welfare	483	477	488	520	3/6	4/1 xxx
SD	105	110	108	95		4/2 xxx
						4/3 xxx
Wife's employment	501	507	502	497	–	
SD	105	107	110	87		
N	255	225	265	161		

1) The column 1 denotes the proportion of the significant differences between all possible differences.
2) Column 2 denotes the level of significance between the groups.

References

Braybrooke, David and Lindblom, Charles, E. (1963). A strategy of decision. New York.

Camhis, Marios (1979). Planning theory and philosophy. London.

Chamberlain, Audrey (1976). Planning versus fatalism. Journal of Biosocial Science 8: 1–16.

Freedman, Ronald and Whelpton, P. K. (1952). The relationship of general planning to fertility planning and fertility rates. In: Social and psychological factors affecting fertility. Volume III, pp. 549–571. Milbank Memorial Fund, New York.

Helminen, Ilmari (1978). Valikoitumisesta Helsingin yliopiston valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan jatko-opintoihin. Helsinki.

Lightbourne, Robert and Macdonald, Alphonse, L. (1982). Family size preferences. World Fertility Survey Comparative Studies, No. 14.

Morgan, S. Philip (1981). Intention and uncertainty at later stages of childbearing: The United States 1965 and 1970. Demography 18 (3): 267–285.

Rauhala, Urho (1966). Suomalaisen yhteiskunnan sosiaalinen kerrostuneisuus. Helsinki.

Riihinen, Olavi (1965). Teollistuvan yhteiskunnan alueellinen erilaistuneisuus. Kuopio.

— (1983). Näkökohtia hyvinvoinnin ja lapsiluvun välisistä yhteyksistä. Tutkielma nro 48. Helsingin yliopisto, Sosiaalipolitiikan laitos.

Ryder, Norman, B. (1973). A critique of the National Fertility Study. Demography 10 (4): 495–506.