PN-AAH-254

'ation Institute, no. 32

The value of children in Asia and the United States: comparative perspectives

Agency for International Development
Library
Room 1656 NS
Washington, D.C. 20523

EAST-WEST CENTER
HONOLULU HAWAII

THE EAST-WEST CENTER is a national educational institution established in Hawaii by the United States Congress in 1960. Formally known as "The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West," the federally-funded Center is administered in cooperation with the University of Hawaii. Its mandated goal is "to promote better relations between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research."

Each year about 2,000 men and women from the United States and some 40 countries in the Asian–Pacific area exchange ideas and cultural insights in East-West Center programs. Working and studying with a multinational Center staff on problems of mutual East-West concern, participants include students, mainly at the graduate level; Senior Fellows and Fellows with research expertise or practical experience in such fields as government, business administration, or communication; mid-career professionals in nondegree study and training programs at the teaching and management levels; and authorities invited for international conferences and seminars. These participants are supported by federal scholarships and grants, supplemented in some fields by contributions from Asian and Pacific governments and from private foundations.

A fundamental aim of all East-West Center programs is to foster understanding and mutual respect among people from differing cultures working together in seeking solutions to common problems. The Center draws on the resources of U.S. mainland universities and Asian–Pacific educational and governmental institutions, as well as organizations in the multicultural State of Hawaii.

Center programs are conducted by the East-West Communication Institute, the East-West Culture Learning Institute, the East-West Food Institute, the East-West Population Institute, and the East-West Technology and Development Institute. Open Grants are awarded to provide scope for educational and research innovation, including emphasis on the humanities and the arts.

THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE, established as a unit of the East-West Center in 1969 with the assistance of a grant from the Agency for International Development, carries out multidisciplinary research, training, and related activities in the field of population, placing emphasis on economic, social, psychological, and environmental aspects of population problems in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States.

Director *Lee-Jay Cho*

Publications Officer *Sandra Ward*
Publications Assistant *Elizabeth Gould*

East-West Center, 1777 East-West Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

The value of children in Asia and the United States: comparative perspectives

by James T. Fawcett
Fred Arnold
Rodolfo A. Bulatao
Chalio Buripakdi
Betty Jamie Chung
Toshio Iritani
Sung Jin Lee
Tsong-Shien Wu

Number 32 • July 1974

PAPERS OF THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE

JAMES T. FAWCETT is Regional Representative in Singapore for the Demographic Division of the Population Council and a Consultant to the East-West Population Institute.

FRED ARNOLD is a Research Associate of the East-West Population Institute and Resident Demographer at the National Statistical Office, Bangkok, Thailand.

RODOLFO A. BULATAO is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of the Philippines.

CHALIO BURIPAKDI is Researcher and Planner, Ministry of Education, Thailand.

BETTY JAMIE CHUNG is a former Research Specialist, Social Research Centre, Chinese University of Hong Kong, and currently a Fellow at the East-West Population Institute.

TOSHIO IRITANI is Professor of Social Psychology at Tokai University, Japan.

SUNG JIN LEE is Director of the Korean Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences and Associate Professor of Psychology, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea.

TSONG-SHIEN WU is Professor and Chairman, Department of Agricultural Extension, College of Agriculture, National Taiwan University, Republic of China.

CONTENTS

Preface *vii*

Abstract *1*

Introduction *1*

Population issues and the value of children *2*

A social-psychological view *4*

The Value of Children Project *8*

The value of children and population policies *18*

Appendix *23*

References *69*

INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Preceding page blank

TABLES AND EXHIBIT

Tables

1 Characteristics of samples: number in sample, education, age, years of marriage, and number of living children, by country and socioeconomic group *10*

A1 Advantages of having children: percentage of respondents who mentioned at least one advantage under each of specified major code categories, by socioeconomic group and country *28*

A2 Disadvantages of having children: percentage of respondents who mentioned at least one disadvantage under each of specified major code categories, by socioeconomic group and country *30*

A3 Advantages of having children: percentage of respondents who assigned first ranking to each of specified major code categories, by socioeconomic group and country *32*

A4 Disadvantages of having children: percentage of respondents who assigned first ranking to each of specified major code categories, by socioeconomic group and country *34*

A5 Advantages of having children: five most frequently mentioned advantages ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *36*

A6 Disadvantages of having children: five most frequently mentioned disadvantages ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *39*

A7 Reasons why people in general want children: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *42*

A8 Rank order of six value-of-children attitude scales, by socioeconomic group and country: mean scores *45*

A9 Reasons for wanting another child: percentage of respondents rating specified reasons as very important, by socioeconomic group and country *48*

Tables, *continued*

A10 Reasons for not wanting another child: percentage of respondents rating specified reasons as very important, by socioeconomic group and country *51*

A11 Reasons for not wanting fewer than desired number of children: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *53*

A12 Reasons for not wanting more than desired number of children or any more children: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *56*

A13 Reasons for wanting girls: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *60*

A14 Reasons for wanting boys: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country *63*

A15 Percentage of respondents who expect to rely on children for financial support in old age, by country and socioeconomic group *66*

A16 Index of expected economic help from children, by country and socioeconomic group *66*

A17 Percentage of respondents who believe that three children would be a heavy financial burden, by country and socioeconomic group *67*

Exhibit

A Major code categories and specific code categories used in the content analysis of responses: advantages and disadvantages of having children *25*

PREFACE

This paper is a revised and combined version of two previous presentations on the same topic: the third annual Weisz Memorial Lecture, given by James T. Fawcett at Stanford University on 29 January 1974, entitled "The Value of Children: Continuity and Change," and a paper with the same title and authorship as the present paper, prepared for the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, New York, April, 1974.

Timely support from several funding agencies made this research possible. The Ford Foundation provided support for the research in Taiwan, Japan, and Hawaii and for the coordination of the project. The International Development Research Centre of Canada provided support for the research in Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand and for one of the project workshops. The Agency for International Development, through an institutional contract with the East-West Population Institute, provided support to initiate the project and to expedite the work at various stages.

In country reports that are in preparation acknowledgment is made for assistance and consultation given in each country. In this report we will mention by name only those involved in the project as a whole, but we wish also to express a general word of thanks to those many others whom we cannot name here.

Dr. Ozzie Simmons of Ford Foundation and Drs. Walter Mertens and Alan Simmons of the International Development Research Centre have been closely involved with the project throughout, not just as representatives of funding agencies but as interested scholars. Dr. Lois Hoffman, University of Michigan, was a valuable consultant. Among the many persons at the East-West Population Institute who have supported the project technically and administratively, the following deserve special mention: Sonia Albores, Lois Bender, Robert Bloeden, Joan Choi, Ann Midkiff, Peter Norris, Ruby Ogawa, and Sandra Ward.

Thanks are due also to Dr. Paul Demeny, former Director of the East-West Population Institute, and Keith Adamson, Executive Officer and former Acting Director, both of whom have supported fully the project reported here.

ABSTRACT Findings are reported from a comparative study of the value of children that was carried out in six countries—Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of China (Taiwan), the Philippines, Thailand, and the United States (Hawaii). For each country, results are presented for three contrasting socioeconomic groups: urban middle class, urban lower class, and rural. These results are based upon interviews with young husbands and wives with at least one child; about 360 respondents were interviewed in each of the Asian countries, 557 in Hawaii to permit comparison of Caucasian, Japanese, and Filipino ethnic groups.

The value of children is defined as having two basic dimensions: positive values or satisfactions, and negative values or costs. In this study, the economic, social, and psychological components of the satisfactions and costs of children are analyzed. Cultural and socioeconomic differences in the value of children are described and the implications of these findings for population policies are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The value of children is at once simple and complex; obvious and surprising; changing and timeless. Some of the ways in which children are valued by parents are universal, while other ways are specific to cultures, social groups, or individuals. For many parents, children serve to preserve and perpetuate tradition; for other parents, children are the agents of change, pointing the way toward different life styles and a new social order. Children may be valued for themselves, as intrinsically precious beings, or they may be valued as a means to an end, as as instrument of economic gain or as a vehicle to carry on the parent's name or identity. Some children are wanted, others are not; some are loved and protected and even spoiled, while others are exploited and even abused.

How can the value of children be assessed? It cannot be measured only in dollars or pesos or yen, although the financial costs and benefits of children are an important part of their value. The exchange of affection between parent and child is also important, as are the emotional stresses of childrearing, but these are difficult to assess. And what of such subtle matters as confirmation of one's sex role through having children? It might be argued that, rather than dealing with these psychological components, the best way to measure the value of

children would be to count the number of them that a parent has or wants. That can hardly be a valid procedure, however, if contraception is imperfect or if value can be expressed through quality rather than quantity.

Despite these complexities and difficulties, research on the value of children is needed to understand better the determinants of human fertility and to suggest guidelines for policies through which societies may bring about regulation of fertility. This assertion is elaborated upon below, after which the concept of "the value of children" is defined, some findings from a cross-cultural study of the value of children are presented, and the policy implications of these findings are discussed.

POPULATION ISSUES AND THE VALUE OF CHILDREN

In a finite world population growth must eventually cease. The only legitimate questions are how and when population stabilization will occur. The question of "how" has three components: births, deaths, and migration. For a particular locality, the growth rate can be reduced through fewer births, more deaths, or movements of people to other localities. The last alternative, migration, has no effect on growth from a global perspective and only slight effects for most nations because of legal restrictions on international migration.[1] An increase in deaths to reduce population growth is an alternative that few people would favor. It is a reduction in births, then, that must be the aim; this is the "how" of population stabilization.

The question of "when" population should stabilize is much more complex and allows no definitive answers. There is no consenses on an "optimal" population level, although most experts would agree that optimal levels will be exceeded in many countries by the end of this century if current growth rates continue. If that position is adopted as a standard, then the "when" of population stabilization is "soon," in historical perspective; moreover, a reduction in births is needed now, because even when birth rates are reduced to replacement levels the size of a population continues to grow for some time. For example, Frejka (1968) has shown that the population of the United States would increase by 37 percent over the next 70 years even if replacement-level births (2.1 per woman) were achieved immediately and continued indefinitely.

---

1 For present purposes migration is considered only in relation to population growth. The distribution of population, especially in relation to urbanization, is of course a major problem in its own right.

It is perhaps obvious in this context why it seems important to study the value of children. Knowledge of this topic will help us to understand why people want children, and why they choose to have children over available alternatives. Research on the value of children can provide information about the factors influencing the decisions of couples to have a certain number of children, decisions which, in the aggregate, add up to a "population problem."

Demographers and economists have for some time been interested in the effects of the value of children on fertility, but their interest has been expressed more in theory than in empirical research. Before presenting a psychological approach and related research findings, we will briefly describe demographic and economic perspectives on the value of children.

The demographic transition describes an important change over time in a society, from high mortality and high fertility to low mortality and low fertility. Most demographic explanations of this transition concentrate on societal-level variables, such as urbanization or, more generally, socioeconomic modernization. These explanations are supported by correlational data.

When demographers attempt a micro-level explanation of the transition, the changing value of children is often cited as a basic causal element. Specifically, it is noted that in a more modern society children cost more economically, because of such factors as higher educational requirements, and they provide fewer economic benefits, because of such factors as child labor laws and the reduced availability of productive roles in family farms or businesses. It is also postulated that more educated, modern parents are increasingly aware of attractive alternatives, such as leisure activities or consumer goods; in addition, the care of children is viewed as more of a burden for nuclear families in urban settings than for extended families in rural settings. It is thought also that the relative isolation of nuclear families may reduce pronatalist pressures from the older generation. Through a variety of mechanisms, then, it appears that social change should bring about changes in the way children are valued by parents, resulting in actions taken by parents to restrict family size.

Economists have approached this topic in a more systematic way, initially by regarding childbearing as similar to the purchase of goods, and applying the framework of household consumer choices. In this approach, decisions about having children are made on the basis of anticipated costs weighed against resources, within the context of preferences applied to children and to alternatives. In bare outline, the

economic theory seems too simple and mechanistic to be applied to the complexities of sexual behavior, contraception, and children as living, growing, interacting beings. In fact, however, elaborations of the theory in recent years have expanded the basic economic dimensions and moved toward a broad, behaviorally-oriented theory of human fertility decisions. For present purposes, it is sufficient to note that the core of the theory is, indeed, the value of children, as perceived by parents. The basic postulate of the theory is that parents will make decisions about whether to have children based on their expectations about the utility to be derived from children, in relation to perceived alternatives.

The demographic and economic approaches have in common that they treat the value of children as a basic causal element in the determination of societal fertility. This common focus is hardly surprising, since children are after all the tangible outcome for parents of the births that are counted by demographers. What is surprising, though, is that this consensus on the importance of the value of children has led to so little research. We have no systematic knowledge about the value of children to parents, or at least have not had such knowledge until recently. (For current reviews of work in this area, see Fawcett, ed., 1972; Schultz, ed., 1973.) In the sections that follow, a social-psychological approach that encompasses demographic and economic perspectives is presented, and illustrative research findings are discussed.

A SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEW

The value of children may be viewed functionally, from the perspective of parents, and the functions served can operate at different levels of conceptualization. In the framework of the psychology of individuals, the functional approach would be reflected in the question: What are the needs of individual parents that are fulfilled by having children? Or, if childbearing is viewed as a social phenomenon, the question may be cast in social-psychological terms: From the perspective of parents, what are the functions—social, economic, and psychological—that are served by having children?

The phrase "the value of children" appears to emphasize the positive functions, or the satisfactions, of having children. It must be recognized, however, that dysfunctions or costs are also involved. The reality of childbearing is that one cannot have the satisfactions without also incurring some costs. Thus, two basic dimensions are involved: positive values or satisfactions, and negative values or costs. Concep-

tually, the value of children refers to the net balance between these opposing forces. For research and policy purposes, however, it is desirable to examine the diverse components of satisfactions and costs, rather than to seek a single index of the value of children.

A useful set of categories has been provided by Hoffman and Hoffman (1973). Their essay analyzes and systematically describes the positive functions served by children, within a psychological framework. (See also Berelson, n.d.) The Hoffmans developed nine types of values that are intended to cover comprehensively the social and psychological needs met by having children:

1 Adult status and social identity (woman's major role)

2 Expansion of the self, tie to a larger entity, "immortality"

3 Morality: religions; altruism, good of the group; norms regarding sexuality, impulsivity, virtue

4 Primary group ties, affection

5 Stimulation, novelty, fun

6 Achievement, competence, creativity

7 Power, influence, effectance

8 Social comparison, competition

9 Economic utility.

In the total scheme developed by the Hoffmans, the nine values are part of a larger framework that takes into account the costs of children, alternatives to children for fulfilling these values, and societal barriers and facilitators affecting realization of the values. The Hoffmans' work was very influential in the development of the cross-cultural research described below; as a result of that research, however, a different set of positive and negative values that fits rather closely with the empirical findings has been developed:

POSITIVE VALUES

1 *Emotional benefits.* Happiness, love, companionship and fun; also viewed in reverse as relief from strain, avoidance of boredom or loneliness.

2 *Economic benefits and security.* Benefits are derived from children's help in the house, business, or farm, from care of siblings, and from sharing of income; old-age security for the parents, including psychological security, is often a distinctive aspect of this value.

3 *Self-enrichment and development.* Learning from the experience of childrearing; becoming more responsible and mature; incentive and goals in life; being viewed as an adult, a grown woman or man; self-fulfillment; feeling of competence as a parent.

4 *Identification with children.* Pleasure from watching growth and development of children; pride in children's accomplishments; reflection of self in children.

5 *Family cohesiveness and continuity.* Children as a bond between husband and wife; fulfillment of marriage; completeness of family life; continuity of family name and traditions; to produce heirs; to have future grandchildren.

NEGATIVE VALUES

1 *Emotional costs.* General emotional strain; concern about discipline and moral behavior of children; worry over health; noise and disorder in household; children as nuisance.

2 *Economic costs.* Expenses of childrearing; educational costs.

3 *Restrictions or opportunity costs.* Lack of flexibility and freedom; restrictions on social life, recreation, travel; lack of privacy; restrictions on career or occupational mobility; no time for personal needs and desires.

4 *Physical demands.* Extra housework; caring for children; loss of sleep; general weariness.

5 *Family costs.* Less time with spouse; disagreements over rearing of children; loss of spouse's affection.

These ten broad categories seem to represent fairly well the way people in a variety of cultural settings think about the satisfactions and costs of children. They do not of course represent the total sphere of motivations for and against childbearing. Biological drives or maternal needs are not represented, for instance, and these empirically-derived categories encompass mainly conscious, admissible reasons for wanting and not wanting children. The deeper, less verbalizable motivations stressed by psychoanalysts do not appear here, nor do some of the socially less desirable motivations, such as proof of sexual potency or the need to dominate others. Moreover, these categories pertain

especially to reasons for wanting children, in the context of children versus no children. When values related to family size or reasons for wanting another child are considered, at least the following categories should be added:

LARGE-FAMILY VALUES

1 *Sibling relationships.* Desire for another child to provide companionship for existing children; to enrich the lives of children; to avoid an only child.

2 *Sex preferences.* Specific desire for a son or daughter; desire for a certain combination of sexes among children.

3 *Child survival.* Concern that existing children may die; need for more children to have enough survive to adulthood.

SMALL-FAMILY VALUES

1 *Maternal health.* Concern that too many pregnancies, or pregnancy beyond a certain age, is bad for the mother's health.

2 *Societal costs.* Concern about overpopulation, that another child would be a burden to society.

The 15 categories described above encompass most of the descriptive findings from a recent comparative study carried out in Asia and the United States. The research was not designed to test a formal model, but to provide basic knowledge about how people in different cultures perceive the satisfactions and costs of children. Implicit in the research, however, is a conceptual scheme in which the value-of-children dimensions are seen as a set of variables that intervene between background factors, situational variables, and general psychological orientations on the one hand, and fertility attitudes and behavior on the other. This conceptual scheme is tested through multivariate analyses in the project report (Arnold et al., 1974) but will not be discussed in detail here. It should be noted, however, that multivariate analyses do reveal that the value-of-children dimensions have a substantial predictive effect, independent of background and situational factors, on such fertility variables as desired and ideal family size.

THE VALUE OF CHILDREN PROJECT

The research that provided a basis for deriving the 15 categories given above was a cross-national exploratory study, carried out over the past two years by cooperating social scientists in six countries—Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, the Republic of China (Taiwan), Thailand, and the United States (Hawaii). The research was a collaborative effort from the outset, with all co-investigators participating in the design of the study and the construction and pre-testing of the questionnaire, as well as in data collection and analysis.

In each country, comparable data were collected from young couples having at least one child. Husband and wife were interviewed separately. Country samples consisting of three contrasting groups were studied: urban middle class, urban lower class, and rural. About 60 couples were interviewed in each group, giving a sample of about 360 respondents in each country. In Hawaii a somewhat larger sample was chosen to facilitate ethnic comparisons among Caucasian, Japanese, and Filipino parents. Table 1 summarizes the basic characteristics of the samples in the six countries. Altogether, more than 2,500 respondents were interviewed in this exploratory study. The interview itself was intensive and multifaceted; it took about one and a half hours to complete, on the average, and about half of that time was devoted to various measures of the value of children.

Because the samples are not strictly representative of the national populations from which they are drawn and because the three equal-size subsamples do not reflect the proportions of those groups represented in the populations of the various countries, the results for subgroups cannot be combined to give results for any country as a whole. Rather, the analytic approach used here is to compare similar socioeconomic groups across countries, then to look at the patterns that emerge for each of the three groups. Since the socioeconomic groups were sampled by similar criteria in each country, and because the study is regarded as exploratory, this seems to be a reasonable approach. Primary attention is given in this paper to describing and interpreting the value-of-children dimensions, since that is the main focus of the exploratory study.

Open-ended questions were relied upon heavily in the study to elicit the dimensions of the value of children that were salient to respondents in the six countries. Structured questions developed on the basis of pre-test experience were also used, so that results from different types of questions could be compared. It should be noted, however, that to avoid excessive redundancy in the interview, the questionnaire

was designed so that the context as well as the format varies for different questions. For example, an open-ended question asks about advantages and disadvantages of having children, compared with not having children; a structured set of items asks about reasons for wanting another child; a set of attitude items asks about the degree of importance of various values associated with children. Each of these questions gives a slightly different perspective on the value of children. Moreover, similarities in the pattern of responses to different questions enhance confidence in the validity of the results especially when similarities are shown also in comparisons across countries. The data presented here are organized to facilitate such comparisons.

Each of the tables presenting the descriptive results from the study has three components: the pertinent dimension of the value of children; the three subgroups that were sampled in each country (urban middle class, urban lower class, and rural); and, within subgroups, the six countries. In the case of Hawaii, separate results are shown for Caucasian, Japanese, and Filipino respondents.

Because the results discussed below are derived from the total set of data and cannot be easily keyed to specific tables, the tables are presented together in an appendix which discusses the sources of the data. As a guide, however, it may be mentioned that Tables A1, A3, A5, A7, and A8 deal with the general advantages of children; Tables A2, A4, and A6 concern general disadvantages; Tables A9, A10, A11, and A12 deal with values related to family size or having another child; Tables A13 and A14 pertain to preferences for sex of children; and Tables A15, A16, and A17 relate specifically to economic costs and benefits of children.

General Observations

The diversity of both satisfactions and costs is striking. The cross-national data confirm the commonsense notion that children, who are complex, growing, interacting beings, fulfill many needs of parents but also create many difficulties in parents' lives. It is important to note that most parents in all six countries are quite aware of these conflicting aspects of having children and are able to articulate them, at least to some extent.

With respect to the three broad categories of satisfactions and costs—psychological, economic, and social—the data show that each emerges as important in its own right.

1 Psychological or *emotional benefits*, such as happiness and companionship, have very high salience generally and are

TABLE 1 Characteristics of samples: number in sample, education, age, years of marriage, and number of living children, by country and socioeconomic group

Country and characteristic	Urban middle		Urban low		Rural		All groups	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Korea								
(Number in sample)	(120)		(132)		(126)		(378)	
Education[a]	15.4	1.4	8.1	3.4	6.3	3.4	9.8	4.9
Age	33.3	3.8	31.8	4.6	31.9	4.6	32.3	4.4
Years of marriage	6.6	2.5	7.3	3.9	9.2	4.2	7.7	3.8
Living children	2.5	0.8	2.7	1.1	3.4	1.4	2.8	1.2
Taiwan								
(Number in sample)	(144)		(144)		(144)		(432)	
Education[a]	12.2	3.4	6.0	2.0	4.7	3.1	7.6	4.4
Age	30.2	5.5	30.3	5.0	28.8	4.2	29.8	4.9
Years of marriage	5.3	3.0	6.9	3.7	7.8	4.5	6.7	3.9
Living children	2.2	1.1	2.9	1.1	2.8	1.2	2.6	1.2
Japan								
(Number in sample)	(136)		(134)		(142)		(412)	
Education[a]	12.3	2.4	11.5	2.3	10.6	1.6	11.4	2.2
Age	32.6	4.5	30.4	4.4	31.8	3.4	31.6	4.2
Years of marriage	7.2	3.1	5.7	3.7	8.2	3.8	7.1	3.7
Living children	2.0	0.7	1.6	0.7	2.0	0.6	1.9	0.7
U.S. (Hawaii)								
Japanese								
(Number in sample)	(98)		(76)		(0)		([b])	
Education[a]	13.6	1.8	12.3	1.3	na	na	b	b
Age	30.8	4.5	29.3	4.9	na	na	b	b
Years of marriage	6.6	3.6	7.4	4.2	na	na	b	b
Living children	2.0	1.4	2.0	1.0	na	na	b	b

Caucasian								
(Number in sample)	(95)		(87)		(0)		(557[b])	
Education[a]	13.4	1.8	11.7	1.5	na	na	11.7[b]	3.1[b]
Age	29.4	3.6	28.8	4.7	na	na	30.1[b]	4.9[b]
Years of marriage	7.6	2.9	7.1	4.5	na	na	7.5[b]	4.4[b]
Living children	2.0	1.0	2.5	1.7	na	na	2.3[b]	1.5[b]
Filipino								
(Number in sample)	(0)		(126)		(84)		([b])	
Education[a]	na	na	10.7	3.1	7.0	2.8	[b]	[b]
Age	na	na	30.6	4.6	33.6	5.7	[b]	[b]
Years of marriage	na	na	6.9	4.8	11.1	5.2	[b]	[b]
Living children	na	na	2.4	1.5	3.2	2.0	[b]	[b]
Philippines								
(Number in sample)	(136)		(126)		(127)		(389)	
Education[a]	12.6	3.5	9.9	3.6	7.0	3.6	9.9	4.2
Age	30.2	5.1	30.5	5.5	31.4	5.7	30.7	5.5
Years of marriage	6.6	4.8	7.9	4.3	8.3	4.9	7.6	4.7
Living children	3.0	1.9	3.4	1.9	3.3	1.9	3.2	1.9
Thailand								
(Number in sample)	(120)		(120)		(120)		(360)	
Education[a]	13.8	3.2	5.6	3.6	4.2	2.0	7.9	5.2
Age	34.0	4.7	28.6	5.2	31.8	6.1	31.6	5.8
Years of marriage	6.8	3.8	7.5	4.2	9.4	4.8	7.8	4.4
Living children	2.2	1.2	2.8	1.6	3.3	1.5	2.8	1.5

na—not applicable because subsample did not include persons in this socioeconomic group.

a Years of formal education.

b Figure for Caucasian includes Filipino and Japanese.

particularly strong for certain economic and cultural groups; *emotional costs* are also salient but they show less differentiation across groups.

2 Perceptions of *economic benefits* from children are shown to be clearly related to the socioeconomic setting of the family, with strong urban-rural contrasts, while *economic costs* of children are shown to be a potent influence overall but not related so strongly or so simply to the setting.

3 *Social benefits* pertain mainly to the welfare and integration of the family unit, rather than to larger social aggregates, and vary by both culture and socioeconomic group; *social costs* pertain especially to restrictions on interactions with persons other than children, including both the spouse and others outside the family, and are most salient for urban respondents.

Different sets of values emerge in the context of different types of questions. When asked about the advantages and disadvantages of having children, parents tend to cite personal satisfactions and costs--that is, they describe the ways in which children either fulfill or interfere with the needs of the parents themselves. When respondents are asked about advantages and disadvantages in relation to number of children, the concern shifts to the children or to the family unit--i.e., responses pertain to sibling relationships, rearing of children, and providing for children. In questions about the advantages and disadvantages of sons and daughters, both personal and familial motivations emerge and strong differences are shown in reasons for wanting sons and daughters. These sets of values each show some relationship to family size and they are of course related to each other.

While the results from different countries are far from identical, some striking cross-cultural similarities are shown in the data. These similarities seem especially impressive in the responses to open-ended questions, where instrument or measurement influences are minimized. Similarities are naturally to be expected in studying aspects of human behavior that have intrinsic uniformities, as is true for childbearing and childrearing. Nonetheless, the limited appearance of culturally distinct values in our data is surprising.

On the other hand, the relationships among value-of-children variables and other variables do vary considerably across countries, in nature and in degree. Perhaps it is in these patterns that cultural influences assert themselves. Such patterns are shown most clearly in

correlational analyses that are contained in the project report but not included in this paper.

The analyses show that husbands and wives share a broadly similar orientation toward children. For that reason we have adopted for this report the simplification of presenting results only by socioeconomic group and not by sex of respondent. Some specific sex differences are noted below, however.

In the paragraphs that follow, a composite profile of the three socioeconomic groups is drawn, based on all of the available data. The profile reveals the main findings of the study but necessarily obscures some important differences among groups. Following the generalizations significant exceptions are pointed out, but the appendix tables themselves should be consulted for a more complete picture.

Satisfactions

In the *urban middle-class group,* psychological or emotional advantages of having children are emphasized. These include happiness for the individual parent or the family, a feeling of personal growth and development of the parent that is associated with childrearing, and pleasure in the companionship and fun provided by children. Values related to specific aspects of family life, such as continuity of the family name and a strengthening of the bond between husband and wife, are shown to be important for the middle class in some countries but not in others. Economic benefits of children are not generally salient for middle-class respondents.

When middle-class respondents describe reasons why other people want children, rather than their own reasons, two interesting differences occur: continuity of family name emerges as the most important reason in Korea and Taiwan, and in four countries respondents frequently mention that it is "instinctive" or "natural" to have children.

Daughters are wanted mainly for psychological reasons, especially as companions for the mother and because of their positive personality or behavioral qualities. Sons are wanted mainly for continuity of family name everywhere but in Japan. Middle-class respondents also see psychological advantages of having sons similar to those of having daughters, but when sons are discussed there is an increase in responses pertaining to economic or practical benefits.

With respect to reasons given as important for wanting another child, the pattern of strong emotional-psychological values and weak economic motivations among the middle class is generally maintained, and continuity of family name and sex preference are also shown as

important. Values related to the respondent's desired family size include providing companionship for other children or avoiding an only child, as well as sex preference or a desire for balance between sexes. A common response for the middle class in four countries is "can afford that number or am able to raise that number," which may suggest that overt, rational planning of family size in relation to family resources is more common for this group.

Urban lower-class respondents, like those of the middle class, stress psychological or emotional benefits provided by children, but there is an increase of economic motivations for this group and some evidence of a stronger orientation toward continuity of family name. The differences in economic dimensions and family continuity show up more clearly in the reasons for wanting sons and daughters than in the general advantages. Similar to the middle class, the lower-class respondents attribute strongly to others the motivation of continuity of family name and also that it is "instinctive" or "natural" to have children.

In reasons for wanting another child, the similarity between urban middle-class and urban lower-class respondents is again shown on many dimensions, but with the same increased emphasis in the lower class on economic benefits and family continuity. Concerning motivations related to family size, the lower class is distinguished from the middle class mainly by an increase in the specific desire for more boys.

For the *rural group,* the economic utility of children comes to the fore, with respect to both current economic contributions and security in the parents' old age. This emphasis shows up in a variety of items: the general advantages of having children, the reasons for wanting both sons and daughters, the perceived motivations of others for having children, the reasons for wanting another child, and in responses to specific questions on old-age support. Economic motivations are thus most salient for the rural group, somewhat less so for the urban lower class, and least salient for the middle class. The "traditional" value of family continuity shows this same trend, again reflected in responses to several types of questions, including the attitude scale labeled "continuity, tradition, security."

Emotional benefits remain salient to rural respondents in all countries, but their significance diminishes both in relation to other benefits and by absolute frequency of mention. This does not mean, of course, that rural parents do not enjoy their children; it does seem to suggest that, given their socioeconomic setting, the emotional benefits of children are much less important than the economic benefits. It is of interest that a particular type of psychological benefit emerges as

important for rural respondents in three East Asian countries: "pride in children's accomplishments" and "children to carry out the parents' hopes and aspirations." Perhaps these rural parents are especially frustrated by their own life circumstances and hope for better for their children.

Costs

Financial costs are very salient even to the more affluent *middle class.* This finding presumably reflects their desire for children of high "quality" at a greater cost per child, as well as the generally higher costs of raising children in an urban setting. While the level of concern about financial costs tends to be somewhat lower for the middle class than for other socioeconomic groups, the importance of financial considerations in relation to other costs is shown clearly in middle-class responses to questions on the general disadvantages of having children, reasons for not wanting another child, reasons for limiting the family to the desired size, and the perceived financial burden of having three children.

Restrictions of various kinds, or opportunity costs, are important to middle-class respondents in all countries. In tabulations of spontaneous responses by major coding categories, restrictions show up as more salient than financial costs for middle-class respondents in all countries except the Philippines and Thailand. The relative importance of restrictions diminishes, however, in a structured item on reasons for not wanting another child, possibly because opportunity costs are significant in the decision to have children or not have children, but less so in decisions for more children after the first child has been born.

Emotional strain from rearing children and such associated factors as noise and disorder in the household show up as salient to middle-class respondents in all countries. Health problems of children and general rearing problems are also salient in most countries. In the decision to have another child, parents are also concerned about not being able to give enough care and attention to existing children. Problems of pregnancy and maternal health are cited with modest frequency by middle-class respondents as reasons for restricting family size. In Japan, housing problems are the second-most important reason for limiting the number of children, for all urban respondents.

Lower-class respondents in general show greater concern than the middle class about financial costs of raising children. In fact, in some countries the data suggest a trend toward curvilinearity, with the urban lower class more concerned about costs than either the middle class or

the rural group. This is not surprising, since the urban lower-class respondents tend to have more children and lower income than the middle class while being exposed to the same high urban cost factors, and to have higher costs and fewer benefits than the rural group.

Restrictions on alternative activities are also important to the lower class, although generally less important than for the middle class. Rearing and health problems are fairly similar across the middle and lower class, and likewise there is little difference with respect to emotional costs.

Rural respondents in all countries show a strong awareness of the financial burden of children. Although the costs of raising children should be lower in rural areas, rural respondents tend to have many children to raise on relatively low incomes. Restrictions on alternative activities of the parents are less salient in rural areas, but restrictions on work do rank as somewhat important among rural respondents in Taiwan and Thailand, and other types of restrictions are cited in Japan and by Filipinos in Hawaii.

Rural respondents in several countries mention physical work, tiredness, and emotional strain caused by children, both as a general disadvantage and as a reason for restricting family size. This pattern of responses is probably related to the greater amount of physical labor required of both husbands and wives in rural areas.

Discussion

Most striking in the profiles described above is the contrast between psychological benefits of children emphasized by the middle class and economic benefits emphasized by the rural respondents, with the urban lower class falling between. This finding may be in part a function of different styles of response related to the education of respondents, but the pervasiveness of the trend in different types of questions suggests that the three groups have genuinely different orientations toward the value of children. The difference in expected economic benefits is, of course, quite consistent with explanations of the demographic transition that have been advanced.

Results pertaining to economic costs are more complex, and this study probably has not dealt adequately with that aspect of the value of children. Among other things, better indicators of parents' aspirations for quality of children are needed to understand the effects of costs.

Opportunity costs, it appears, may not play a very significant role in determining family size, once the decision has been made to have

children. This finding seems reasonable, since the major restrictions and change in life style occur with the birth of the first child and additional children have relatively slight impact.

While a general similarity between husbands and wives in their orientations toward children was noted, some significant differences emerged. Wives, especially in urban locations, tend to emphasize more the affectional relationship with children and the companionship they provide. Expectations for economic help from children are consistently higher among wives, compared with husbands, perhaps reflecting the generally greater degree of economic dependence of women and their longer life expectancy.

Husbands are more likely than wives to stress the benefits of continuity of family name, pride in children's accomplishments, and family happiness. In general, husbands are more concerned about financial costs than are wives.

Preference for sex of children, or the desire for a balance of sexes, is a pervasive influence on family-size decisions. The desire for sons appears strongest in Taiwan and Korea.

Reasons for wanting daughters and reasons for wanting sons show strong similarities across countries, presumably reflecting certain universals in sex-role prescriptions. It appears that daughters are wanted for qualities that apply mainly when they are still children and still living with the parents, whereas sons are wanted for reasons that apply more when they have become adults—for example, continuity of family name and economic security for the parents.

The pattern of results for the Philippines differs substantially from that of the other countries. The perceived economic benefits from children are higher and are spread more evenly across socioeconomic groups in the Philippines; large numbers of children are seen as less of an economic burden; there is more emphasis on emotional gratifications from children; restrictions on parents are less important. This pattern is quite consistent with the higher fertility evident in the Philippines.

In most countries, major differences appear between all urban respondents (middle and lower socioeconomic groups combined) and rural respondents. In Thailand, a greater contrast is found between middle-class respondents and the other two groups (urban lower and rural).

Looking at the whole set of data, one is struck by the multiplicity of motives for and against childbearing. For most people, it appears that childrearing is an activity characterized by ambivalence but with

benefits clearly outweighing costs up to some number of children, at which parents try to stop having more. On the other hand, it may be that costs are simply accepted (or ignored) up to some threshold, after which costs come to play a major part in childbearing decisions. In any event, it is this issue of the numerical level at which people decide to stop having children that has special demographic significance. When and why do negative motivations come to dominate over positive motivations? Answers to this question are crucial to a complete understanding of fertility trends and to the development of effective population policies.

THE VALUE OF CHILDREN AND POPULATION POLICIES

Some people might argue that children mean the same thing to parents everywhere. They do not. The results of this cross-national study leave no doubt that perceived values of children are sensitive to changing social conditions. While there are certainly aspects of childbearing and childrearing that are universal, there are also very striking differences across social groups in the perceived advantages and disadvantages of children. People in different cultures and different socioeconomic groups want children for different reasons. Moreover, these patterns of motivations are related to the number of children wanted and therefore have an effect on societal fertility. If we can understand what forces bring about changes in the value of children, we should gain some insight into the mechanisms that lead to fertility change.

These findings serve both to confirm and to expand our notions about the demographic transition. To begin with, the results provide an empirical demonstration of the differences in children's economic utility among subgroups that differ in both socioeconomic status and fertility. Differences in perceptions of children as competing with other goods or services are also shown. These findings are related to education, income, and urbanization, and are thus quite consistent with transition theory.

Knowledge about the value of children also has implications for population policies and programs. Many population policies aim, explicitly or implicitly, to change the balance of satisfactions and costs associated with children. Baseline knowledge about the value of children permits an assessment of policy alternatives.

For example, the results of this study make it clear that there is no substitute for a child. For most people, nothing else could fulfill so many important social and psychological needs. At best, alternatives may fulfill some of the values usually satisfied by children. And it is

precisely because of this finding that research on the value of children is useful. As it becomes possible to identify more clearly the diverse values related to children, it also becomes possible to understand more precisely the effects of different policies. For example, if one looks at the satisfactions provided by children in relation to the satisfactions that can be provided by meaningful employment, it is immediately apparent that there is only a partial overlap. Employment may provide self-enrichment and economic security, but it will not assure continuity of the family name and may not afford the same type of pleasure parents derive from playing with children and watching them grow and develop. Other kinds of policies, however, might provide substitutes for some of the positive values of children that are not fulfilled by employment.

Antinatalist policies related to costs require a different framework, since the aim there is not to provide substitutes but to increase either actual costs or awareness of costs. At a general level, the relationship between the positive and negative values of children and population policies that aim to reduce fertility rates may be formulated in the following terms:

> *Positive values* that are related to fertility should be (a) disengaged from family size or associated with small family sizes, or (b) made less important, or (c) newly attached to objects or activities other than children.
>
> *Negative values* that are related to fertility should be (a) engaged more firmly with family size, or (b) made more important, or (c) made salient at earlier stages of the life cycle.

For each of these approaches, knowledge about the value of children is useful in suggesting appropriate content for educational and communications programs, as well as for indicating likely effects of social policies that operate by fiscal or regulatory mechanisms.

Ultimately, policy recommendation should be made in a country-specific context, with a view to both sociocultural factors and programmatic considerations. It would seem useful, however, to provide examples of the kinds of recommendations that might emerge from research on the value of children. A few policy and program recommendations arising from the findings of this study are presented below, with the caveat that some would apply mainly to the economically more developed societies, such as the United States and Japan, while others would be especially pertinent for less developed societies. The discussion is organized according to the five positive values and five

negative values described above in the section A Social-Psychological View.

Economic factors are shown as important on both the positive and negative sides. The obvious policy recommendation regarding economic benefits is provision of societal substitutes such as old-age pensions. Nevertheless, there is also an element of psychological or emotional security in old age connected with economic reliance on children, and psychological security is harder to satisfy by means other than children.

On the costs side, the immediate course is to make prospective parents more aware, through educational programs, of the actual expense of rearing children. Most people have only the vaguest ideas about what children cost. Another option is to raise the costs of children, through such means as taxation or by reducing public subsidies that operate by transfer payments, for example free public education. Such actions might have to be substantial in magnitude, however, since the data from this study indicate that most people believe they could afford more children than they plan to have.

Emotional benefits would seem difficult to affect through public policies. After all, what substitutes are there for the fun, the companionship, and the love of a child? Here is an area, however, where emphasis could be given to disassociating the specific value of emotional benefits from the idea of large families. The prevalent belief that children in small families are emotionally closer to their parents might be reinforced.

Emotional costs, on the other hand, might be stressed as increasing with family size. Health problems of children, for instance, increase with number, as do noise and disorder. Particularly for the mother, the emotional strain is greater with more children.

The positive value of self-enrichment from children might be dealt with in two ways. First, it should be emphasized that many aspects of this value are met through having only one or two children: being viewed as an adult, learning from childrearing, self-fulfillment, and so on. With respect to alternatives to children, the creation of meaningful job opportunities for both women and men is relevant. The adult role, the feeling of responsibility and competence, and incentives in life can be fulfilled in somewhat parallel ways through occupational achievement and satisfaction.

Identification with children, however, seems to have no easy substitutes. Perhaps the higher quality of children in small families should be stressed, indicating a more valued object for identification.

The value of family cohesiveness and continuity presents special problems. The obvious policy recommendation would be to weaken the importance of the family; in fact, however, there is considerable sentiment to reverse the secular trend in that direction, because of the central role of the family in the total social structure. Perhaps public policies can only facilitate the idea that not everyone has to have a family, and that positive interpersonal values can flourish also in the context of nonfamilial life styles. Also, changes in inheritance laws may in some instances affect the value of family continuity; changes in practices for transmission of family names might reduce the preference for boys.

Perhaps the greatest policy leverage exists in connection with the negative value of restrictions or opportunity costs. This category actually encompasses the whole sphere of providing alternative means of satisfying the positive values, but with the added dimension of enhancing personal freedom and flexibility. It is probably true that most people do not realize the impact that the first birth will have on their life style and the extent to which their future life course is determined by that event. At the very least, public educational programs could raise the level of awareness of this basic fact. Thus one would hope for a more realistic assessment by prospective parents of alternatives to children. Included as part of this assessment would be consideration of the remaining two negative values, physical demands on the parents and possible deterioration of the marital relationship.

Among the additional motivations that emerged in connection with family size, in contrast to the general value of having children, were the following: the specific preference for a boy or a girl; the desire for a companion for children already born; and worry about infant and child mortality.

Public policies leading toward equalization of sex roles should tend to reduce preferences for children of one or the other sex, since these preferences seemed mainly role-related. Technological developments should also reduce the effect of this value on family size, as methods are perfected to predetermine the sex of a child.

Companionship for other children can be partly met through the provision of good day-care facilities—that is, situations outside the home where children can find satisfactory peer relationships. Peer relationships are not regarded by most parents as equivalent to sibling relationships, however. (It must also be noted that day care has other effects that are both pronatalist, such as reducing psychological costs, and antinatalist, such as facilitating female employment. The net

effect is not known.) Residential arrangements, such as clustered housing with common play areas, can also provide nonsibling companionship for children.

Concern about infant and child mortality can be met in two ways, by public health programs to reduce that mortality and, perhaps more important in most places, by educational programs showing the high probability of survival for children after their first year.

These suggestions represent only a few tentative observations about the policy implications of research on the value of children. More detailed recommendations are contained in the forthcoming country reports from our exploratory study. As research in this area progresses, with larger studies and better measures, it should become possible to make additional recommendations for policies that would shift the balance of satisfactions and costs of children and thereby contribute to the lowering of fertility.

APPENDIX

The tables in this appendix contain comparative data on the value of children in six countries. Each table is organized to show both cross-cultural comparisons and comparisons of three socioeconomic groups: urban middle class, urban lower class, and rural. (The characteristics of the samples for each country are shown in Table 1 in the body of this report.)

The country results are presented in the appendix tables in a sequence that facilitates regional and subcultural comparisons. The East Asian countries are listed first (Korea, Taiwan, Japan), then ethnic groups in Hawaii are listed (first Japanese to facilitate comparison with Japan, then Caucasians, then Filipinos to facilitate comparisons with the Philippines), and finally the Southeast Asian countries are listed (Philippines, Thailand). The three socioeconomic groups are shown separately. Country totals for the subgroups combined are not shown, for reasons related to sampling that are explained in the text of this report.

A number of the tables contain results derived by content analysis of responses given to open-ended questions. The categories for content analysis were constructed by the group of investigators at a workshop. Prior to the workshop, trial analyses had been carried out on a sample of questionnaires in each country. The final content analyses were conducted independently by two coders in each country and discrepancies were resolved with the assistance of a third person, usually the investigator.

The coding scheme contained 49 specific advantages of children, organized under nine major headings, and 25 specific disadvantages, organized under eight major headings. To enhance understanding of the results shown for content analysis, the complete set of code categories is shown in Exhibit A, preceding the tables.

The first six tables are based upon two open-ended questions that asked respondents to describe in their own words the advantages and disadvantages of having children, compared with not having children, and to rank the advantages and disadvantages that were most important and second most important to them. By intensive nondirective

probing, the interviewers were able to elicit several advantages and disadvantages from most respondents in all countries. Tables A1 and A2 show the percentage of respondents mentioning at least one specific advantage or disadvantage within each of the major categories; Tables A3 and A4 show which major categories contained the responses ranked first in importance.

In Tables A5 and A6, the specific advantages and disadvantages are shown, rather than the major categories. To present a profile for each subgroup within each country, the five most frequently mentioned items are shown in rank order for the subgroups, along with the percentage of respondents mentioning each.

Table A7 uses the same format to show the results of another question that was designed to elicit perceived norms, rather than personal motivations. The question asked, "In your opinion, what are the main reasons why people around here want children?" (This question may also serve in part as a projective technique, eliciting personal motivations that respondents would prefer not to attribute to themselves.)

Mean scores on six attitude scales for the value of children are shown in Table A8. A score of 7 represents strong agreement and 1 indicates strong disagreement. The items making up each scale are shown in a note to the table.

Reasons for wanting another child and not wanting another child are shown in Tables A9 and A10. All respondents, whether or not they wanted another child, were asked to rate each reason as very important, somewhat important, or not important. The percentage rating each reason as very important is given in the tables.

To obtain positive and negative values related to number of children, the respondent's desired family size was used as a referent and questions were asked about reasons for not wanting fewer children and reasons for not wanting more children. The content-analyzed responses are presented in Tables A11 and A12.

To obtain data related to the sex of children, another set of open-ended questions was asked concerning reasons for wanting sons and reasons for wanting daughters. Tables A13 and A14 show the most frequent responses, derived by content analysis.

Responses to questionnaire items pertaining specifically to economic values are presented in Tables A15–A17. Expectations for economic help from children in the parents' old age and before the parents grow old are shown in Tables A15 and A16. The percentage of respondents who considered three children to be a heavy financial burden is shown in Table A17.

EXHIBIT A Major code categories and specific code categories used in the content analysis of responses: advantages and disadvantages of having children

ADVANTAGES

Happiness, love, companionship

Companionship, avoidance of loneliness
Love, affection
Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom
Relief from strain, distraction from problems
Happiness for individual parent (general)
Happiness for family
Uniqueness, specialness in parent-child relationship

Personal development of parent

Character development, responsibility, maturity, morality
Incentives to succeed, striving to provide for children
Fulfillment of self, completeness as person
Extension of self
Learning from experience of childrearing
Motherhood, fatherhood; adulthood
Proof of fertility, masculinity, femininity

Childrearing satisfactions

Pride in children's accomplishment
Pleasure from growth, development of children
Children to carry out parent's hopes, aspirations
Opportunity to teach, guide, instill values
Satisfaction in one's childrearing ability, accomplishment
Satisfaction in providing for children

Economic benefits, security

Economic help in old age
Companionship, comfort, care in old age
Unspecified help in old age
Economic help (old age not mentioned)
Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)
Help in housework, family chores; practical help
Sharing financial responsibility; insurance, security
Help in family business, farm
Help in taking care of other children
Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)

EXHIBIT A *(continued)*

Benefits to family unit

Children as bond between spouses
Children as reason for, fulfillment of marriage
Children as family life, complete or close-knit family

Kin group benefits

Continuity of family name
Continuity of family traditions
Enhancement of reputation of family
Having future grandchildren
Children as heirs, someone to inherit family wealth
Religious rituals, ancestor worship
To increase strength, power of kin group
To satisfy desires of spouse
To satisfy desires of other kin

Social, religious influences

Conformity to social norms
Conformity to religious norms
Children as benefits to society

General, intrinsic value of children

Children as treasure, wealth, assets
Instinctive, natural to have children
General wanting, liking children

Other advantages

DISADVANTAGES

Financial costs

Educational costs
General, other costs

Emotional costs

Responsibility of parenthood
Discipline, moral behavior
Health problems of children
Concern over children's future success, happiness
Concern about satisfying children's present wants
Noise, disorder, nuisance
General rearing problems
General emotional strain

EXHIBIT A *(continued)*

Physical demands on parents

Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health
Physical work, tiredness caused by children

Restrictions on alternative activities

Restrictions on time
Restrictions on travel
Restrictions on social life, recreation
Restrictions on job, career
Restrictions on personal wants
Restrictions on privacy
General lack of flexibility, freedom

Marital problems

Less time, interaction between spouses
Disagreements over children
General marital problems

Kin group costs, problems of inheritance

Disadvantages relating to, affecting kin group

Societal costs, overpopulation

Disadvantages relating to, affecting society; concern about overpopulation

Other disadvantages

TABLE A1 Advantages of having children: percentage of respon- major code categories, by socioeconomic (SES) group

SES group and country	Major code category: Happiness, love, companionship	Personal development of parent	Childrearing satisfactions	Economic benefits, security
URBAN MIDDLE				
Korea	69	39	54	12
Taiwan	88	10	9	6
Japan	61	29	37	7
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Japanese	74	48	47	15
Caucasian	73	66	61	14
Philippines	79	34	17	80
Thailand	67	35	8	20
URBAN LOW				
Korea	72	39	42	25
Taiwan	89	3	8	29
Japan	69	21	36	9
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Japanese	84	55	43	22
Caucasian	66	54	55	13
Filipino	86	22	13	76
Philippines	83	29	21	84
Thailand	35	6	3	80
RURAL				
Korea	56	22	42	45
Taiwan	51	3	19	53
Japan	63	17	46	19
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Filipino	90	19	5	96
Philippines	68	17	20	91
Thailand	25	3	3	76

* Less than 1 percent.

dents who mentioned at least one advantage under each of specified and country

Benefits to family unit	Kin group benefits	Social, religious influences	General intrinsic value of children	Other advantages
25	15	5	5	1
14	20	4	6	*
28	3	4	1	*
51	21	4	17	7
40	23	8	15	5
26	8	5	6	*
42	23	5	1	7
30	23	2	1	1
3	46	4	7	2
35	4	1	2	*
33	18	1	17	1
34	17	1	18	5
20	21	*	3	2
17	16	8	6	*
6	18	4	1	4
4	32	11	6	2
5	35	5	4	1
14	11	1	3	*
6	12	*	4	*
13	6	4	6	*
4	37	13	1	0

TABLE A2 Disadvantages of having children: percentage of respon- specified major code categories, by socioeconomic group

SES group and country	Major code category: Financial costs	Emotional costs	Physical demands on parents
URBAN MIDDLE			
Korea	41	56	15
Taiwan	33	59	11
Japan	42	38	6
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	31	50	12
Caucasian	49	66	12
Philippines	60	82	15
Thailand	44	56	15
URBAN LOW			
Korea	69	60	8
Taiwan	48	71	11
Japan	40	49	9
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	42	45	16
Caucasian	43	51	3
Filipino	68	74	23
Philippines	56	75	12
Thailand	61	38	9
RURAL			
Korea	46	63	7
Taiwan	67	57	18
Japan	43	45	5
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Filipino	90	82	30
Philippines	57	74	12
Thailand	54	36	31

* Less than 1 percent.

dents who mentioned at least one disadvantage under each of
and country

Restrictions on alternative activities	Marital problems	Kin group costs, problems of inheritance	Societal costs, over-population	Other disadvantages
51	24	*	*	3
40	4	*	*	*
57	12	*	*	*
70	7	1	*	5
79	15	*	1	5
37	2	*	*	1
19	*	1	*	2
25	6	*	1	2
32	2	*	*	*
54	2	*	*	*
82	9	3	4	3
63	8	*	2	6
50	1	*	*	3
33	3	*	1	1
18	*	*	*	8
21	4	*	*	2
22	*	*	*	*
33	3	1	1	2
57	*	*	2	1
23	*	*	*	*
21	1	1	*	2

TABLE A3 Advantages of having children: percentage of respon- categories, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	Major code category			
	Happiness, love, companionship	Personal development of parent	Childrearing satisfactions	Economic benefits, security
URBAN MIDDLE				
Korea	34	10	29	3
Taiwan	62	4	5	3
Japan	37	19	24	2
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Japanese	26	18	18	1
Caucasian	37	21	16	2
Philippines	38	11	4	30
Thailand	34	17	3	6
URBAN LOW				
Korea	42	8	18	11
Taiwan	39	1	4	9
Japan	54	10	14	3
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Japanese	29	16	21	3
Caucasian	33	17	18	2
Filipino	62	3	3	15
Philippines	24	9	7	46
Thailand	15	4	1	66
RURAL				
Korea	27	9	19	21
Taiwan	19	1	11	36
Japan	44	9	20	11
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Filipino	25	4	1	63
Philippines	23	6	7	60
Thailand	14	2	*	60

* Less than 1 percent.

dents who assigned first ranking to each of specified major code

Benefits to family unit	Kin group benefits	Social, religious influences	General, intrinsic value of children	Other advantages
9	10	1	3	*
13	10	2	2	*
14	3	1	*	*
20	1	1	9	2
14	1	1	3	*
12	1	1	2	*
28	9	2	1	1
8	12	0	1	1
3	40	1	2	1
17	1	2	*	*
20	1	*	4	*
16	2	1	1	*
11	2	*	2	*
7	4	1	2	*
3	8	2	*	1
2	17	3	2	*
4	25	2	1	*
5	7	1	2	*
4	1	*	1	*
2	*	2	*	*
3	17	3	*	*

TABLE A4 Disadvantages of having children: percentage of respon- categories, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	Major code category		
	Financial costs	Emotional costs	Physical demands on parents
URBAN MIDDLE			
Korea	20	35	4
Taiwan	17	53	5
Japan	10	30	2
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	8	26	1
Caucasian	16	25	2
Philippines	29	54	3
Thailand	32	51	8
URBAN LOW			
Korea	41	41	3
Taiwan	35	47	5
Japan	8	41	3
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	22	18	3
Caucasian	20	30	*
Filipino	30	32	7
Philippines	34	50	1
Thailand	50	32	5
RURAL			
Korea	42	44	4
Taiwan	49	34	9
Japan	14	53	2
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Filipino	81	11	2
Philippines	39	51	4
Thailand	42	51	28

* Less than 1 percent.

dents who assigned first ranking to each of specified major code

Restrictions on alternative activities	Marital problems	Kin group costs, problems of inheritance	Societal costs, over-population	Other disadvantages
28	12	*	*	1
25	*	*	*	*
50	8	*	*	*
35	2	*	*	*
39	5	*	*	2
12	1	*	*	1
7	*	1	*	1
13	1	*	*	1
14	*	*	*	*
48	*	*	*	*
38	4	*	*	*
21	5	1	*	2
20	*	*	*	*
13	1	*	*	1
12	*	*	*	2
8	1	*	*	1
9	*	*	*	*
28	1	1	1	*
1	*	*	*	1
6	*	*	*	*
9	*	*	*	*

TABLE A5 Advantages of having children: five most frequently mentioned advantages ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1 Advantage	%	2 Advantage	%	3 Advantage	%	4 Advantage	%	5 Advantage	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Happiness for family	42	Incentives to succeed	25	Satisfaction in one's child-rearing abilities	25	Pleasure from growth, development of children	23	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	20
Taiwan	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	44	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	22	Continuity of family name	19	Happiness for individual parent	13	Happiness for family	13
Japan	Happiness for family	41	Prime value of life[a]	35	Pleasure from growth, development of children	24	Children as bond between spouses	22	Children to carry out parents' hopes, aspirations	14
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	37	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	32	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	30	Pleasure from growth, development of children	28	Learning from experience of childrearing	25
Caucasian	Pleasure from growth, development of children	39	Love, affection	31	Learning from experience of childrearing	29	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	25	Character development, responsibility, maturity, morality	25
Philippines	Happiness for individual parent	38	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	36	Unspecified help in old age	33	Happiness for family	33	Incentives to succeed	24
Thailand	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	38	Children as bond between spouses	28	Character development, responsibility, maturity, morality	23	Incentives to succeed	20	Continuity of family name	20

URBAN LOW										
Korea	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	37	Happiness for family	33	Incentives to succeed	27	Children as bond between spouses	26	Pleasure from growth, development of children	19
Taiwan	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	52	Continuity of family name	44	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	38	Unspecified help in old age	24	Love, affection	14
Japan	Happiness for family	49	Prime value of life[a]	41	Children as bond between spouses	27	Pleasure from growth, development of children	19	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	16
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	45	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	43	Pleasure from growth, development of children	28	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	25	Character development, responsibility, maturity, morality	24
Caucasian	Pleasure from growth, development of children	40	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	28	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	28	Learning from experience of childrearing	22	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family Children as bond between spouses	21 21
Filipino	Happiness for individual parent	45	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	38	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	28	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	27	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom Unspecified help in old age	16 16
Philippines	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	39	Happiness for individual parent	37	Unspecified help in old age	34	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	25	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	22
Thailand	Unspecified help in old age	49	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	23	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	22	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	17	Continuity of family name	14

TABLE A5 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Advantage	%	2 Advantage	%	3 Advantage	%	4 Advantage	%	5 Advantage	%
RURAL										
Korea	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	30	Continuity of family name	25	Happiness for family	18	Pleasure from growth, development of children	18	Pride in children's accomplishment	16
Taiwan	Unspecified help in old age	39	Continuity of family name	33	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	32	Pride in children's accomplishment	16	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	15
Japan	Happiness for family	46	Prime value of life[a]	42	Children to carry out parents' hopes, aspirations	23	Pleasure from growth, development of children	18	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	12
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	66	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	64	Happiness for individual parent	63	Unspecified help in old age	42	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	13
Philippines	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	48	Unspecified help in old age	35	Happiness for individual parent	32	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	27	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	23
Thailand	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	43	Continuity of family name	28	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	18	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	13	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	13

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category (see Exhibit A). In cases where two or more advantages were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

a Translated from the Japanese expression *iki-gai*—literally, "one's life worthwhile." The response is similar to the English expression "goals and incentives from children," but because it implies an emphasis on present satisfactions from raising children it has been coded as a country-specific response category.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to question 4 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A6 Disadvantages of having children: five most frequently mentioned disadvantages ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1 Disadvantage	%	2 Disadvantage	%	3 Disadvantage	%	4 Disadvantage	%	5 Disadvantage	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Financial costs (general, other)	39	Noise, disorder, nuisance	22	Health problems of children	22	Restrictions on time	22	Restrictions on travel	19
Taiwan	Financial costs (general, other)	31	Noise, disorder, nuisance	27	Restrictions on time	20	General lack of flexibility, freedom	17	Health problems of children	16
Japan	Restrictions on time	24	Financial costs (general, other)	20	Health problems of children	15	General emotional strain	15	General lack of flexibility, freedom	12
									Restrictions on social life, recreation	12
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	General lack of flexibility, freedom	46	Financial costs (general, other)	31	General emotional strain	21	Restrictions on social life, recreation	18	General rearing problems	14
Caucasian	General lack of flexibility, freedom	64	Financial costs (general, other)	49	General emotional strain	24	General rearing problems	22	Restrictions on job, career	14
Philippines	Financial costs (general, other)	50	Discipline, moral behavior	42	Health problems of children	31	Financial costs (education)	24	Noise, disorder, nuisance	18
									General rearing problems	18
Thailand	Financial costs (general, other)	39	General rearing problems	28	General emotional strain	18	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	13	Responsibility of parenthood	9

TABLE A6 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Disadvantage	%	2 Disadvantage	%	3 Disadvantage	%	4 Disadvantage	%	5 Disadvantage	%
URBAN LOW										
Korea	Financial costs (general, other)	58	Noise, disorder, nuisance	35	Financial costs (education)	25	Health problems of children	20	General emotional strain	19
Taiwan	Financial costs (general, other)	42	Noise, disorder, nuisance	38	General lack of flexibility, freedom	17	Health problems of children	15	General rearing problems	11
Japan	Restrictions on time	29	Financial costs (general, other)	21	Health problems of children	19	General emotional strain	13	Noise, disorder, nuisance	13
							Restrictions on job, career	13	General lack of flexibility, freedom	13
									Restrictions on social life, recreation	13
U.S. (Hawaii)										
Japanese	General lack of flexibility, freedom	61	Financial costs (general, other)	36	Restrictions on job, career	21	Discipline, moral behavior	16	Restrictions on social life, recreation	16
Caucasian	General lack of flexibility, freedom	49	Financial costs (general, other)	37	Discipline, moral behavior	17	Health problems of children	15	General rearing problems	14
Filipino	Financial costs (general, other)	65	General lack of flexibility, freedom	40	General rearing problems	33	Discipline, moral behavior	30	Noise, disorder, nuisance	23
Philippines	Financial costs (general, other)	46	Discipline, moral behavior	46	Health problems of children	25	Financial costs (education)	25	Noise, disorder nuisance	21
Thailand	Financial costs (general, other)	61	General rearing problems	20	General emotional strain	14	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	9	Financial costs (education)	8

Thailand *(continued)*									Discipline, moral behavior	8
									Restrictions on job, career	8
									General lack of flexibility, freedom	8
RURAL										
Korea	Financial costs (general, other)	44	Financial costs (education)	38	Noise, disorder, nuisance	32	Health problems of children	29	Discipline, moral behavior	18
Taiwan	Financial costs (general, other)	64	Health problems of children	24	Noise, disorder, nuisance	22	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	17	Restrictions on job, career	14
Japan	Health problems of children	22	Financial costs (general, other)	21	Restrictions on time	15	General emotional strain	12	Noise, disorder, nuisance	12
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Financial costs (general, other)	90	Health problems of children	57	General lack of flexibility, freedom	33	Discipline, moral behavior	31	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	30
Philippines	Financial costs (general, other)	44	Discipline, moral behavior	36	Health problems of children	26	General rearing problems	22	Noise, disorder, nuisance	20
Thailand	Financial costs (general, other)	42	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	31	Financial costs (education)	18	Discipline, moral behavior	17	Restrictions on job, career	11

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category (see Exhibit A). In cases where two or more reasons were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to question 6 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A7 Reasons why people in general want children: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1		2		3		4		5	
	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Continuity of family name	33	Happiness for family	32	Instinctive, natural to have children	17	Satisfaction in one's childrearing ability, accomplishment	16	Having future grandchildren	14
Taiwan	Continuity of family name	49	Don't know	30	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	16	Unspecified help in old age	14	Instinctive, natural to have children	9
Japan	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	16	Happiness for family	16	Instinctive, natural to have children	15	Prime value in life[a]	15	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	14
									Children as heirs, someone to inherit family wealth	14
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	General wanting, liking children	30	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	21	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	17	Don't know	13	Children as reason for, fulfillment of marriage	13
Caucasian	Don't know	18	General wanting, liking children	17	Continuity of family name	16	Instinctive, natural to have children	16	Other people's reasons same as respondent's	14
Philippines	Happiness for family	35	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	28	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	25	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	22	Happiness for individual parent, general responses	16
Thailand	Don't know	30	Continuity of family name	19	No reason given	17	Happiness for family	14	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	12

URBAN LOW										
Korea	Continuity of family name	52	Happiness for family	27	Instinctive, natural to have children	17	Pleasure from growth, development of children	12	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	11
									Conformity to social norms	11
Taiwan	Continuity of family name	75	Unspecified help in old age	26	Instinctive, natural to have children	10	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	10	Don't know	9
Japan	Happiness for family	21	General wanting, liking children	15	Don't know	15	Instinctive, natural to have children	13	Children as heirs, someone to inherit family wealth	10
									Prime value in life[a]	10
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	General wanting, liking children	31	Continuity of family name	25	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	24	Instinctive, natural to have children	16	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	15
Caucasian	General wanting, liking children	24	Love, affection	18	Children as family life, complete or close-knit family	16	Don't know	15	Instinctive, natural to have children	12
Filipino	Happiness for individual parent (general)	48	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	29	Children as reason for, fulfillment of marriage	17	Unspecified help in old age	16	Continuity of family name	10
Philippines	Happiness for family	39	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	36	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	24	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	16	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	13
Thailand	Don't know	26	Continuity of family name	18	Unspecified help in old age	17	No reason given	14	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	11
RURAL										
Korea	Continuity of family name	59	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	17	Conformity to social norms	13	Proof of fertility, masculinity, femininity	12	Pride in children's accomplishment	9
									Economic help in old age	9

TABLE A7 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Reason	%	2 Reason	%	3 Reason	%	4 Reason	%	5 Reason	%
Taiwan	Continuity of family name	56	Unspecified help in old age	32	Don't know	7	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	6	Conformity to social norms Instinctive, natural to have children	6 6
Japan	Children as heirs, someone to inherit family wealth	32	Prime value in life[a]	22	Happiness for family	19	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	10	Happiness for individual parent	9
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	67	Unspecified help in old age	44	Happiness for individual parent (general)	44	Love, affection	10	Continuity of family name	5
Philippines	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	32	Happiness for family	27	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	20	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	20	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	17
Thailand	Continuity of family name	37	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	18	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	18	Don't know	17	No reason given	14

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category (see Exhibit A). In cases where two or more reasons were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

a Translated from the Japanese expression *iki-gai*—literally, "one's life worthwhile." The response is similar to the English expression "goals and incentives from children," but because it implies an emphasis on present satisfactions from raising children it has been coded as a country-specific response category.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to question 73 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A8 Rank order of six value-of-children attitude scales, by socioeconomic group and country: mean scores

SES group and country	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean	Scale	Mean
URBAN MIDDLE												
Korea	Parenthood satisfactions	6.3	Goals, incentives from children	6.3	Role motivations	5.8	Happiness, affection	5.3	Continuity, tradition, security	4.2	Social status from children	4.0
Taiwan	Parenthood satisfactions	5.7	Role motivations	5.4	Goals, incentives from children	5.3	Continuity, tradition, security	5.0	Happiness, affection	5.0	Social status from children	4.0
Japan	Goals, incentives from children	6.0	Role motivations	5.4	Parenthood satisfactions	5.3	Happiness, affection	4.0	Continuity, tradition, security	3.6	Social status from children	2.5
U.S. (Hawaii)												
Japanese	Parenthood satisfactions	5.3	Goals, incentives from children	5.3	Continuity, tradition, security	4.0	Role motivations	3.6	Happiness, affection	3.0	Social status from children	2.5
Caucasian	Parenthood satisfactions	5.0	Goals, incentives from children	4.7	Continuity, tradition, security	3.4	Role motivations	3.2	Happiness, affection	2.3	Social status from children	1.7
Philippines	Parenthood satisfactions	6.7	Goals, incentives from children	6.7	Continuity, tradition, security	6.0	Role motivations	5.8	Happiness, affection	5.3	Social status from children	3.5
Thailand	Goals, incentives from children	6.7	Parenthood satisfactions	6.0	Happiness, affection	6.0	Continuity, tradition, security	5.8	Role motivations	5.6	Social status from children	3.5
URBAN LOW												
Korea	Goals, incentives from children	6.3	Parenthood satisfactions	6.0	Role motivations	6.0	Happiness, affection	5.7	Continuity, tradition, security	5.6	Social status from children	5.5
Taiwan	Continuity, tradition, security	6.0	Parenthood satisfactions	6.0	Goals, incentives from children	6.0	Role motivations	5.8	Happiness, affection	5.7	Social status from children	5.0

TABLE A8 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Scale	1 Mean	2 Scale	2 Mean	3 Scale	3 Mean	4 Scale	4 Mean	5 Scale	5 Mean	6 Scale	6 Mean
Japan	Goals, incentives from children	6.3	Role motivations	5.6	Parenthood satisfactions	5.3	Happiness, affection	4.0	Continuity, tradition, security	3.6	Social status from children	2.5
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Parenthood satisfactions	6.0	Goals, incentives from children	5.7	Continuity, tradition, security	4.6	Role motivations	3.8	Happiness, affection	3.7	Social status from children	2.0
Caucasian	Parenthood satisfactions	5.7	Goals, incentives from children	5.3	Continuity, tradition, security	4.2	Role motivations	3.8	Happiness, affection	3.7	Social status from children	2.5
Filipino	Goals, incentives from children	6.7	Parenthood satisfactions	6.3	Continuity, tradition, security	6.0	Happiness, affection	5.0	Role motivations	4.8	Social status from children	3.5
Philippines	Goals, incentives from children	6.7	Parenthood satisfactions	6.3	Continuity, tradition, security	6.2	Role motivations	6.0	Happiness, affection	5.3	Social status from children	3.5
Thailand	Continuity, tradition, security	6.6	Parenthood satisfactions	6.3	Happiness, affection	6.3	Goals, incentives from children	6.3	Role motivations	6.2	Social status from children	5.0
RURAL Korea	Continuity, tradition, security	6.0	Parenthood satisfactions	6.0	Role motivations	6.0	Goals, incentives from children	6.0	Social status from children	5.5	Happiness, affection	5.3
Taiwan	Continuity, tradition, security	6.4	Parenthood satisfactions	6.3	Role motivations	6.2	Goals, incentives from children	6.0	Happiness, affection	5.7	Social status from children	5.0
Japan	Goals, incentives from children	6.3	Parenthood satisfactions	5.7	Role motivations	5.6	Continuity, tradition, security	4.8	Happiness, affection	4.7	Social status from children	3.0
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Continuity, tradition, security	7.0	Parenthood satisfactions	7.0	Goals, incentives from children	7.0	Role motivations	6.4	Happiness, affection	2.0	Social status from children	1.5

Philippines	Parenthood satisfactions 6.7	Goals, incentives from children 6.7	Continuity, tradition, security 6.6	Role motivations 6.2	Happiness, affection 5.7	Social status from children 4.5
Thailand	Continuity, tradition, security 6.8	Goals, incentives from children 6.7	Role motivations 6.4	Parenthood satisfactions 6.3	Happiness, affection 6.3	Social status from children 5.5

NOTE: The specific items contained in each value-of-children attitude scale are as follows:

Scale 1 Continuity, tradition, security
- a A good reason for having children is that they can help when parents are too old to work.
- b It is important to have children so that the family traditions will live on.
- c One of the best things about having children is the true loyalty they show to their parents.
- d A man has a duty to have children to continue the family name.
- e A person can feel that part of him lives on after death if he has children.

Scale 2 Parenthood satisfactions
- a Just the feeling a parent gets of being needed is enough to make having children worthwhile.
- b A person who has been a good parent can feel completely satisfied with his achievements in life.
- c One of the best things about being a parent is the chance to teach children what they should do and what they should not do.

Scale 3 Role motivations
- a It is only natural that a man should want children.
- b A girl becomes a woman only after she is a mother.
- c After becoming a parent, a person is less likely to behave immorally.
- d It is only natural that a woman should want children.
- e A boy becomes a man only after he is a father.

Scale 4 Happiness and affection
- a It is only with a child that a person can feel completely free to express his love and affection.
- b The family with children is the only place in the modern world where a person can feel comfortable and happy.
- c A person who has no children can never really be happy.

Scale 5 Goals and incentives from children
- a Having children gives a person a special incentive to succeed in life.
- b Having children makes a stronger bond between husband and wife.
- c One of the highest purposes of life is to have children.

Scale 6 Social status from children
- a A young couple is not fully accepted in the community until they have children.
- b A person with children is looked up to in the community more than a person without children.

In cases where two or more attitude scales received the same ranking, identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

TABLE A9 Reasons for wanting another child: percentage of respon- group and country

SES group and country	Enjoy having a small baby	Carry family name, traditions	Want a boy/ another boy	Want a girl/ another girl	Relatives feel I should have more children
URBAN MIDDLE					
Korea	13	29	24	13	2
Taiwan	10	27	28	16	6
Japan	16	10	38	29	6
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Japanese	17	12	9	12	*
Caucasian	21	13	17	4	*
Philippines	49	43	38	43	6
Thailand	37	41	29	30	6
URBAN LOW					
Korea	23	54	37	14	7
Taiwan	11	48	29	15	4
Japan	28	6	37	27	3
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Japanese	16	18	9	17	1
Caucasian	33	25	23	15	1
Filipino	43	64	44	37	5
Philippines	43	50	33	33	8
Thailand	22	53	44	18	8
RURAL					
Korea	15	69	41	15	7
Taiwan	15	49	40	19	9
Japan	19	24	31	21	4
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Filipino	37	92	67	44	2
Philippines	62	61	51	50	16
Thailand	23	59	35	23	10

dents rating specified reasons as very important, by socioeconomic

In my old age, have child to help me	Religious duty to have children	One more person to help family economically	Make my marriage stronger	A companion for my child/ children	Enjoy caring for, raising children	Spouse wants more children
3	3	2	15	21	14	13
9	10	4	4	24	14	5
2	*	2	7	44	15	23
6	2	1	5	41	35	25
*	3	1	3	26	34	18
49	27	36	43	50	36	23
12	*	3	10	29	18	23
26	7	14	20	14	24	18
21	18	14	9	23	16	11
7	*	3	10	55	18	26
4	1	1	5	41	43	18
10	3	5	5	24	42	25
54	16	37	42	55	33	35
53	34	43	49	36	32	19
55	19	31	39	25	20	21
43	14	18	15	22	32	18
35	21	22	13	19	12	13
21	5	6	11	36	20	19
77	11	76	5	52	75	31
80	58	68	69	58	55	42
58	19	35	34	24	21	17

TABLE A9 *(continued)*

SES group and country	Fun to have children around house	Helps me to learn about life, myself	Special feeling between parent and child	Share what I have, know with children	Have enough children to survive to adulthood
URBAN MIDDLE					
Korea	29	39	29	12	5
Taiwan	40	31	43	37	13
Japan	47	47	32	13	22
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Japanese	42	47	59	56	18
Caucasian	34	45	57	60	12
Philippines	57	61	71	66	57
Thailand	42	44	51	38	36
URBAN LOW					
Korea	39	44	28	18	11
Taiwan	32	24	35	26	30
Japan	56	46	29	10	14
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Japanese	50	57	67	63	22
Caucasian	43	59	71	63	25
Filipino	53	52	68	69	36
Philippines	49	52	63	65	56
Thailand	30	53	49	39	54
RURAL					
Korea	31	41	20	35	27
Taiwan	29	23	35	27	27
Japan	53	48	38	12	35
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Filipino	87	92	98	93	43
Philippines	71	75	79	76	80
Thailand	23	47	50	44	53

* Less than 1 percent.

TABLE A10 Reasons for not wanting another child: percentage of respondents rating specified reasons as very important, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	Would be financial burden to family	Spouse does not want more	Restrict my freedom to do other things I enjoy	A lot of work, bother for me
URBAN MIDDLE				
Korea	41	23	18	13
Taiwan	32	18	22	33
Japan	11	21	13	6
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Japanese	16	16	11	9
Caucasian	21	22	12	5
Philippines	39	16	19	24
Thailand	42	20	16	28
URBAN LOW				
Korea	74	30	17	18
Taiwan	56	23	28	37
Japan	23	16	17	11
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Japanese	32	20	7	5
Caucasian	31	15	7	6
Filipino	40	21	14	15
Philippines	62	30	21	33
Thailand	77	25	39	50
RURAL				
Korea	64	22	13	31
Taiwan	69	28	47	54
Japan	21	17	10	14
U.S. (Hawaii)				
Filipino	57	32	4	6
Philippines	54	25	20	28
Thailand	67	30	43	47

TABLE A10 *(continued)*

SES group and country	Not able to spend as much time with spouse	Concerned about over-population	Emotional strain for me	Not enough attention, care to other children	Cause problems, strains between me and spouse
URBAN MIDDLE					
Korea	17	16	29	44	*
Taiwan	15	36	29	50	16
Japan	4	6	15	9	4
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Japanese	8	13	9	22	11
Caucasian	16	27	7	15	11
Philippines	10	49	25	37	27
Thailand	4	16	18	43	13
URBAN LOW					
Korea	7	24	34	63	1
Taiwan	9	22	28	35	16
Japan	7	4	21	16	6
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Japanese	10	20	9	20	11
Caucasian	8	17	17	10	14
Filipino	15	22	15	27	11
Philippines	18	56	29	45	33
Thailand	10	20	28	53	23
RURAL					
Korea	6	24	48	62	*
Taiwan	13	30	52	49	13
Japan	2	1	18	17	10
U.S. (Hawaii)					
Filipino	2	1	2	63	4
Philippines	24	48	35	40	35
Thailand	16	30	30	48	21

* Less than 1 percent.

TABLE A11 Reasons for not wanting fewer than desired number of children: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1		2		3		4		5	
	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	21	To avoid an only child	21	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	17	Good number to have, want that number	17	Satisfy desires of other kin	8
									Want more boys	8
									Want more girls	8
									Companionship for other children	8
Taiwan	Companionship for other children	28	To avoid an only child	25	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	15	Good number to have, want that number	15	Want more boys	13
Japan	Companionship for other children	30	To foster character development of children	30	Good number to have, want that number	21	To avoid an only child	12	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	11
U.S. (Hawaii)										
Japanese	Good number to have, want that number	55	Companionship for other children	45	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	18	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	10	Want more girls	8
Caucasian	Companionship for other children	49	To avoid an only child	28	Other reasons	21	Good number to have, want that number	15	Want more boys	10
									Can afford that number, able to raise that many	10
Philippines	Companionship for other children	33	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	22	Anxiety over infant mortality	19	Happiness for individual parent	16	Happiness for family	14

TABLE A11 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Reason	%	2 Reason	%	3 Reason	%	4 Reason	%	5 Reason	%
Thailand	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	30	Companionship for other children	26	Want more girls	15	Anxiety over infant mortality	11	Happiness for family	6
									Good number to have, want that number	6
URBAN LOW Korea	Good number to have, want that number	28	Want more boys	26	Companionship for other children	18	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	15	To avoid an only child	12
									Anxiety over infant mortality	12
Taiwan	Companionship for other children	22	Want more boys	17	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	17	Good number to have, want that number	17	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	8
									Continuity of family name	8
									To increase strength, power of kin	8
Japan	To foster character development of children	51	Companionship for other children	35	To avoid an only child	17	Good number to have, want that number	15	Companionship, avoidance of loneliness	5
									Anxiety over infant mortality	5
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Companionship for other children	59	To avoid an only child	24	Good number to have, want that number	21	Other reasons	15	General wanting, liking children	9
									Anxiety over infant mortality	9
Caucasian	Companionship for other children	38	To avoid an only child	24	Good number to have, want that number	22	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	14	General wanting, liking children	8
Filipino	Good number to have, want that number	41	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	30	Companionship for other children	22	Want more girls	15	Want more boys	13

Philippines	Companionship for other children	42	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	27	Want more boys	18	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	18	Good number to have, want that number	15
Thailand	Want more boys	21	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	21	Companionship for other children	17	Unspecified help	12	Want more girls	11
RURAL										
Korea	Want more boys	29	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	20	Good number to have, want that number	20	Anxiety over infant mortality	15	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	12
Taiwan	Want more boys	31	Companionship for other children	20	Parents will have more alternative places to live when they are old	17	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	14	Anxiety over infant mortality	11
Japan	Companionship for other children	36	Anxiety over infant mortality	28	Don't know	10	To foster character development of children	10	Want more boys	9
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Good number to have, want that number	50	Want particular combination of boys and girls, balance	36	Want more girls	25	Companionship for other children	25	Want more boys	11
Philippines	Can afford that number, able to raise that many	20	Anxiety over infant mortality	19	Want more boys	17	Happiness for family	15	Good number to have, want that number	15
Thailand	Anxiety over infant mortality	25	Want more boys	14	Want more girls	14	Companionship for other children	14	Unspecified help	11
									To avoid an only child	11
									Good number to have, want that number	11

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category. In cases where two or more reasons were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to question 14 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A12 Reasons for not wanting more than desired number of children or any more children: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1		2		3		4		5	
	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Financial costs (general, other)	49	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	46	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	27	Financial costs (education)	17	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	15
Taiwan	Financial costs (general, other)	38	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	29	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	28	Financial costs (education)	21	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	7
Japan	Financial costs (general, other)	41	Housing problems	18	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	15	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	13	General rearing problems	9
U.S. (Hawaii)										
Japanese	Financial costs (general, other)	72	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	32	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	23	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	11	Other disadvantages	10
Caucasian	Financial costs (general, other)	52	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	36	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	29	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	24	Infecund, too old	10

Philippines	Financial costs (general, other)	88	General rearing problems	28	Financial costs (education)	25	Concern over children's future success, happiness	10	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	10
Thailand	Financial costs (general, other)	45	Financial costs (education)	25	General rearing problems	20	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	18	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	8
URBAN LOW										
Korea	Financial costs (general, other)	59	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	38	Financial costs (education)	22	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	16	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	7
Taiwan	Financial costs (general, other)	65	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	44	Noise, disorder, nuisance	9	Financial costs (education)	7	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	7
									To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	7
Japan	Financial costs (general, other)	55	Housing problems	18	General rearing problems	10	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	10	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	6
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Financial costs (general, other)	72	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	26	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	19	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	13	Other reasons	8

TABLE A12 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Reason	%	2 Reason	%	3 Reason	%	4 Reason	%	5 Reason	%
Caucasian	Financial costs (general, other)	59	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	31	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	23	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	13	Infecund, too old	8
Filipino	Financial costs (general, other)	65	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	36	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	22	General rearing problems	16	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	5
Philippines	Financial costs (general, other)	97	Financial costs (education)	28	General rearing problems	21	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	12	Concern over children's future success, happiness	10
Thailand	Financial costs (general, other)	93	Financial costs (education)	18	General rearing problems	10	Other reasons	7	Restrictions on job, career	4
RURAL										
Korea	Financial costs (general, other)	64	Financial costs (education)	48	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	22	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	13	General emotional strain	9
Taiwan	Financial costs (general, other)	66	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	24	Financial costs (education)	15	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	14	Disadvantages to society; concern about overpopulation	9

Japan	Financial costs (general, other)	40	General rearing problems	23	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	21	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	12	Restrictions on job, career	8
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Financial costs (general, other)	78	To have correct number of children for rearing; ease of handling, happiness	52	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	33	Discipline, moral behavior	13	Health hazard of pregnancy; maternal health	9
Philippines	Financial costs (general, other)	90	Financial costs (education)	23	General rearing problems	15	Concern over children's future success, happiness	14	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	9
Thailand	Financial costs (general, other)	67	Financial costs (education)	24	Physical work, tiredness caused by children	20	General rearing problems	12	Already have/ will have number of children wanted; enough boys, girls	10

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category. In cases where two or more reasons were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, the identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to questions 15 and 18 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A13 Reasons for wanting girls: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1 Reason	%	2 Reason	%	3 Reason	%	4 Reason	%	5 Reason	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	56	Companionship, closeness with mother	34	Happiness for family	22	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	11	Parents' preferred sex	10
Taiwan	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	35	Companionship, closeness with mother	33	Parents' preferred sex ratio	23	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	12	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	6
Japan	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	48	Companionship, closeness with mother	46	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	14	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	13	Parents' preferred sex ratio	12
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Companionship, closeness with mother	30	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	20	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	13	Parents' preferred sex ratio	13	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	13
Caucasian	Companionship, closeness with mother	31	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	28	Parents' preferred sex ratio	16	Opportunity to teach, guide, instill values	16	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	9
Philippines	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	76	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	15	Companionship, closeness with mother	9	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	5	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	5
Thailand	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	53	Companionship, closeness with mother	29	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	15	Parents' preferred sex ratio	8	Love, affection	6
									Companionship, comfort, care in old age	6
									Help in taking care of other children	6

URBAN LOW										
Korea	Companionship, closeness with mother	32	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	31	Happiness for family	23	Love, affection	18	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	15
Taiwan	Companionship, closeness with mother	41	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	35	Parents' preferred sex ratio	24	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	19	Help in taking care of other children	6
Japan	Companionship, closeness with mother	54	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	40	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	18	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	7	Parents' preferred sex ratio	5
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	32	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	27	Companionship, closeness with mother	21	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	11	Parents' preferred sex ratio	11
Caucasian	Companionship, closeness with mother	28	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	28	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	19	Parents' preferred sex ratio	18	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	13
Filipino	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	66	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	11	Parents' preferred sex ratio	9	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	9	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	9
									Opportunity to teach, guide, instill values	9
Philippines	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	73	Companionship, closeness with mother	8	Behavior, personality of girls (position)	8	Play, fun with children; avoidance of boredom	6	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	4
Thailand	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	79	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	7	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	5	Help in taking care of other children	5	Other reasons	5

TABLE A13 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Reason	%	2 Reason	%	3 Reason	%	4 Reason	%	5 Reason	%
RURAL										
Korea	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	35	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	31	Companionship, closeness with mother	31	Conformity to social norms	10	Parents' preferred sex ratio	10
Taiwan	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	47	Parents' preferred sex ratio	30	Companionship, closeness with mother	18	Religious rituals, ancestor worship	9	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	8
Japan	Companionship, closeness with mother	41	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	34	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	30	Satisfaction in providing for children	8	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	7
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	90	Companionship, closeness with mother	18	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	2	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	2	*	
Philippines	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	92	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	6	Help in taking care of other children	4	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	4	Companionship, closeness with mother	3
Thailand	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	82	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	11	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	9	Behavior, personality of girls (positive)	8	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	7

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category. In cases where two or more reasons were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

* Less than 1 percent.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to question 28 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A14 Reasons for wanting boys: five most frequently mentioned reasons ranked according to percentage of respondents mentioning them, by socioeconomic group and country

SES group and country	1		2		3		4		5	
	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%	Reason	%
URBAN MIDDLE										
Korea	Continuity of family name	49	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	33	Continuity of family traditions	16	Conformity to social norms	10	Having future grandchildren	9
Taiwan	Continuity of family name	69	Unspecified help in old age	8	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	7	Conformity to social norms	7	Satisfy desires of other kin	7
									Only son belongs to us	7
Japan	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	29	Companionship, closeness with father	24	Continuity of family name	12	Parents' preferred sex ratio	9	Extension of self	7
U.S. (Hawaii) Japanese	Continuity of family name	43	Companionship, closeness with father	31	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	10	Parents' preferred sex ratio	9	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	7
Caucasian	Continuity of family name	41	Companionship, closeness with father	36	Parents' preferred sex ratio	13	To satisfy desires of the spouse	10	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	9
Philippines	Continuity of family name	34	Help in taking care of other children	24	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	22	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	17	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	7
Thailand	Continuity of family name	71	Help in taking care of other children	19	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	13	Extension of self	6	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	5

TABLE A14 *(continued)*

SES group and country	1 Reason	%	2 Reason	%	3 Reason	%	4 Reason	%	5 Reason	%
URBAN LOW										
Korea	Continuity of family name	68	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	35	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	17	Sharing financial responsibility; insurance, security	9	Conformity to social norms	6
Taiwan	Continuity of family name	80	Unspecified help in old age	21	To satisfy desires of other kin	7	Conformity to social norms	7	Help in family business or farm	6
Japan	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	53	Companionship, closeness with father	32	Children as heirs, someone to inherit family wealth	19	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	15	Children to carry out parents' hopes, aspirations	8
U.S. (Hawaii)										
Japanese	Continuity of family name	45	Companionship, closeness with father	19	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	10	To satisfy desires of spouse	10	Parents' preferred sex ratio	7
Caucasian	Continuity of family name	50	Companionship, closeness with father	30	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	15	Help in taking care of other children	12	To satisfy desires of spouse	8
Filipino	Continuity of family name	46	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	26	Companionship, closeness with father	9	Help in taking care of other children	6	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	5
Philippines	Continuity of family name	29	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	24	Help in taking care of other children	16	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	13	Companionship, closeness with father	4

Thailand	Continuity of family name	55	Conformity to religious norms	13	Unspecified help in old age	10	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	10	Economic help in old age Benefits to society	9 9
RURAL										
Korea	Continuity of family name	51	Companionship, comfort, care in old age	25	Comfort, care (old age not mentioned)	20	Economic help in old age	13	Religious rituals, ancestor worship	13
Taiwan	Continuity of family name	65	Unspecified help in old age	44	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	9	Sharing financial responsibility; insurance, security	7	Help in family business, farm	6
Japan	Children as heirs, someone to inherit family wealth	65	Behavior, personality of boys (positive)	19	Companionship, closeness with father	10	Unspecified help in old age	8	Unspecified help (old age not mentioned)	7
U.S. (Hawaii) Filipino	Continuity of family name	90	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	31	Companionship, closeness with father	4	To satisfy desires of spouse	1	Mixture of sexes for benefit of children	1
Philippines	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	50	Help in housework, family chores; practical help	18	Continuity of family name	14	Help in family business, farm	12	Help in taking care of other children	10
Thailand	Continuity of family name	58	Conformity to religious norms	26	Children as benefits to society	26	Economic help (old age not mentioned)	15	Religious rituals, ancestor worship	12

NOTE: Responses have been coded by category. In cases where two or more reasons were mentioned by the same percentage of respondents, the identical ranking is indicated by the omission of vertical rules.

SOURCE: Derived from a content analysis of responses to question 30 of the VOC questionnaire.

TABLE A15 Percentage of respondents who expect to rely on children for financial support in old age, by country and socioeconomic group

Country	Urban middle	Urban low	Rural
Korea	25	62	71
Taiwan	44	76	92
Japan	29	31	73
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	18	20	na
Caucasian	2	21	na
Filipino	na	52	76
Philippines	72	78	89
Thailand	25	83	90

NOTE: Table is based on the percentage of respondents who answered either "a little" or "a good deal" to a structured question about how much they expected to rely on their children in old age, or who mentioned children in an open-ended question about sources of old-age support.

na—not applicable because subsample did not include persons in this socioeconomic group.

TABLE A16 Index of expected economic help from children, by country and socioeconomic group

Country	Urban middle	Urban low	Rural
Korea	4.3	8.5	10.3
Taiwan	6.5	10.3	12.8
Japan	3.1	4.3	7.8
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	6.5	6.3	na
Caucasian	5.1	7.2	na
Filipino	na	12.5	15.6
Philippines	11.8	12.7	15.0
Thailand	7.3	13.5	14.3

NOTE: Index was constructed by combining five structured items on economic help expected from children both in the parents' old age and before parents grow old. The range of possible scores is from 0 (no help expected) to 17 (a great deal of help expected).

na—not applicable because subsample did not include persons in this socioeconomic group.

TABLE A17 Percentage of respondents who believe that three children would be a heavy financial burden, by country and socioeconomic group

Country	Urban middle	Urban low	Rural
Korea	53	72	55
Taiwan	26	33	41
Japan	24	39	24
U.S. (Hawaii)			
Japanese	18	18	na
Caucasian	17	15	na
Filipino	na	19	25
Philippines	10	17	7
Thailand	41	43	38

na—not applicable because subsample did not include persons in this socioeconomic group.

INTENTIONALLY
LEFT BLANK

Preceding page blank

REFERENCES

Arnold, Fred, et al.

1974 *The Value of Children: A Cross-National Study.* Honolulu: East-West Population Institute (in press).

Berelson, Bernard

n.d. The value of children: a taxonomical essay. In *The Population Council Annual Report 1972*, pp. 17–27. New York: Population Council.

Fawcett, James T., ed.

1972 *The Satisfactions and Costs of Children: Theories, Concepts, Methods.* Honolulu: East-West Population Institute.

Frejka, Tomas

1968 Reflections on the demographic conditions needed to establish a U.S. stationary population growth. *Population Studies* 22(3): 379–397.

Hoffman, Lois Wladis, and Martin L. Hoffman

1973 The value of children to parents. In James T. Fawcett, ed., *Psychological Perspectives on Population*, pp. 19–76. New York: Basic Books.

Schultz, Theodore W., ed.

1973 New economic approaches to fertility. *Journal of Political Economy* 81(2), part 2.

70

PAPERS OF THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE are a continuation of the series *Working Papers of the East-West Population Institute*, previous issues of which are listed on the following pages. The new title and improved format reflect the Institute's desire to bring these *Papers* to the attention of a wider audience. Single copies are available upon request while they remain in print. Because the topics explored in the series are varied and the supply of each *Paper* is limited, individuals are asked to limit requests to those titles of special interest. Institutions conducting research or programs in the field of population may order copies of all *Papers*.

PAPERS OF THE EAST-WEST POPULATION INSTITUTE

No.

1 On the momentum of population growth, by Nathan Keyfitz, September 1970, 26 pp. [Now available as Reprint 6.]

*2 Reflections on the family planning policy of Korea, by Hi-Sup Chung, October 1970, 31 pp.

3 Husband-wife interaction and family planning acceptance: a survey of the literature, by Florangel Z. Rosario, November 1970, 21 pp.

4 How birth control affects births, by Nathan Keyfitz, November 1970, 31 pp. [Now available as Reprint 16.]

*5 Neoclassical growth models and the optimum rate of population growth (with applications to underdeveloped countries), by Robert L. Crouch, November 1970, 67 pp.

6 Research in Indonesian demography: a bibliographic essay, by Geoffrey McNicoll, December 1970, 51 pp.

7 Migration as a means of population control, by Nathan Keyfitz, December 1970, 25 pp. [Now available as Reprint 8.]

*8 Estimating recent fertility from data on own children: West Malaysia, 1958–1967, by Lee-Jay Cho, December 1970, 31 pp.

9 Linkages of intrinsic to age-specific rates, by Nathan Keyfitz, December 1970, 33 pp. [Now available as Reprint 14.]

10 Methods of demographic estimation for statistically underdeveloped areas, by Paul Demeny, January 1971, 149 pp. [Now available as Reprint 17.]

*11 A survey of social-psychological variables used in studies of family planning, by Florangel Z. Rosario, February 1971, 28 pp.

12 Interpersonal communication and the diffusion of family planning in West Malaysia, by James A. Palmore, Paul M. Hirsch, and Ariffin bin Marzuki, March 1971, 33 pp. [Now available as Reprint 13.]

*13 Dual record systems for measurement of fertility changes, by H. Bradley Wells, April 1971, 59 pp.

14 Fertility differentials of Japanese women in Japan, Hawaii and California, by Y. Scott Matsumoto, Chai Bin Park, and Bella Z. Bell, May 1971, 29 pp.

15 Measuring mortality: a self-teaching guide to elementary measures, by James A. Palmore, May 1971, revised June 1973, 61 pp.

16 Measuring fertility and natural increase: a self-teaching guide to elementary measures, by James A. Palmore, May 1971, revised October 1972, 81 pp.

17 Population research in the Pacific Islands: a case study and some reflections, by Murray Chapman, September 1971, 41 pp.

18 On aggregative economic models and population policy, by Geoffrey McNicoll, October 1971, 87 pp.

19 Households, families and friends in a Hawaiian-American community, by Alan Howard, November 1971, 117 pp.

20 What mathematical demography tells that we would not know without it, by Nathan Keyfitz, March 1972, 72 pp.

*21 Multivariate analysis of areal fertility in Honolulu, by Chai Bin Park, March 1972, 39 pp.

22 Population policy under an arbitrary welfare criterion: theory and issues, by W. Brian Arthur, March 1972, 48 pp.

23 A model for the age distribution of first marriage, by Griffith M. Feeney, April 1972, 31 pp.

24 Optimal population policy, by W. Brian Arthur and Geoffrey McNicoll, May 1972, 54 pp.

25 Legal regulation of population movement to, from, and within the United States—a survey of current law and constitutional limitations, by Peter Maggs, June 1972, 58 pp.

* Out of print.

26 Spatial patterns of socio-economic structure and change in the Philippines, 1939–60, by Roland J. Fuchs and Telesforo W. Luna, Jr., August 1972, 55 pp.

27 Representation of national and regional political units in a computerized world future model, by Peter Maggs, October 1972, 51 pp.

28 The demographic situation in Indonesia, by Geoffrey McNicoll and Si Gde Made Mamas, December 1973, 68 pp.

29 The demographic situation in the Republic of Korea, by Lee-Jay Cho, December 1973, 52 pp.

30 Demographic research in Japan, 1955–70: a survey and selected bibliography, by Y. Scott Matsumoto, April 1974, 88 pp.

31 The demographic situation in Hawaii, by Robert W. Gardner and Eleanor C. Nordyke, June 1974, 120 pp.