Wanted and Unwanted Childbearing in the United States 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

An analysis of legitimate live births and whether they were wanted at the time they occurred, wanted later, or not wanted at all, as reported by the mother. Discusses trends and variations in relation to race, live-birth order, age of mother, expectation of future births, age at marriage, duration of marriage, education, income, and religious preference.

DHEW Publication No. (PHS)78-1918

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE Public Health Service National Center for Health Statistics Hyattsville, Md. September 1978



Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Weller, Robert H

Wanted and unwanted childbearing in the United States.

(Vital and health statistics: Series 21, Data from the National Vital Statistics System; no. 32) (DHEW publication; (PHS) 78-1918)

1. Fertility, Human-United States. 2. Fertility, Human-United States-Statistics. 3. United States-Statistics, Vital. I. Heuser, Robert L., joint author. II. Title. III. Series: United States. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital and health statistics : Series 21, Data from the National and Vital Statistics System, Data on natality, marriage, and divorce ; no. 38. IV. Series: United States. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. DHEW publication ; (PHS) 78-1918.

HA211.A3 no. 32	[HB915]	312′.1′73s	[312' 1'73]
ISBN 0-8406-0140-9			78-15719

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

DOROTHY P. RICE, Director

ROBERT A. ISRAEL, Deputy Director JACOB J. FELDMAN, Ph.D., Associate Director for Analysis GAIL F. FISHER, Ph.D., Associate Director for the Cooperative Health Statistics System ELIJAH L. WHITE, Associate Director for Data Systems JAMES T. BAIRD, JR., Ph.D., Associate Director for International Statistics ROBERT C. HUBER, Associate Director for Management MONROE G. SIRKEN, Ph.D., Associate Director for Mathematical Statistics PETER L. HURLEY, Associate Director for Operations JAMES M. ROBEY, Ph.D., Associate Director for Program Development PAUL E. LEAVERTON, Ph.D., Associate Director for Research ALICE HAYWOOD, Information Officer

DIVISION OF VITAL STATISTICS

JOHN E. PATTERSON, Director ALICE M. HETZEL, Deputy Director ROBERT L. HEUSER, M.A., Chief, Natality Statistics Branch MABEL G. SMITH, Chief, Statistical Resources Branch

Vital and Health Statistics-Series 21-No. 32

DHEW Publication No. (PHS)78-1918 Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 78-15719

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Summary of Principal Findings	2
Sources and Limitations of Data	2
Results	3
Birth Order and Age of Mother	5
Birth Expectations	8
Age at Marriage	8
Duration of Marriage	8
Education of Parents	10
Husband's Income	11
Religious Preference of Parents	12
Characteristics of Wanted and Unwanted Births	12
Color and Live-Birth Order	13
Educational Attainment of Mother	13
Income	13
Effect of Unwanted Childbearing on Population Growth	13
References	15
List of Detailed Tables	16
Appendixes	
I. Technical Notes on Methods	33
II. Source Forms	43

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Percent of legitimate live births wanted earlier, by live-birth order and by age of mother: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	6
2.	Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by live-birth order: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	6
8.	Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by age of mother: United States, 1972 Na- tional Natality Survey	7
4.	Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by educational attainment of father: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	10
5.	Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by educational attainment of mother: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	11
6.	Percent of legitimate live births unwanted, by educational attainment of father and of mother: United States, 1968 and 1972 National Natality Survey	12

LIST OF TEXT TABLES

A.	Estimated number, percent distribution, and rate of legitimate live births, by wantedness status and race of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	4
в.	Estimated rates for married women, by wantedness status and age of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	5
C.	Estimated number of legitimate first births to women married once and percent distribution by wantedness status, by duration of marriage and color of mother: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	9

D. Effects of unwanted childbearing on population growth: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972...... 14

SYMBOLS Data not available ... Category not applicable ... Quantity zero ... Quantity more than 0 but less than 0.05 0.0 Figure does not meet standards of reliability or precision *

WANTED AND UNWANTED CHILDBEARING IN THE UNITED STATES: 1968, 1969, AND 1972 NATIONAL NATALITY SURVEYS

Robert H. Weller, Ph.D., Center for the Study of Population, Florida State University, and Robert L. Heuser, M.A., Division of Vital Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics

INTRODUCTION

This report presents data on the extent to which American women have children earlier than they would have liked or have children who were not wanted at all. This subject is of interest both for its demographic implications and for the social and economic implications to the mother, father, and child.

Variations in the incidence of unwanted births may help to explain temporal variations in the birth rate. If a substantial proportion of births that occur are unwanted, then declines in this proportion could contribute to substantial downward movements in the birth rate. Some segments of the population are more likely than others to have unwanted births, which may partially explain differences in completed family size among various population subgroups.

The ability to control the timing of births is also important, especially with respect to first births, because the first birth represents the transition to parenthood and its associated roles. By having the first birth before it is wanted, a woman has less child-free time to continue her education and to acquire occupational interests and skills. This may result in an increase in desired family size and hence in actual completed family size. In many cases the first birth leads couples into marriage itself. Presumably, if the timing of all first births were planned, the incidence of illegitimate births and

hasty marriages would be reduced. The importance of this factor may be seen in the fact that 12.5 percent of the legitimate first births occurring in 1972 were conceived premaritally (i.e., born less than 8 months after the first marriage). Among women aged 15-19 years this incidence was 36.6 percent. Thus for many women the planned timing of the first birth would have resulted in a later age at marriage and motherhood. The proportions of these women who might have developed a less family-oriented role and perhaps have chosen to remain single and/or childless permanently are unknown. Even after the first birth, the inability to control the timing of births may reduce the woman's ability to plan her life.¹

The statistics presented in this report are based on the National Natality Surveys of 1968, 1969, and 1972, which are followback surveys of samples of the legitimate live births occurring during those years.

This report utilizes information supplied by the mother on whether she wanted to become pregnant with her last child (the sample child) at the time she did ("wanted then"), at a later time ("wanted later"), or not at all ("unwanted"). This classification is referred to as the "wantedness status" of the birth. Data are presented to show (1) the extent to which births occurred in each of these three categories, (2) the relationship between the failure to control the number or timing of births and social and demographic characteristics of the parents, and (3) changes that have occurred between 1968 and 1972.

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

The data show that many legitimate births in the United States were wanted later or were not wanted at all. A substantial reduction in unwanted childbearing took place between 1968 and 1972, however, with the proportion of legitimate births classified as unwanted declining from 12.7 percent to 8.2 percent. Slightly more than one-fourth of all legitimate births at each date were classified as wanted later. The decrease in unwanted childbearing between 1968 and 1972 contributed to the shift toward lower birth order that occurred.

The variables most strongly related to having an unwanted birth are race^a and family size variables such as live-birth order^b and the mother's childbearing expectations. In 1968, 11.6 percent of the white legitimate births were classified as not wanted, compared with 20.5 percent of all other^c legitimate births. However, between 1968 and 1972 the women of "all other" races experienced an extremely sharp decline in unwanted childbearing, reducing the race differential considerably. In 1972, 8.1 percent of the white legitimate births were unwanted, compared with 9.5 percent of all other births. Shifts toward a lower birth order distribution are more important among white than among all other births in accounting for these changes.

The likelihood that the birth was classified as unwanted increased as the birth order and age of mother increased, was larger when the mother expected no more children than when she expected to have more children, and decreased as the mother's educational attainment increased. About half of the first births that apparently had resulted from a premarital conception were reported by the mother as being wanted later; only 1 percent were reported as being unwanted. The percent of births unwanted was unrelated to husband's income in 1968, but increased slightly among cases where the husband's income was above the \$2,000-\$3,999 category in 1972.

The elimination of unwanted childbearing among married women would have had a substantial effect on population growth rates during these years. Eliminating unwanted childbearing would also appear to have a substantial effect upon average completed family size, but such a conclusion must be drawn with extreme caution because of the unknown extent to which the childbearing experience of the women giving birth in these years was representative of their entire birth cohorts.

SOURCES AND LIMITATIONS OF DATA

The data used in this report are from the 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics. A probability sample of births in each year was selected and the mothers of legitimate live births were subsequently sent a mail questionnaire. In 1968 and 1969 the sampling fraction was 1 in 1,000 for white births and 1 in 500 for all other births. In 1972, the sampling fraction was 1 in 500 for all births. Data from the questionnaires were used to supplement data from the birth certificates. Since the statistics derived from this survey are estimates based on a sample, they may differ from the figures that would have been obtained had all legitimate births been surveyed using the same questionnaire and procedures. The probability design of the sample makes the calculation of sampling errors possible. Findings discussed in the text are considered statistically significant at the .05 level for a two-tailed test. In some instances, relationships are referred to that are not statistically significant. When this is done, note is made that they are not significant.

A detailed description of the survey procedures, response rates and imputation procedures, and sampling errors as well as facsimiles of the U.S. Standard Certificate of

^aThe race or color of the mother is used in the text when referring to the child.

^bLive-birth order refers to the number of children the mother has borne alive, including the sample child.

^cAs used throughout this report "all other" refers to the combined grouping of all races other than white.

Live Birth and the questionnaires are included in the appendixes.

In 1968 and 1969 the dependent variable for this report—whether or not the mother wanted the pregnancy at that time—was measured by tabulating responses to this question: "Just before you became pregnant with your new baby, did you want to become pregnant?" Mothers were instructed to check one of the following:

"Yes."

"No, wanted a baby, but did not want to become pregnant yet."

"No, did not want a baby."

In 1972 the wording of the question was changed slightly to: "Thinking back, just before you became pregnant with your new baby, did you want to become pregnant at that time?" Mothers were given their choice of the following responses:

- "I wanted this pregnancy at an earlier time, as well as at that time."
- "I wanted to become pregnant at that time."
- "I did not want to become pregnant at that time, but I wanted another child <u>sometime</u> in the future."
- "I did not want to become pregnant at that time, or at any time in the future."

To allow comparisons, the first two responses to the 1972 question have been considered equivalent to the "yes" that appears in the 1968 and 1969 schedules and are referred to as being "wanted then." Births that were wanted, but at a later time, are often referred to as "timing failures." The term "unwanted" always refers to a number failure, a birth that was classified as not wanted at all. While the questions were phrased in terms of the wantedness of the *pregnancy*, the data in this report refer only to pregnancies resulting in live births and the term "birth" is used throughout the analysis.

It should be emphasized that information on illegitimate births is not included in this report. This is especially important for the age group under 20 years where, in 1972, 34 percent of all births were illegitimate and for births of all other races, 69 percent were illegitimate. The distributions of the illegitimate births by wantedness status as well as by other characteristics may be considerably different than for the legitimate births.

RESULTS

Table A shows the distribution of legitimate births classified by their wantedness status and the mother's race. In 1968, 59.4 percent of the births were wanted then, another 27.9 percent were wanted later (timing failures), and the remaining 12.7 percent were unwanted (number failures). Between 1968 and 1972 the percent of births that were unwanted declined; in 1972, 8.2 percent of the legitimate births were unwanted. In relative terms, this was a decrease of about a third. There was an increase in the percent of births reported as being wanted then, from 59.4 to 64.5 percent. There was no change in the percent of births that were timing failures.

The number of legitimate births declined by 337,000, or 11 percent, between 1968 and 1972. Half of this decline was accounted for by the decline in unwanted births and another third by births that were wanted later. Births that were wanted then represented only a sixth of the total decline in the number of legitimate births.

Black mothers were more likely than white mothers were to have had either a number failure or a timing failure in 1968, and were thus less likely to have had a birth that was wanted then. The differential between black and white mothers in the percent of births unwanted declined markedly during this period, primarily due to the large decrease in unwanted births among black mothers, and by 1972 there was no significant difference between the percents for white and black mothers. This is because the proportion of black births that were unwanted declined from 21.6 percent in 1968 to 9.9 percent in 1972, while the proportion of white births that were unwanted declined from 11.6 to 8.1 percent. These declines amounted to about a half for black births and about a third for white births.

Page of mother and wontedness status	Numt	per in tho	usands	Perce	nt distrib	oution	Rate ¹			
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	
ALL RACES										
Total	2,839	3,242	3,176	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.6	119.3	117.7	
Wanted then Wanted later Unwanted	1,832 773 234	2,035 833 373	1,886 885 405	64.5 27.2 8.2	62.8 25.7 11.5	59.4 27.9 12.7	64.9 27.4 8.3	74.9 30.7 13.7	69.9 32.8 15.0	
WHITE										
Total	2,504	2,844	2,774	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	117.7	115.7	
Wanted then Wanted later Unwanted	1,642 661 202	1,851 704 289	1,700 751 323	65.6 26.4 8.1	65.1 24.8 10.2	61.3 27.1 11.6	65.6 26.4 8.1	76.6 29.1 11.9	70.9 31.3 13.5	
ALL OTHER										
Total	335	398	402	100.0	100.0	100.0	104.0	132.4	133.7	
Wanted then Wanted later Unwanted	190 113 32	184 130 84	185 134 82	56.9 33.7 9.5	46.3 32.6 21.2	46.2 33.4 20.5	59.1 35.0 9.9	61.3 43.1 28.0	61.7 44.6 27.4	
Black					:			۱		
Total	285	352	355	100.0	100.0	100.0	103.5	131.0		
Wanted then Wanted later Unwanted	160 97 28	154 119 79	156 122 77	56.2 33.9 9.9	43.8 33.8 22.5	44.0 34.4 21.6	58.2 35.1 10.2	57.3 44.2 29.4		

 Table A. Estimated number, percent distribution, and rate of legitimate live births, by wantedness status and race of mother: United

 States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

¹Rate per 1,000 married women aged 15-44 years.

NOTE: Numbers may not add to totals due to rounding.

Most of the data in this report are presented in terms of the percent of births in a given group that were wanted or unwanted. The level of legitimate fertility may also be described in terms of the probabilities of bearing a wanted or unwanted child. The probabilities may be measured by relating the number of legitimate births of a particular wantedness status to the number of married women in the childbearing ages (assumed to be 15-44 years). The result is an age-specific legitimate birth rate for each category of wantedness status. These rates are shown in tables A and B. The denominator includes all married women and does not differentiate between women who may or may not want another child. Such a distinction would have given a more precise probability.

The rates show that the probability of

bearing a child declined between 1968 and 1972 for each wantedness category for total and for white legitimate births. For all other births, the declines were significant only for births that were wanted later and were unwanted. The increase between 1968 and 1972 in the *percent* of births of all races wanted then reflects the fact that the relative decline in the *rates* was greater for unwanted births than for births wanted then.

While there was a decline in the rate for births wanted later and for unwanted births, it was relatively greater for unwanted births. This may be an indication that the consequences of a timing failure are not seen to be as great as for a number failure. Couples may become more effective family planners when they have had all the children they want and are no longer concerned with failures that merely involve the

Table B. Estimated rates for married women, by wantedness status and age of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 NationalNatality Surveys

	Age of mother								
Wantedness status	15-44 years ¹	15-19 years ²	20-24 years	25-29 years	30-34 years	35-44 years ³			
Total									
1972 1969 1968 Wanted then	100.6 119.3 117.7	381.2 436.7 462.5	192.7 246.9 242.5	136.3 161.3 157.3	67.0 80.6 80.2	16.6 22.8 24.2			
1972 1969 1968 Wanted later	64.9 74.9 69.9	233.6 248.6 259.5	127.4 166.2 152.8	94.9 108.1 100.3	39.3 43.7 42.2	8.3 10.9 10.7			
1972 1969 1968	27.4 30.7 32.8	129.4 158.2 177.0	57.1 66.4 73.2	31.4 38.0 38.4	18.3 18.6 19.6	2.9 3.0 3.8			
 1972 1969 1968	8.3 13.7 15.0	18.1 29.9 26.0	8.2 14.3 16.5	10.1 15.2 18.5	9.4 18.3 18.4	5.5 8.9 9.8			

[Rates are legitimate births per 1,000 married women of specified age]

¹Rates computed by relating total legitimate births, regardless of age of mother, to married women aged 15-44 years.

²Rates computed by relating legitimate births to mothers under 20 years to married women aged 15-19 years.

³Rates computed by relating legitimate births to mothers 35 years and over to married women aged 35-44 years.

timing of births. This is consistent with the increases in the use of more effective methods of contraception (the "pill" and intrauterine device) and in sterilization, especially among older couples.^{2,3}

The 1972 survey permitted the mother to indicate that she would have liked the pregnancy to occur earlier, an alternative that was not presented to the responding mother in 1968 or 1969. This represents a different type of timing failure—failure to become pregnant when desired rather than becoming pregnant sooner than desired. In 1972, 20.5 percent of the legitimate births were wanted earlier than they actually occurred. White births were more likely to be reported as wanted earlier than were all other births (21.1 percent as compared with 16.1 percent).

There is an inverse relationship between the percent of births wanted earlier and birth order-24 to 25 percent of the first and second order births were wanted earlier while only 6.9

percent of the fifth and higher order births were in this category (figure 1). There is a slight tendency for the percent of births wanted earlier to increase with age of mother; the proportion increased from 16.8 percent for mothers under 20 years to 22 to 23 percent for mothers aged 25-29 and 30-34 years.

Birth Order and Age of Mother

The birth order of the infant is closely related to the wantedness status of the birth, as may be seen in table 1 and figure 2. With few exceptions, the higher the birth order the more likely it is that the birth was classified as unwanted and the less likely it is that the birth was classified as wanted then. For example, only 1.3 percent of the first order births in 1972 were unwanted, compared with 41.1 percent of the fifth and higher order births. Conversely, first order births were twice as likely to have been wanted then (74.3 percent) as were fifth and



Figure 1. Percent of legitimate live births wanted earlier, by live-birth order and by age of mother: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey



Figure 2. Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by live-birth order: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

higher order births (34.4 percent). There was no significant difference between first and second or between the fourth and fifth and higher order births in the percent wanted then. The biggest differences in the percent unwanted were between the second and third children (2.0 percent compared with 16.1 percent) and between the fourth and fifth and higher order children (21.1 percent compared with 41.1 percent).

The distribution of births by live-birth order shifted toward the lower orders between 1968 and 1972. The downward shift in birth order may be seen in the change in the proportion of legitimate births that are fourth or higher orders. Between 1968 and 1972, this proportion decreased from 22.1 to 14.7 percent. Since the higher order births are more likely to be unwanted, the decline in the percent of births that were unwanted would account for some of the decline in this proportion.

Although the proportion of births that were unwanted in 1968 was lower for white mothers than for all other mothers at every birth order, the difference is significant only for second and third order births. By 1972 the proportion was significantly lower only for first order births and was significantly higher for fifth and higher order births; for third and fourth orders the percents unwanted were higher for white mothers, but not significantly. Between 1968 and 1972 there were declines in the percent unwanted for all other mothers in all birth orders except the first order.

The wantedness status of the birth is also related to the age of the mother (table 1 and figure 3). In 1972 the percent of legitimate births that were wanted then increased from



Figure 3. Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by age of mother: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

61.3 for mothers under 20 years to 69.6 for the 25-29-year age group and then decreased to 49.9 for mothers 35 years and older. The percent wanted later generally decreased with age, ranging from 34.0 percent for mothers under 20 years of age to 17.2 percent for mothers 35 years and older. The percent of births not wanted at all increased from 5 and 4 percent for mothers under 20 and 20-24 years, respectively, to about 33 percent for the oldest age group.

The rate per 1,000 married women and the percent of births that were wanted later had the same relationship with age of mother-the older ages had lower rates and lower percents (table B). The rate had generally this same relationship with age for births that were unwanted and that were wanted then. However, the percent of births unwanted was higher for older mothers and the percent wanted then was higher for mothers aged 25-29 years than for younger or older mothers. The most striking difference between these two measures was for births classified as unwanted; in this category the percent was highest and the rate was lowest for women 35 years and older. This reflects the fact that few of these older women were having births but a large proportion of the births that did occur to these women were unwanted.

The *percent* of births unwanted was lower in 1972 than in 1968 for each age-of-mother group except for those in the age group 18-19 years. The percent of births wanted then was higher in 1972 for all mothers except those aged 20-24 years.

There were significant declines in the *rate* of unwanted childbearing for women in all age groups. For births that were wanted later the rates declined for all women except at ages 30-34 years; for births wanted then there were declines only for ages 20-24 years and 35 years and over.

Birth Expectations

Women who expect no more children are much more likely than other women to have classified the last birth as unwanted and are much less likely to have classified it as wanted then, as may be seen in table 2. This is to be expected since women who say their last child was unwanted would be far less likely than other women to expect more children. This same pattern is seen for all birth orders except the second.

Expected completed family size is strongly related to the wantedness status of the birth. This is because current birth order, which is one of the components of family size, is related to wantedness status. Within each order, the number of additional births expected by the mother—the other component of family size—is not related to the percent of births wanted then. This is also true for births wanted later and for unwanted births.

Age at Marriage

Age at marriage is related to the wantedness status of the birth, as shown by the data in table 3. In 1972, mothers who had married at age 30 or older were more likely than mothers who had married younger to classify their birth as unwanted. There was also a general tendency for the percent of births wanted later to decrease as the age at marriage increased and for the percent wanted then to increase as age at marriage increased. These relationships for births that were wanted then and wanted later are also seen in the 1968 data. However, for unwanted births the relationships were quite different in 1968 than in 1972. Indeed, in 1968 mothers most likely to classify their birth as unwanted were those married before age 18. The only significant declines between 1968 and 1972 in the proportion of mothers who classified their birth as unwanted were for those who were married before age 18, at ages 19-20, and 21-22. These declines were accompanied by increases in the percent of births wanted then for these age-atmarriage groups.

Although table 3 shows some large differences by color in the percent of births unwanted, many of these percents are based on relatively small numbers of births and, therefore, have large sampling errors. This is especially true for all other births.

Duration of Marriage

Although no direct question was asked concerning premarital conception, the 1972 data can be used to calculate the number of months between the date of the woman's present marriage and the date of the present birth (table C). When analysis is restricted to mothers who have been married only once, it is seen that 12.5 percent of the first births occurred less than 8 months after marriage and probably were the result of a premarital conception. These infants were less likely than other births to be wanted then, and more likely to have been wanted later. For first births occurring within 8 months of first marriage, 45.8 percent were wanted then, and 53.4 percent were wanted later. By contrast, of first infants born 12 or more months after marriage 85.7 percent were wanted then and 13.0 percent were wanted later. There was no significant difference in the proportion unwanted for these duration-of-marriage groups.

Three general patterns are seen in the 1972 data when longer durations of marriage and all birth orders are examined. These data, for women married one time, are shown in table 4. The first pattern is that births occurring less than 12 months after marriage were more likely than those occurring 12-23 months after marriage to be wanted later (i.e., timing failures), and were less likely to be wanted then. This is primarily a function of the incidence of premaritally conceived births within the 0-11-month category, because it was observed only for first births. For first births, 48.3 percent occurring less than 12 months after marriage but only 18.6 percent occurring 12-23 months after marriage were timing failures. By contrast, about half of the second order births occurring both less than 12 months and 12-23 months after marriage were timing failures. Similarly, among first order births 50.5 percent of the births within 12 months after marriage and 80.7 percent of those 12-23 months after marriage were wanted then; among second order births about half of the births in *both* groups were wanted then.

The second major pattern in table 4 is that after 3-4 years of marriage (36-47 months) the longer the duration of marriage the greater the probability that the birth was classified as unwanted. Although this tendency was present within all birth order categories except the first and fifth and higher, some of the differences for specific birth orders were not significant.

The third pattern seen in table 4 is that for first, second, and third order births the longer the duration of marriage the less likely that the birth was a timing failure. For second order births in 1972, the percent of births that were timing failures declined from about 50 percent

Color of mother and duration of marriage	Number of births (in thousands)	Total	Wanted then	Wanted later	Unwanted	
			Percent c	listribution		
Total	1,001	100.0	74.3	24.5	1.3	
0-7 months 8-11 months 12 months and over	125 201 676	100.0 100.0 100.0	45.8 53.4 85.7	53.4 45.1 13.0	0.8 1.5 1.3	
White	887	100.0	74.8	24.1	1.1	
0-7 months 8-11 months 12 months and over	108 175 604	100.0 100.0 100.0	45.6 54.1 86.1	53.9 44.2 12.9	0.5 1.7 1.0	
All other	114	100.0	69.8	27.6	2.7	
0-7 months 8-11 months 12 months and over	17 26 72	100.0 100.0 100.0	46.6 49.0 82.6	50.3 51.0 13.9	3.1 3.6	

 Table C. Estimated number of legitimate first births to women married once and percent distribution by wantedness status, by duration

 of marriage and color of mother:
 United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

among births occurring less than 2 years after marriage to only 4.1 percent among women giving birth 14 years or more after marriage.

Education of Parents

The wantedness status of the birth in relation to the educational attainment of each parent is shown in tables 5 and 6 and figures 4 and 5. Higher educational attainment of the father was generally associated with a higher percent of births wanted then and a lower percent of births unwanted. In 1972, 53.6 percent of the births to fathers with 0-8 years of school were classified by the mother as wanted then as compared with 71.9 percent for fathers with 4 or more years of college. The percent of births unwanted was 15.9 percent for fathers with the lowest education, decreased to 4.6 percent for those with some college, and then increased slightly to 7.2 percent for fathers who had completed 4 or more years of college. Examined through time, the likelihood of a birth being unwanted has decreased significantly between 1968 and 1972 for all fathers except those with 0-8 years of school (figure 6), while the percent of births wanted then increased for fathers with 9-11 through 13-15 years of school.

Similar patterns are present for the educational attainment of the mother. However, the percent of births wanted then decreased from the 0-8- to 9-11-years-of-school category, and



Figure 4. Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by educational attainment of father: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey



Figure 5. Percent of legitimate live births by wantedness status, by educational attainment of mother: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

then increased to the highest education group. In general, the higher the number of grades completed by the mother the less likely it was that the birth was classified as unwanted. When birth order is controlled, the negative relationship between unwanted childbearing and the mother's education generally disappears. Between 1968 and 1972, unwanted childbearing declined among mothers at all educational levels.

There were differences in unwanted childbearing between white and all other mothers in the 0-8-, 9-11- and 12-year categories of educational attainment in 1968. In 1972, the only significant color difference was for mothers with 9-11 years of school completed.

Husband's Income

Between 1968 and 1972, the percent of births unwanted declined for all but the lowest (under \$2,000) income group (table 7). In 1968, husband's income was unrelated to whether the birth was classified as unwanted. However, in 1972 the percent unwanted declined from the under-\$2,000 to the \$2,000-\$3,999 category and then increased to the income groups \$7,000 and over.

Husband's income is inversely associated with the proportion of births that were timing failures. In 1972, 38.2 percent of births in the lowest income category were wanted later as



Figure 6. Percent of legitimate live births unwanted, by educational attainment of father and of mother: United States, 1968 and 1972 National Natality Surveys

compared with only 17.8 percent in the highest income category. Thus people in the lowest income category were about twice as likely as people in the highest category to experience a timing failure.

The pattern of increase in the percent of births unwanted with increasing income for total and white mothers may be primarily a reflection of differences in the duration of marriage. Higher income groups have a longer duration of marriage and, as we have already observed, after 3-4 years of marriage the proportion of births unwanted rises with duration of marriage (table 4). Table 8 shows the percent of births unwanted by husband's income within four duration-of-marriage groups for women married once. These data show no significant differences in the percent unwanted for incomes of \$2,000 or more for any duration-of-marriage category. In fact the pattern, although not significant, is toward a decrease rather than an increase in the percent unwanted with higher income in each duration-of-marriage category.

Religious Preference of Parents

The 1968 and 1969 surveys contained a question concerning the religious preference of each parent. Differences in wantedness status by religious preference were minimal, with one exception. Jewish women were less likely than other women to report their birth as unwanted or as wanted later and were more likely to report it as wanted then (table 9). This is shown by the data on both the mother's and the father's religious preference.

CHARACTERISTICS OF WANTED AND UNWANTED BIRTHS

Previous sections of this report have focused on the distribution of births by wantedness status within specific groups such as live-birth order, age of mother, and so on. In this section, the births of a particular wantedness category are described in terms of these other characteristics. For example, are mothers of unwanted births older or younger than mothers of births that are wanted then? Estimated numbers of legitimate births and percent distributions by selected characteristics are shown for each category of wantedness status in tables 10 and 11.

Color and Live-Birth Order

In each of the three survey years, about 90 percent of the births wanted then and about 85 percent of the births wanted later were to white mothers. The percent of unwanted births to white mothers increased from 80 percent in 1968 to 86 percent in 1972 reflecting the greater decline in unwanted childbearing among mothers of all other races. Unwanted births were of higher birth order than births in the other two wantedness categories. In 1972, 86 percent of the unwanted births were third and higher order as compared with only 20 percent of the births wanted then and 38 percent of the births wanted later; this is also reflected in the median birth orders of 4.3, 1.2, and 1.6, respectively. Since age of mother and live-birth order are related, it is expected that mothers of unwanted births would be older on the average than mothers of other births would be. Median ages show that mothers of unwanted births were 4 to 5 years older on the average than mothers in the other two categories.

Educational Attainment of Mother

Although there is little difference in the median years of school completed by the mother for the different categories of wantedness status, the percent distributions show that mothers of unwanted births had somewhat lower educational attainment than the other groups of mothers had. While 30.0 percent of the mothers of unwanted births had not completed high school, only 18.8 percent of mothers whose births were wanted then were in this educational group. In addition, only 5.7 percent of the mothers of unwanted births had completed 16 or more years of school as compared with 13.7 percent of the mothers of births that were wanted then.

Income

Income data are often used as a measure of socioeconomic status. The distributions of births

by husband's income and median income shown in tables 10 and 11 can be compared from one wantedness category to another, but should not be compared from one year to another because the income data are not given in constant dollars.

The data in table 11 show that the lowest median income is associated with births that were wanted later. This is consistent with the fact that most births in this category occur to young mothers, whose husbands are presumably just beginning their careers.

The median income for fathers of unwanted births was as high in each survey year as for fathers of births that were wanted then. The mothers of unwanted births were considerably older and their husbands were far closer to their maximum earning power than were the mothers of births wanted then. The data on income are thus consistent with a lower socioeconomic status for mothers of unwanted births than for mothers of births wanted then, and the distributions of births by husband's income are compatible with those by education.

EFFECT OF UNWANTED CHILDBEARING ON POPULATION GROWTH

The number of unwanted legitimate births in each year was quite large, ranging from 405,000 in 1968 to 234,000 in 1972. To what extent did these unwanted births contribute to the Nation's population growth during these years? Table D shows estimates of the population growth that would have occurred if there had been no unwanted legitimate live births in each year. Under these conditions, the amount of population growth would have been reduced by 20.7 percent in 1968, 17.9 percent in 1969, and 14.5 percent in 1972.

Another way of looking at this question is to estimate what proportion of the decline in the birth rate between 1968 and 1972 can be attributed to changes in unwanted marital childbearing. The crude birth rate for the United States declined from 17.5 births per 1,000 population in 1968 to 15.6 in 1972, a change of 1.9 points. If no unwanted legitimate births had occurred in 1968, the birth rate would have been 15.5, and

	Pop	oulation grown	th	Rates of population growth			
Year 1972 1969 1968	With unwanted births ¹	Without unwanted births	Percent reduced	With unwanted births ¹	Without unwanted births	Percent reduced	
1972 1969 1968	1,615,000 2,089,000 1,952,000	1,381,000 1,716,000 1,547,000	14.5 17.9 20.7	7.7 10.3 9.7	6.6 8.5 7.7	14.3 17.5 20.6	

[Rates per 1,000 population]

¹Based on components of change published by the U.S. Bureau of Census in *Current Population Reports*, Series P-25, No. 521, Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, May 1974.

- 000 —

if no unwanted births had occurred in 1972 the rate would have been 14.5. Thus, about half of the reduction in the crude birth rate between 1968 and 1972 can be attributed to reductions in unwanted marital childbearing and the other half can be attributed to changes in other factors including wanted (wanted then as well as wanted later) legitimate births.

Because the data in this report do not represent the total childbearing experience of an actual cohort of women as it passes through the childbearing ages, it is not possible to determine the effects of eliminating unwanted childbearing upon actual completed family size. However, the total fertility rate provides an estimate of completed family size (per 1,000 women) *if* current levels of fertility and timing patterns persist and *if* the mothers in the sample are representative of all women in their birth cohorts.

Total fertility rates were computed with the unwanted births excluded and compared with the actual rates. In 1968, the adjusted total fertility rate (excluding unwanted births) was 13 percent lower than the actual rate, 2,158 compared with 2,477. In 1972, when there were fewer unwanted births, the difference was reduced to 8 percent (1,853 compared with 2,022). It should be emphasized that these rates show the implications of current age-specific levels of fertility for completed family size and not actual or expected family size.

So far we have been discussing the effect of number failures on rates of population change. The demographic effect of timing failures is more difficult to estimate since these are births that were wanted, but at some other time. This report has concentrated upon a subset of these births, those that were wanted later rather than earlier. In each year, the number of births wanted later was substantially larger than the number of unwanted legitimate births. In 1972 there were about three times as many births wanted later as there were unwanted births. The demographic effect upon period fertility rates of hypothetically postponing these births until they are wanted is minimized by two considerations. First, any downward pressures on the birth rate caused by the removal of this many births from the numerator would be shortlived and would last only until the postponed births began to occur in subsequent years, when they would exert upward pressures on the birth rate. Second, the 1972 data indicate that 20.5 percent of the births were wanted at some earlier time. Having these births at the time they were wanted would, in turn, partially offset the effect of the postponement of births that were wanted later.

REFERENCES

¹Presser, H. B.: Perfect fertility control: Consequences for women and the family, in C. F. Westoff, et al., eds., *Toward the End of Growth*. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice-Hall, 1973.

²Westoff, C. F.: The modernization of U.S. contraceptive practice. *Fam. Plann. Perspec.* 4(3): 9-12, July 1972.

³National Center for Health Statistics: Contraceptive utilization among currently married women 15-44 years of age; United States, 1973, by Kathleen Ford. *Monthly Vital Statistics Report.* Vol. 25, No. 7, Supp. DHEW Pub. No. (HRA) 76-1120. Health Resources Administration. Rockville, Md., Oct. 1976. ⁴National Center for Health Statistics: Replication, an approach to the analysis of data from complex surveys, by Philip J. McCarthy, Ph.D. Vital and Health Statistics. PHS Pub. No. 1000-Series 2-No. 14. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, Apr. 1966.

⁵National Center for Health Statistics: Pseudoreplication—Further evaluation and application of the balanced half-sample technique, by Philip J. McCarthy, Ph.D. Vital and Health Statistics. PHS Pub. No. 1000-Series 2-No. 31. Public Health Service. Washington. U.S. Government Printing Office, Jan. 1969.

LIST OF DETAILED TABLES

1.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to age of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	17
2.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to number of additional births expected, live-birth order, and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	20
3.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to age at marriage and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	22
4.	Estimated number of legitimate live births to women married once and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to color of mother, live-birth order, and duration of marriage: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	23
5.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to educational attain- ment of father and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	24
6.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to educational attain- ment of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	25
7.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to husband's income and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	27
8.	Estimated number of legitimate live births to women married once and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to color of mother, duration of marriage, and husband's income: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	28
9.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to religious preference of mother and of father: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys	29
10.	Estimated number of legitimate live births, by wantedness status and selected characteristics: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	30
11.	Percent distribution of legitimate live births by selected characteristics, according to wantedness status: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	31

Table 1. I	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percen	t distribution by wantedness status	, according to age of mother,	live-birth order, and color of mother:	United
	States	s, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National N	latality Surveys		

				Wantedness status								
Age of mother, live birth order, and color of mother	Legiti	mate live	births		Wanted the	en	١	Vanted late	er	Unwanted		
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968
TOTAL	Numb	er in tho	usands					Percent	I	I		•
All ages	2,839	3,242	3,176	64.5	62.8	59.4	27.2	25.7	27.9	8.2	11.5	12.7
	=	<u> </u>		<u> </u>								
First child	1,036	1,133	1.125	74.3	72.8	69.5	24.4	24.6	27.6	1.3	2.6	2.9
Third child	435	566	497	47.1	55.1	51.5	36.7	22.5	32.9	16.1	15.7	15.6
Fourth child	202	270	310	39.1	46.9	39.8	39.7	28.3	32.7	21.1	24.7	27.6
Fifth child and over	214	365	393	34.4	29.8	26.6	24.5	28.7	27.6	41.1	41.6	45.8
Under 20 years	419	431	456	61.3	56.9	56.1	34.0	36.2	38.3	4.8	6.8	5.6
First child	252	326	350	64.7	58.7	59 7	33.1	35.6	36.1	2.3	5.7	43
Second child	104	81	75	65.3	55.8	50,3	33.7	37.1	47.8	0.9	7.1	1.9
Third child and over	63	24	31	41.3	37.0	30.0	37.7	42.0	40.3	21.0	21.0	30.0
Under 18 years	125	101	122	64.9	57.1	51.2	32.5	36.2	43.1	2.6	6.7	5.7
First child	80	88	106	65,6	58.0	52.2	33.7	34.9	42.1	0.6	7.1	5.7
Second child	31	12	12	72.8	59.6	40,7	27.2	40.4	55.5	-	-	3.8
Third child and over	14	*2	*3	43.0	-	*57.3	36.9	*70.4	*28.2	20.2	*29.6	*14.5
18-19 years	294	330	335	59.8	56.9	57.9	34.6	36.2	36.5	5.7	6.9	5.6
First child	172	238	244	64.2	58.9	62,9	32.8	35.8	33.4	3.0	5.2	3.7
Second child Third child and over	73 50	70 22	63 28	62.2 40.9	55.2 40.4	52.3 26.6	36.5 38.0	36.5 39.4	46.3 41.7	1.3 21.2	8.4 20.2	1.5 31.7
20-24 years	1,037	1,246	1,193	66.1	67.3	63.0	29.6	26.9	30.2	4.3	5,8	6.8
												<u> </u>
First child	461	564	533	74.7	74.8	69,9 60.6	24.6	23.5	27.4	0.8	1.7	2.7
Third child	109	163	160	37.4	49.4	40.0	20.0	37.3	20.4 47.8	11.4	13.3	17.3
Fourth child and over	69	77	84	33.0	39.6	30.7	33.8	30.5	42.0	33.3	29.4	27.0
20-21 years	366	485	487	63.7	68.2	60,9	31.9	27.4	32.7	4.4	4.5	6.3
First child	185	273	273	71.9	76.0	66.2	27.3	22.0	30.5	0.8	21	33
Second child	130	144	159	65.2	64.9	63.8	32.9	30.9	30.3	1,9	4.2	5.9
Third child	28	54	41	27.6	48.2	25.8	58,9	44.3	55.6	13.6	7.5	18.6
Fourth child and over	22	13	14	32.6	23.8	27.1	30.6	29.2	37.1	36.8	45.4	35.0
22-24 years	671	761	706	67.4	66.8	64.5	28.4	26.6	28.4	4.2	6.6	7.1
First child	275	291	260	76.6	73.6	73.7	22.7	25.0	24.3	0.7	1.4	2.1
Second child	268	297	258	72.1	71.4	73.2	26.8	24.6	24.0	1.1	4.0	2.9
Third child	81	109	119	40.8	50.1	44.8	48.4	33.8	38.4	10.7	16.2	16.8
Fourth child and over	4/	64		33.Z	42.8	31,5	35.3	30.8	43.0	31.5	26.1	25.4
25-29 years	854	921	870	69.6	67.0	63.8	23.0	23.5	24.4	7.4	9.4	11.8
First child	231	193	192	82.1	85.2	80.3	17.0	14.3	17.8	09	0.5	19
Second child	322	290	258	82.0	81.7	82,2	16.7	16.1	16.3	1,3	2.2	1.5
Third child	186	245	198	50.0	59.4	57.3	33.1	27.6	30.8	16,9	12.9	11.9
Fourth child and over	70	91	120	44.5	47.7	42,4	39.7	36.3	31.7	15.8	16.1	25.9
	45	100	101	30.3	20.2	23,4	31.5	41.1	30.7	32.3	32.7	39.9
30-34 years	361	409	401	58.6	54.2	52.6	27.2	23.1	24.4	14.1	22.8	23.0
First child	71	38	34	78.1	97.3	91.2	19,7	2.7	8.8	2.2	-	
Second child	97	69	76	75.8	80.1	85.6	20.5	15.9	11.6	3.8	4.0	2.7
Third child	74	95	82	54.8	57.3	61.9	26.5	26.8	27.9	18.6	16.0	10.2
Fifth child and over	54 66	127	123	39.1	28.7	25.4	40.4 31.3	25.5	27.7	23.1	20.9 42.3	28.0 46.9
35 years and over	168	236	256	49.9	47.8	43.9	17.2	13.3	15.7	32.9	38.9	40.4
					, .,,0			.0.0		52.5		
First child	21	12	16	81.7	84.6	93.8	16.1	15.4	6.2	2.2		
Third child	31	26	24	70.2 45.5	76.0 56 1	62.5	12.7	10.3	18.8	17.2	13.7	18.8
Fourth child	26	37	50	49.2	49.3	48.8	19.0	8.8	13.2	31.9	42.0	37.9
Fifth child and over	62	121	134	31.0	34.9	28.5	13.5	18.0	19.6	55,5	47.2	52.1

Table 1. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to age of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys-Con.

		moto live husthe					Wante	dness stat	us			
Age of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother	Legiti	mate live	DIrths		Wanted the	en	Wanted later			Unwanted		
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968
White	Numb	er in tho	usands					Percent	.		۱	
All ages	2,504	2,844	2,774	65.6	65.1	61.3	26.4	24.8	27.1	8.1	10.2	11.6
First child	920	1,033	1,015	74.9	74.1	70.3	24.1	23.6	27.0	1,1	2.3	2.8
Second child	848	817	757	75.2	74.5	74.8	22.7	21.8	22.3	2.0	3.7	3.0
Fourth child	1 390	490	427	47.8	57.2	52.4	35.8	28.5	33.0	16.4	14.3	14.6
Fifth child and over	173	272	304	35.1	32.1	28.2	22.0	27.8	26.9	42.9	39.6	44.9
Under 20 years	355	365	376	63.0	59.6	57.8	32.9	34.3	37.4	4.1	6.1	4.9
First child	222	200	202	ee e	CO 7	60.7	22.0	22.0	25.0	1.0		
Second child	83	200	54	68.8	60.7 57.4	49.7	32.9	33.9	35.2	1.6	5.4	4.2
Third child and over	50	12	18	42.4	46.8	35.0	37.6	46.0	39.9	20.0	6.5	25.1
Under 18 years	108	84	99	65.6	61.9	52.0	31.3	33.1	42.5	3.1	4.9	5.5
First child	71	73	90	66.2	63,1	52.6	33.1	31.2	41.3	0.7	5.7	6.0
Second child	24	10	*6	76.2	58.3	*42.9	23.8	41.7	*57.1	-	.	
Third child and over	13	*1	*2	42.5	-	*50.0	35.6	*100.0	*50.0	21.9	-	-
18-19 years	247	281	277	61.9	58.9	59.8	33.6	34.6	35.6	4.6	6.4	4.6
First child	151	213	213	65.2	59.9	64.0	32.8	34.8	32.5	2.0	5.4	3.4
Second child Third child and over	59 38	56 12	48 16	65.7 42.4	57.3 50.0	50.0 33.3	32.7 38.3	32.4 42.2	48.1 38.8	1.6 19.3	10.3 6.9	1.9 27.9
20-24 years	920	1,103	1,056	66.7	69.4	64.7	29.4	25.9	29.9	4.0	4.6	5.4
First child	412	500	400	74.0	75.0	70.4			07.4			
Second child	360	394	375	69.7	70.5	71.4	24.4	22.9	27.1	0.7	1.4	2.4
Third child	93	128	132	37.4	51.5	38.7	50.8	36.9	45.8	11.9	11.6	15.5
Fourth child and over	56	59	59	34.5	44.4	32.1	33.5	31.1	46.4	32.0	24.0	20.8
20-21 years	314	424	427	64.4	70.0	62,5	31.2	26.9	32.7	4.4	3.1	4.8
First child	162	249	248	72.4	76.8	66.8	27.0	21.6	30.6	0.6	1.6	2.6
Second child	111	122	140	65.0	65.7	66.0	33.3	30.6	29.6	1.7	3.6	4.5
Fourth child and over	23	44	33	29.3	\$1.3	23.5	54.1	43.5	59.2	16.6	5.2	17.3
	10	°	0	34.4	27.5	10.0	20.1	-42,5	*48.3	39.5	*27.5	*34.5
22-24 years	606	679	629	67,8	69.0	66.2	28.4	25.4	27.9	3.7	5.6	5.9
First child	250	272	242	76.6	74.9	74.2	22.7	24.0	23.6	0.8	1.1	2.2
Third child	249	272	234	71.9	72.7	74.7	26.9	23.5	22.6	1.2	3.8	2.7
Fourth child and over	37	51	53	34.5	47.0	34.0	37.1	29.3	46.2	28.4	23.4	19.3
3E 20 years			770	70.4		07.0						
20-29 years		822	773	/0.4	69.0	65.9	22.1	23.2	23.5	7.6	7.8	10.6
First child	208	178	175	83.0	85.3	80.4	16.3	14.1	17.6	0.8	0.6	2.0
Second child	292	268	238	83.5	83.0	83.2	15.5	15.5	15.5	1.0	1.5	1.2
Third child	174	227	178	49.7	60.3	58.5	32.8	27.8	29.5	17.5	11.9	11.9
Fifth child and over	36	70	72	45.0 34.0	40.3 28.2	42.7	29.6	37.8	31.8	36.5	15,9	25.5
30.34 years	214	254	250	50.0	50.0	54.0	05.0	01.0	00.0	44.5		00.0
SU-S4 years	314	354	350	59.9	56.3	54.2	25.6	21.9	23.2	14.5	21.8	22.6
First child	60	35	30	78.6	97,1	93.1	19.5	2.9	6.9	1.9		
Second child	86	64	67	77.6	80.6	87.6	18.1	16.1	9.3	4.2	3.2	3.1
Fourth child	68 48	87	76 78	56.5 31.6	58.3 47.2	38.7	23.8	25,9	28,4	19.7	15.8	10.5
Fifth child and over	53	98	99	39.8	30.7	26.9	28.2	27.6	26.9	32.0	41.8	46.2
35 years and over	144	200	219	51.4	50.8	46.0	16.0	12.1	14.7	32.6	37.1	39.2
												
First child.	18	12	16	83.9	84.6	93.4	13.5	15,4	6.6	2.7	-	10 -
Third child	25	36	22	46.1	57.5	64.0	30.7	5.0	4.0	23.3	37.5	32.0
Fourth child	23	34	47	46.7	50.0	52.1	19.3	7.9	13.0	34.0	42.1	34,9
Fifth child and over	51	93	109	33.6	37.7	28.9	11.2	16.4	18.4	55.1	45.9	52.7

Table 1. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to age of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother	r: United
States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys-Con.	

	1		f. :	Wantedness status											
Age of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother	Legiti	mate live	DIFTINS		Wanted th	en	1	Nanted late	er	l i	Inwanted				
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968			
All other	Numb	er in thou	usands		·	•		Percent				_			
All ages	335	398	402	56.9	46.3	46.1	33.7	32.6	33.4	9.5	21.2	20.5			
First child	116	100	110	69,4	59,7	62.2	27,5	34.7	33.4	3.1	5.6	4.4			
Second child	103	92	94	64.4	60.2	58.5	33.6	33.0	35.2	2.1	6.8	6.3			
Third child	46	76	70	41.6	42.1	45.5	44.6	33.4	32.5	13.8	24.6	22.0			
Fifth child and over	41	93	89	31.3	23.0	20.9	35.1	29.6	29.8	33.6	47.4	49.3			
Under 20 years	64	66	81	51.8	42.0	48.5	39.9	46.8	42.4	8.3	11.1	9.1			
First child	30	40	47	58.3	44.2	53.3	34.8	48.0	42.0	6.9	7.8	4.9			
Second child and over	34	26	34	45.9	38.8	41.6	44.4	45.2	42.8	9.6	16.0	15.3			
Under 18 years	17	17	23	60,2	33,5	48.0	39.8	51.2	45.6	·	15.3	6.5			
First child.	*9	14	16	*61.3	32.1	50.0	*38.7	53.6	46.4	• •	14.3	3.6			
Second child and over	-8	-3	8	-59,0	40,0	-44.0	~41.0	*40.0	44.0	-	~20.0	13.3			
18-19 years	47	49	58	48,6	45.1	48.6	39,9	45.3	41.1	11.4	9.5	10.3			
First child.	21	25	31	57.0	51.2	55.0	33.0	44.7	39.6	10.0	4.1	5.4			
	20	25	20	-1.5	55.0	-0.5	40.0	40.5	72.7	12.0	10.0	10.0			
20-24 years	116	143	137	61.8	51.3	50.1	31.6	34,1	32,4	6.7	14.6	17.5			
First child	49	42	42	72.8	62.2	63.0	26.1	31.7	30.8	1.1	5.9	6.2			
Second child	38	47	42	70.7	58.6	53.1	27.9	34.9	37.2	1.4	6.3	9.7			
	30	55	55	52.7	30.0	57.3	45.0	35.0	30,1	22.3	20.5	32.0			
20-21 years	52	61	60	59.6	55.4	49.5	36.3	30,7	33.0	4.1	13.9	17.5			
First child	24	24	25	68.9	67.4	60.4	28.9	26.1	29.2	2.2	6.5	10.4			
Second child	19 +q	22 15	19	*21.9	29.6	47.2	30.5 *66.7	32.5	36,1	*11.3	34.9	16,7			
22-24 years	64	82	77	63.5	48.1	50.5	21.7	36.7	32.0	8.8	15.2	17.5			
First child	25	19	17	76.5	55.6	66.7	23.5	38.9	33.3	-	5.6				
Third child and over	21	38	36	37.6	38.5	38.1	35.1	35.1	27.7	27.4	25.7	34.2			
25-29 years	82	99	97	62,1	50.6	46.9	32.0	26.3	31,9	5.8	23.1	21.1			
First child	23	15	17	73,8	65.9	80.0	23.8	16.1	20.0	2.4	10.7	42			
Third child	13	18	20	54,1	48.8	46.5	37.6	25.5	41.9	8.3	25.7	11.6			
Fourth child and over	17	43	40	43.9	31.7	21.7	43.6	31.5	35.2	12,5	36.6	43.1			
30-34 years	47	55	50	50.5	40.5	40.9	38.2	30.7	33.1	11.3	28.7	25,9			
First child	11	*4	*4	75.2	*100.0	*75.0	20.8		*25.0	4.0	-				
Second child	11	*6	*9	61.4	*75.0	*71.4	38.6	*12.5	*28.6		*12.5				
Fourth child and over	*6 19	-8 38	*6 32	*35.7	*45.5 28.6	22.2	*57.1	*36.4 35.2	37.7	23.3	36.0	40.2			
35 years and over	24	35	36	41.3	30.8	31.4	23.9	20.0	21.4	34.8	49.2	47.1			
First child	*4	•1	*1	*71.4	+100.0	*100.0	*28.6	•	*25.0	*14.3	-	*25.0			
Third child	*3	*4	*5	*40.0	*42.9	*55.6	*20.0	•	*11.1	*40.0	*57.1	*33.3			
Fourth child and over	14	30	29	29.6	26.6	23.7	22.2	23.0	23.7	48.1	49.8	52.6			

Table 2. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to number of additional births expected, live-birth order, and color of mother United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

	Legitimate live births			Wantedness status										
Number of additional births expected, live- birth order, and color of mother	Legiti	mate nve	Dirtis	w	anted the	n	w	anted lat	er	U	nwanted			
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968		
TOTAL	Numb	er in thoi	usands	-			F	Percent						
All orders	2,839	3,242	3,176	64.5	62.8	59.4	27.2	25.7	27.9	8,2	11.5	12.7		
No additional births expected Additional births expected One birth Two births Three births Four births or more	1,354 1,486 906 422 100 57	1,477 1,765 964 514 190 97	1,347 1,829 872 604 234 119	56.3 72.0 70.6 74.0 75.5 72.8	53.9 70.3 70.1 71.0 70.4 67.7	48.9 67.1 65.5 68.3 68.9 69.2	28.4 26.2 27.1 25.3 22.9 23.5	25.0 26.3 26.0 26.2 25.0 31.4	26.2 29.1 29.4 29.4 28.1 27.5	15.2 1.8 2.3 0.7 1.6 3.7	21.1 3.5 3.9 2.7 4.5 1.0	24.9 3.8 5.2 2.3 2.9 3.3		
First child	1,036	1,133	1,125	74.3	72.8	69.5	24.4	24.6	27.6	1.3	2.6	2.9		
No additional births expected Additional births expected One birth Two births Three births Four births or more	138 898 516 278 73 31	115 1,018 479 325 159 56	106 1,020 368 371 197 83	69.3 75.0 74.2 76.5 75.4 75.5	68.1 73.3 74.7 71.9 71.3 76.0	63.1 70.1 71.1 68.6 70.8 71.1	26.7 24.1 24.7 23.3 23.9 20.8	27.4 24.3 23.5 25.4 24.5 24.0	28.5 27.5 26.1 29.8 26.5 26.1	4.1 0.9 1.1 0.2 0.7 3.7	4.5 2.4 1.8 2.7 4.2	8.4 2.4 2.8 1.6 2.7 2.8		
Second child	951	909	851	74.1	73.0	72.9	23.9	22.9	23.7	2.0	4.0	3.4		
No additional births expected	539 412	467 441	378 473	74.9 72.9	72.2 73.9	74.1 72.0	21,9 26.5	22.1 23.8	20.1 26.6	3.1 0.6	5.7 2,2	5.8 1.4		
One birth Two births Three births Four births or more	260 113 20 19	264 136 19 21	275 156 22 21	70.3 77.0 80.7 76.9	74.2 75.5 63.4 69.7	70.7 74.3 73.8 71.2	28.9 23.0 19.3 20.7	24.0 22.0 27.3 30.3	28.0 24.1 23.8 28.8	0.8 - 2.5	1.8 2.5 9.4	1.3 1.6 2.4		
Third child	435	566	497	47.1	55.1	51.5	36.7	29.2	32.9	16.1	15.7	15.6		
No additional births expected Additional births expected One birth Two births Three births or more	334 101 76 17 *8	396 170 131 22 16	320 177 127 38 12	44.5 56.0 59.4 40.7 *56.2	50.8 65.3 64.8 66.8 67.1	50.8 52.7 54.3 52.5 35.3	37.1 35.6 32.8 47.4 *37.7	29.2 29.0 29.3 29.1 26.2	29.8 38.5 36.0 42.5 52.1	18.5 8.4 7.8 11.9 *6.1	20.0 5.7 5.9 4.1 5.5	19.4 8.8 9.7 5.0 11.8		
Fourth child and over	417	635	703	36.7	37.0	32.4	31.9	28.5	29.8	31.4	34.4	37.8		
No additional births expected Additional births expected One birth Two births or more	343 74 53 21	499 136 90 46	544 159 102 58	33.4 51.7 53.8 46.5	35.8 41.5 41.2 42.3	27.5 49.0 44.8 56.3	31.0 36.4 32.8 45.9	23.9 45.4 40.3 55.3	27.9 36.3 36.6 35.8	35.6 11.8 13.5 7.7	40.3 13.0 18.5 2.2	44.6 14.6 18.6 7.8		
White														
All orders	2,504	2,844	2,774	65.6	65.1	61.3	26.4	24.8	27.1	8.1	10.2	11.6		
No additional births expected Additional births expected One birth Two births Three births Four births or more	1,197 1,307 795 375 87 49	1,274 1,570 847 466 171 86	1,157 1,617 749 546 214 108	57.4 73.1 71.4 75.4 77.9 72.9	56.4 72.2 72.2 72.1 71.7 72.5	51.6 68.2 66.9 69.6 69.1 69.4	27.5 25.3 26.6 23.9 21.5 22.9	24.4 25.0 24.8 25.3 24.2 27.5	25.1 28.5 28.6 28.4 28.2 27.8	15.1 1.6 2.0 0.7 0.6 4.2	19.2 2.8 2.9 2.6 4.1	23.3 3.3 4.5 2.0 2.7 2.7		
First child	920	1,033	1,015	74.9	74.1	70.3	24.1	23.6	27.0	1.1	2.3	2.8		
No additional births expected Additional births expected One birth Two births Three births Four births or more	109 811 468 252 64 26	99 934 439 300 144 51	95 920 320 343 180 77	72.2 75.2 73.6 77.3 78.6 76.8	70.2 74.5 75.5 72.4 73.0 81.9	64.4 70.9 71.7 69.9 70.8 71.6	25.1 23.9 25.4 22.5 20.6 18.9	26.7 23.3 22.9 24.8 23.4 18.1	26.2 27.0 25.8 28.7 26.5 26.0	2.7 .8 1.0 0.2 0.8 4.3	3.1 2.2 1.6 2.7 3.6	9.3 2.1 2.4 1.4 2.7 2.4		
Second child	48 107	517	757 341	/5.2	73.2	76.2	22.7	21.8	18.6	2.0	5.7	5,0		
Additional births expected One birth . Two births	352 218 98 18 18	427 390 232 123 18 17	416 238 137 21 19	74.6 72.3 79.0 77.8 75.5	75.8 75.8 75.8 77.1 64.0 78.4	73.5 72.3 75.1 75.6 74.2	21.2 24.8 27.0 21.0 22.2 21.9	21.3 22.2 22.8 20.5 26.1 21.6	25.2 26.3 23.3 24.4 25.8	0.6 0.7 2.6	2.1 1.4 2.4 9.9	1.3		

Table 2. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to number of additional births expected, live-birth order, and color of mother: United States, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys—Con.

				Wantedness status										
Number of additional births expected, live- birth order, and color of mother	Legiti	mate live	births	w	anted the	n	v	anted lat	er	ι	Inwanted			
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968		
	Numb	er in tho	usands		L			Percent				,		
Third child	390	490	427	47.8	57.2	52.4	35.8	28.5	33.0	16.4	14.3	14.6		
No additional births expected	300	347	279	44,7	52.4	52.0	36.0	28.7	29,9	19,2	18.9	18.1		
Additional births expected	90	143	148	58.0	68.8	53.3	35.0	28.1	38.7	7.0	3.0	8.0		
One birth	69 14	110	106	60.9	69.0	54.8	32.8	27.0	36.8	6.3	3.9	8.4		
Three births or more	*7	14	10	*57.3	67.6	30.2	*35.7	31.6	59.4	*7.0		9.4		
Fourth child and over	347	504	576	37.1	39.2	34.4	30.9	28.1	29.2	32.0	32.7	36.4		
												<u> </u>		
No additional births expected	292	401	442	33.6	38.5	29.5	30.4	23.2	26.9	35.9	38.3	43.6		
One birth	55 41	66	84	59.3	42.2	48.1	27.2	47.1	35.4	13.7	15.2	16.5		
Two births or more	14	37	50	44.6	39.8	54.4	51.9	57.5	39.2	3.5	2.7	6.0		
All other														
All orders	335	398	402	56.9	46.3	46.1	33.7	32.6	33.4	9.5	21.2	20.5		
No additional births expected	156	203	190	48.3	37.9	32.6	35.4	29.2	32.8	16.3	32.9	34.6		
One birth	179	195	122	64.3	55.0	56.2	32.1	30.1	33.9	3.5	8.9	7.9		
Two hirths	47	48	58	63.0	60.3	56.5	35.8	34.4	33.0	4.3	40	5.4		
Three births	13	19	20	59.6	59.1	67.2	32.2	32.6	27.4	8.2	8.3	5.4		
Four births or more	*7	12	11	*72.7	31.4	66.8	*27.3	60.5	*24.1		8.2	9.1		
First child	116	100	110	69.4	59.7	62.2	27.5	34.7	33.4	3.1	5.6	4.4		
No additional births expected	29	16		58.1	55.2	51.6	32.7	32.0	48.4	9.2	12.8			
Additional births expected	88	84	100	73.1	60.5	63,3	25.8	35.2	31.8	1.1	4.2	4,9		
One birth	49	40	48	79.6	65.5	67.0	18.5	30.7	27.5	2.0	3.9	5.6		
Two births	25	25	28	68.9	65,1	52.7	31.1	32,8	43.5		2.1	3.8		
Three births	*9	15	17	*52.3	54.8	70.6	*47.7	34.6	26.1	-	10.5	3.3		
Four births or more	*5	*5	*6	*68.8	*11.2	*63.5	*31.2	*88.8	*27.7	· ·	-	*8.8		
Second child	103	92	94	64.4	60.2	58.5	33,6	33.0	35.2	2.1	6.8	6.3		
No additional births expected	43	40	37	65.9	60.9	53.9	30.3	28.5	33,8	3.8	10.5	12.3		
Additional births expected	61	51	58	63.3	59.6	61.5	35.8	36.3	36.1	.9	3.9	2.4		
One birth	42	33	36	59.9	62.9	59.6	38.8	32.6	39.0	1.3	4.5	1.4		
Two births	15	13	20	63.9	60.0	68.6	36.1	36.2	29.2	•	3.8	2.2		
Three births or more	*4	*6	*2	•100.0	*40.4	*25.0	-	*57.9	*50.0	•	•	*25.0		
Third child	46	76	70	41.6	42.1	45.5	44.6	33.4	32,5	13.8	24.6	22.0		
No additional births expected	34	49	40	42,0	39.5	42.2	46.0	33.1	29.2	12.1	27.4	28.6		
Additional births expected	11	27	30	40.5	46.3	50.2	40.6	33.7	37.3	18.9	19.3	13.2		
One birth	•8	21	21	*46.1	42.5	52.0	*32.9	41.2	31.9	*21.0	16.4	16,1		
Two births	*3	*3	*6	*20.2	*57.7	*39.1	*59.7	*14.1	*60.9	*20.1	*28.2			
Three births or more	*1	*3	•2	*49.0	•64.3	*62.5	*51.0	•	*20.8		*32 1	*20.8		
Fourth child and over	70	130	127	34.8	28.6	23.4	36.9	30.2	32.5	28.4	41.2	44.1		
No additional births expected	51	98	102	32.3	24.9	19.2	34.0	27.0	32.3	33.7	48.1	48.6		
Additional births expected	19	32	25	41.4	39.6	40.9	44.5	39.9	33.7	14.1	20.1	25.8		
One birth	13	23	18	36.6	34.9	29.0	50.7	37.3	42.5	12.7	27.8	28.4		
I wo births or more	*6	•9	•8	*50.8	*52.8	*68.4	*32.2	*47.2	*13.2	•17.0	•	19.7		

Table 3.	Estimated number	of legitimate in	ve births and percei	t distribution by	/ wantedness statu	s, according	to age at marriage ar	nd color of mother:	United States,	1968,
				1969, and 197	2 National Natality	Surveys				

			la setta	Wantedness status									
Age at marriage and color of mother	Legiti	mate live	DIFTINS	w	anted the	n	Wa	inted late	er	U	wanted		
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	
	Numb	er in tho	usands				F	ercent					
Total	2,839	3,242	3,176	64.5	62.8	59.4	27.2	25.7	27.9	8.2	11.5	12.7	
Under 18 years	560 462 824 544 250 161 38	760 497 924 585 260 184 32	792 464 892 555 246 176 51	57.0 61.5 65.3 69.9 66.5 74.3 63.2	58.0 59.9 64.4 64.4 69.0 66.6 74.7	51.3 58.3 60.2 64.0 64.7 67.3 75.4	33.4 29.6 26.2 24.0 26.8 18.0 19.2	25.5 28.5 25.2 27.6 21.3 23.6 16.2	30.5 31.4 27.4 25.6 26.4 21.9 15.5	9.6 9.0 8.5 6.1 6.7 7.7 17.6	16.6 11.6 10.4 8.0 9.7 9.8 9.1	18.2 10.2 12.4 10.4 8.9 10.8 9.1	
White	2,504	2,844	2,774	65.6	65.1	61.3	26.4	24.8	27.1	8.1	10.2	11.6	
Under 18 years	493 405 733 486 219 138 31	647 437 828 526 224 157 26	661 410 795 497 223 149 40	58.6 62.8 65.5 71.3 66.2 77.2 66.9	62.2 62.0 66.3 65.9 70.8 66.1 78.4	53.9 59.7 62.4 64.9 65.3 69.5 79.9	32,5 28,3 26,1 22,8 26,6 14,9 16,1	23.6 27.4 24.1 27.1 21.6 23.9 14.7	29.1 31.1 26.7 25.2 25.8 20.8 15.1	8.9 8.9 8.4 5.9 7.2 7.9 17.0	14.2 10.6 9.6 7.1 7.6 10.0 6,8	17.0 9.2 10.9 10.0 8.9 9.7 5.0	
All other	335	398	402	56.9	46.3	46.1	33.7	32.6	33.4	9.5	21.2	20.5	
Under 18 years	67 57 91 58 31 24 *7	113 60 96 59 37 28 *5	131 55 96 58 24 27 11	45.2 52.1 63.9 58.7 68.7 57.4 *47.2	33.6 44.4 47.8 51.0 58.0 69.1 *56.5	38.1 48.0 42.2 56.8 59.8 55.1 58.9	40.4 38.6 26.6 34.2 28.2 35.7 *32.4	36.0 36.1 34,9 32.4 19.6 21.9 *23.2	37.7 34.2 33.2 29.4 32.0 27.9 17.0	14.4 9.3 9.5 7.2 3.1 6.9 *20.4	30,4 19,4 17,3 16,6 22,4 9,0 *20,2	24.1 17.8 24.6 13.8 8.2 16.9 24.2	

Table 4. Estimated number of legitimate live births to women married once and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to color of mother, live-birth order, and duration of marriage: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

······································		Tot	al			Whi	ite		All other					
Live-birth order and duration of marriage	Legiti- mate live births in thousands	Wanted then	Wanted later	Un- wanted	Legiti- mate live births in thousands	Wanted then	Wanted later	Un- wanted	Legiti- mate live births in thousands	Wanted then	Wanted later	Un- wanted		
		Perce	ent distribu	ition		Perc	ent distribu	tion		Perce	nt distribu	tion		
All orders	2,602	65.3	27.1	7.5	2,290	66.4	26.2	7.4	311	57.4	34.0	8.7		
0-11 months 12-23 months 24-35 months 36-47 months 48-107 months 108-167 months 168 months and over	363 297 308 302 920 278 133	50.9 70.8 72.3 78.1 69.5 54.8 40.3	47.8 27.5 25.4 20.4 23.5 25.5 18.3	1.3 1.7 2.3 1.5 7.0 19.8 41.4	31.0 255 273 272 818 247 116	51.7 73.8 72.8 78.7 70.5 55.1 40.8	47.0 25.4 25.0 19.9 22.8 24.6 17.7	1.3 0.8 2.2 1.4 6.7 20.2 41 5	53 42 35 31 102 31 17	46.5 53.0 68.3 73.0 61.5 51.9 37.0	52.5 39.7 28.6 25.2 28.9 32.1 22.3	1.0 7.3 3.1 1.7 9.7 16.0 40.7		
First child	1,001	74.3	24.5	1.3	887	74.8	24.1	1.1	114	69.8	27.6	2.7		
0-11 months 12-23 months 24-35 months 36-47 months 48-107 months 108-167 months 168 months and over	325 223 167 114 156 13 *3	50.5 80.7 84.0 91.7 89.4 96.2 *84.4	48.3 18.6 13.2 8.3 9.0 3.8 *15.6	1.2 0.7 2.8 1.6 -	283 198 154 102 135 13 *2	50.8 81.1 84.4 92.3 89.7 96.0 *81.0	47.9 18.7 12.9 7.7 9.2 4.0 *19.0	1.2 0.3 2.7 1.1	42 25 13 12 21 *1	48.1 77.5 79.1 86.7 87.6 *100.0	50.7 18.3 16.8 13.3 7.7	1.2 4.2 4.1 - 4.7		
Second child	876	74.6	23.9	1.5	777	76.0	22.5	1.5	99	63.5	34.4	2.2		
0-11 months 12-23 months 24-35 months 36-47 months 48-107 months 108-167 months 168 months and over	27 66 128 153 443 46 12	50.8 43.3 60.0 76.2 82.9 87.8 79.9	49.2 53.7 38.9 22.8 16.1 7.8 4.1	3.0 1.2 1.0 1.0 4.4 16.0	20 53 109 139 403 41 12	56.5 49.4 59.1 76.5 83.7 86.4 79.0	43.5 47.9 40.0 228 15.3 8.7 4.3	2.7 0.9 0.7 1.0 4.9 16.7	*8 13 20 13 40 *5	*35.8 19.3 64.7 73.3 74.8 *100.0	*64.2 76.7 32.6 22.7 23.9	4.0 2.8 4.0 1.3		
Third child	387	45.6	37.6	16.9	346	46.4	36.5	17.1	42	38.2	46.6	15.2		
0-23 months 24-35 months 36-47 months 48-107 months 108-167 months 168 months and over	11 10 29 230 89 17	38.7 43.8 40.6 44.6 49.4 51.3	51.6 56.2 49.3 40.2 29.4 5.7	9.8 10.0 15.1 21.2 43.1	<pre> 16 26 205 84 14 </pre>	45.0 42.7 45.6 50.3 44.5	51.9 46.3 39.5 28.2 6.9	3.2 11.0 14.9 21.5 48.6	*8 25 } *9	*26.1 36.9 *53.0	*66.5 46.3 *29.8	*7.3 16.9 *17.2		
Fourth child	169	39.8	40.1	20.2	143	39.5	40.5	20.0	25	41.1	37.7	21.2		
0-47 months 48-107 months 108-167 months 168 months and over Fifth child and over	*7 68 71 24 169	*24.5 37.6 42.1 43.3 35.4	*60.6 43.6 37.6 31.8 23.0	*14.9 18.9 20.3 24.9 41.6	*2 56 62 23 138	*20.7 37.0 41.3 43.0 36.3	*79.3 45.6 37.9 30.9 20.1	17.4 20.8 26.0 43.6	*4 12 } 10 31	*26.8 40.1 48.1 31.2	*49.3 33.9 37.4 36.2	*23.8 26.0 14.4 32.6		
0-47 months 48-107 months 108-167 months 168 months and over	10 23 59 77	73.7 20.6 43.2 28.9	16.2 36.7 23.6 19.4	10.1 42.7 33.2 51.7	+7 19 48 65	*75.9 22.5 43.7 30.8	*9.3 30.7 20.4 17.9	*14.8 46.7 35.9 51.3	} •7 12 12	*36.1 41.1 18.2	*49.4 36.5 27.6	*14.5 22.3 54.2		

Table 5.	Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to educational attainment of father and color of mother:	United
	States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	

			h latha	Wantedness status									
Years of school completed by father and color of mother	Legiti	materive	Dirtiis	w	anted the	en .	W	anted late	ır	U	nwanted		
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	
	Numb	er in thou	usands				F	Percent					
Total	2,839	3,242	3,176	64.5	62.8	59.4	27.2	25.7	27.9	8,2	11.5	12.7	
0-8 years	183 405 1,188 469 595	346 584 1,224 480 608	397 626 1,196 501 456	53.6 55.7 64.4 67.4 71.9	50.6 56.5 65.2 61.5 71.8	50.5 50.9 61.6 62.4 69.6	30.5 33.3 27.5 28.1 20.9	29.7 27.9 24.1 28.6 22.3	30.9 31.2 27.7 30.0 18.8	15.9 11.0 8.0 4.6 7.2	19.7 15.7 10.6 9.9 5.9	18.7 17.8 10.7 7.6 11.6	
White	2,504	2,844	2,774	65.6	65.1	61.3	26.4	24.8	27.1	8.1	10.2	11.6	
0-8 years	138 349 1,036 430 551	272 474 1,080 440 579	320 518 1,055 448 432	54.6 57.6 65.4 67.5 72.2	54.7 59.3 67.4 63.2 71.9	54.7 52.4 63.6 63.1 69.4	29.0 31.8 26.7 28.1 20.3	29.5 25.9 23.0 27.9 22.4	30.0 31.0 26.5 29.6 19.1	16.4 10.6 7.9 4.4 7.5	15.7 14.9 9.6 8.9 5.7	15.3 16.6 9.9 7.4 11.5	
All other	335	398	402	56.9	46.3	46.1	33.7	32.6	33.4	9.5	21.2	20.5	
0-8 years	45 55 152 39 44	74 110 144 40 29	77 108 141 52 24	50.5 43.9 57.7 66.3 68.3	35.5 44.5 49.3 43.6 69.6	32.8 43.7 46.7 56.9 73.3	35.3 42.6 33.1 27.4 28.2	30.1 36.4 32.4 35.4 20.4	34.6 32.4 36.6 33.9 14.0	14.2 13.5 9.2 6.3 3.5	34.3 19.1 18.3 21.0 9.3	32.6 23.9 16.7 9.2 12.7	

							Wantedness status							
Years of school completed by mother, live-	Legiti	mate live	births					all						
birth order, and color of mother	<u> </u>	r			anted the	n T		anted lat	er 	U	nwanted	 →		
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968		
Total	Numt	per in tho	usands				I	Percent						
All orders	2,839	3,242	3,176	64.5	62.8	59.4	27.2	25.7	27.9	8.2	11.5	12.7		
0-8 years	124	298	287	63.7	55.4	45.6	23.2	26.5	33.9	13.0	18.1	20.6		
9-11 years	481	716	725	55.2	56.1	53.0	33.6	27.0	29.0	11.2	16.9	18.0		
12 years	1,355	1,421	1,434	65.5	63.7	62.0	27.2	26.0	28.0	7.4	10.3	10.0		
16 years and over	336	483	278	64.2 74.9	67.8	62.5	26.5	26.3	25.5	9.3	5.9	12.0		
First and second child	1,987	2,042	1,976	74.2	72.9	71.0	24.2	23.9	25.9	1.6	3.2	3.1		
0-8 veare	65	127	115	76.7	71.0	67.6	20.0	225	21.7	24	= 4	= 7		
9-11 vears	297	368	391	65.1	66.5	65.0	32.5	26.2	29.0	2.4	73	60		
12 years	994	955	932	72.8	73.0	73.3	25.6	24.6	24.9	1.7	2.4	1.8		
13-15 years	357	350	336	79.8	73,9	69.3	18,7	24.5	26.5	1.6	1.6	4.2		
16 years and over	274	242	203	81.3	81.7	79.3	18.0	16.6	20.2	0.7	1.7	0.5		
Third and fourth child	638	835	806	44.6	52.5	47.0	37.7	28. 9	32,8	17.7	18,6	20.2		
0-8 years	35	78	85	56.6	52,9	42.3	29,3	29.7	38.4	14.2	17.3	19.1		
9-11 years	117	234	217	42.7	53.2	45.9	37.7	27.0	30.6	19.6	19.7	23.6		
12 years	280	346	366	48.8	50.7	46.4	33.9	29.1	34.6	17.3	20.2	19.0		
13-15 years	152	109	77	35.3	57.8	51.1	46.3	29.6	24.8	18.4	12.6	24.1		
16 years and over	53	70	60	45.6	50,0	55.7	38.5	32.4	32.5	16.0	17.5	11.9		
Fifth child and over	214	365	393	34.4	29,8	26.6	24.5	28.7	27.6	41.1	41.6	45.9		
0-8 years	24	93	87	38.8	36.2	26.5	20.8	27.6	31.9	40.4	36.0	41.6		
9-11 years	67	115	117	33.2	23.4	26.2	31.3	29.4	26.4	35.5	42.2	47.4		
12 years	81	121	136	34.1	27.2	27.1	23.1	28.2	30.8	42.9	44.6	42.1		
13-15 years and over	34 +q	13	38	30.0	23.8	25.2	19.4	36.6	17.9	\$0.5	39.5	56.8		
White				51.0	23.0	20,5	10.7	10.5	0.0	32.3	51.5	04.9		
All orders	2,504	2,844	2,774	65.6	65.1	61.3	26.4	24.8	27.1	8.1	10.2	11.6		
0-8 years	104	247	237	67.2	58.0	48.7	20.9	27.1	33.4	11.9	14.8	17.9		
9-11 years	400	590	582	57.7	60.6	56.0	32.4	24.8	27.6	9.9	14.6	16.5		
12 years	1,223	1,269	1,291	66.1	65.1	63.4	26.4	25.2	27.3	7.6	9.7	9.3		
13-15 years	473	436	410	64.2	69.1	63.4	26.2	25.3	24.7	9.6	5.6	12.0		
Fint and over	304	302	255	/5.4	73.8	70.9	20.5	20.1	22.7	4.0	6.0	6.3		
First and second child	1,768	1,850	1,772	75.1	74,2	72.2	23.4	22.8	25.0	1.5	2,9	2,9		
0-8 years	56	115	102	79.5	71.6	64.7	19.6	23.4	29.3	0,9	4.9	6.0		
9-11 years	255	328	340	67.1	69.0	66.6	31.1	24.1	27.9	1.8	6.9	5.6		
12 years	898	864	839	73.4	74.2	74.6	24.9	23.6	23.9	1.7	2.2	1.5		
16 years and over	308	318 226	306	79.9	75.3 81.7	70.4	18.4 17.2	23.4 16.9	25.7 20.7	1.7 0.8	1.3 1.3	3,9 0.6		
Third and fourth child	564	722	699	45.1	54.1	48.1	37.0	28.3	32.5	17.9	17.6	19.4		
0-8 years	32	66	72	57.2	53.5	43.6	28.8	31.6	40.2	13.9	14.6	16.1		
9-11 years	98	188	167	44.1	56.3	46.6	37.1	25.1	29.6	18.8	18.6	23.8		
12 years	254	305	334	48.9	51.7	47.6	33.1	28.4	34.2	18.0	19.9	18.2		
13-15 years	135	99	69	35.9	58.1	51.9	45.5	29.4	23.1	18.6	12.4	25.0		
16 years and over	46	64	57	44.8	53.4	56.3	39.1	31.9	32.7	16,1	14.8	11.0		
Fifth child and over	173	272	304	35.1	32.1	28,3	22.0	28.3	26.9	42.9	39.6	44,8		
0-8 years	17	66	63	45.3	38.6 ⁻	29.0	10.2	29,0	32.1	44.5	32.2	38.9		
9-11 years	47	74	75	34.6	34.3	28.6	29.6	27.1	22.0	35.8	38.6	49.4		
12 years	71	100	118	34.1	27.5	29.1	21.0	28.7	32.0	44.9	43.9	38.9		
13-15 years	30	19	35	30.2	23.7	24.5	20.1	35.3	18.0	49.7	41.0	57.5		
16 years and over	*8	11	13	*44.3	33.3	25.0	*19.0	16.7	7.7	*36.8	50.0	67.3		

Table 6. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to educational attainment of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

Table 6. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to educational attainment of mother, live-birth order, and color of mother: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys-Con.

			to construct	Wantedness status										
Years of school completed by mother, live- birth order, and color of mother	Legiti	materive	DIFTINS	w	anted the	n	w	anted late	er	Unwanted				
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968		
All other	Numb	er in thou	usands					Percent						
All orders	335	398	402	56.9	46.3	46.1	33.7	32.6	33,4	9.5	21.2	20.5		
0-8 years 9-11 years 12 years 13-15 years 16 years and over	20 81 132 70 32	50 127 152 46 23	51 143 143 41 24	45.6 42.8 60.2 64.2 69.3	42.6 35.1 51.9 55.5 59.6	30.8 41.0 49.6 53.5 76.2	35.5 39.6 34.3 28.0 27.4	23.1 37.2 33.0 34.9 20.2	36.0 34.9 33.7 34.1 15.7	18.9 17.6 5.5 7.8 3.3	34.3 27.7 15.1 9.5 20.2	33.0 24.1 16.7 12.4 8.5		
First and second child	219	192	205	67.0	60.0	60.5	30,3	33.9	34,2	2.6	6.2	5.3		
0-8 years	*9 41 96 49 24 74	12 40 91 32 16 113	14 51 93 30 18	*60.6 52.3 66.4 78.8 73.5 40.9	64.7 46.4 61.4 60.2 81.4 42.2	46.3 54.5 61.8 58.2 84.9 39.8	*28.3 41.3 31.9 20.3 26.5 42.7	25.2 43.5 34.2 35.0 12.4 32.8	50.0 36.5 34.3 34.6 15.1 34.8	*11.1 6.4 1.7 0.9 -	10.1 10.1 4.4 4.8 6.2 25.0	3.7 9.0 3.9 7.2 25.4		
0-8 years 9-11 years 12 years 13 years and over	*3 20 27 24	12 46 40 15	13 50 32 12	*49.9 36.1 47.8 36.1	49.2 40.7 43.4 37.6	35.6 43.3 34.4 44.4	*33.5 40.3 41.2 47.4	18.6 35.0 33.8 34,2	29.5 33.9 38.0 35.9	*16.6 23.7 11.0 16.5	32.2 24.3 22.8 27.5	35.6 22.8 27.6 19.7		
Fifth child and over	41	93	89	31.3	23.0	20.9	35.1	29.6	29.8	33.6	47.4	49.3		
0-8 years	*7 20 10 *5	26 40 20 *6	24 42 18 *5	*23.2 29.9 33.7 *44.9	29.9 17.4 26.1 *18.6	19.6 21.9 14.5 *39.6	*46.2 35.3 38.5 *11.1	24.2 33.6 25.8 *40.7	31.7 34.3 23.0 *11.3	*30.6 34.9 27.9 *44.0	45.8 49.0 48.1 *42.4	48.8 43.9 62.4 *49.1		

Table 7. Estimated number of legitimate live births and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to husband's income and color of mother:	United States, 19	68,
1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys		

	Lasit						Wante	dness sta	tus			
Husband's income and color of mother	Legiti	mate live	DIFTIS	W	anted the	т П	W	anted late	er	Unwanted		
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968
	Numb	er in tho	usands			-		Percent				
Total	2,839	3,242	3,176	64.5	62.8	59.4	27.2	25.7	27,9	8.2	11.5	12.7
Under \$2,000 \$2,000 \$3,999 \$4,000 \$6,999 \$7,000 \$9 999 \$10,000 \$14,999 \$15,000 and over	195 241 651 773 729 250	308 467 1,031 837 456 143	313 570 1,160 732 292 109	52.4 58.8 60.8 65.5 69.5 71.6	51.2 56.8 63.2 68.1 65.9 63.4	57.4 52.8 58.0 64.0 66.8 63.6	38.2 35.7 32.4 26.1 21.3 17.8	34.1 32.5 26.3 21.9 21.6 16.6	31.2 34.5 30.1 22.7 18.4 19.8	9.4 5.5 6.8 8.4 9.2 10.5	14.7 10.7 10.6 9.9 12.5 20.0	11.5 12.7 11.9 13.3 14.8 16.7
White	2,504	2,844	2,774	65.6	65.1	61.3	26.4	24.8	27.1	8.1	10.2	11.6
Under \$2,000 \$2,000-\$3,999 \$4,000-\$6,999 \$7,000-\$9 999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$15,000 and over	131 196 557 702 675 242	223 370 898 778 437 138	219 449 1,025 697 227 107	56.6 58.1 61.8 66.0 69.6 72.3	54.2 59.4 66.1 69.2 66.6 63.6	60.3 56.1 59.9 64.4 66.6 63.6	36.5 37.1 31.7 25.6 21.0 17.0	34.5 32.3 24.7 21.4 21.8 16.8	32.0 33.3 29.7 22.4 18.0 19.8	6.9 4.9 6.4 8.3 9.3 10.7	11.3 8.3 9.2 9.3 11.6 19.6	7.7 10.6 10.4 13.2 15.4 16.6
All other	335	398	402	56.9	46.3	46.1	33.7	32.6	33.4	9.5	21.2	20.5
Under \$2,000 \$2,000.\$3,999 \$4,000.\$6,999 \$7,000.\$9,999 \$10,000.\$14,999 \$10,000.\$14,999 \$15,000 and over	64 44 94 71 54 *8	85 96 134 60 18 *5	94 121 135 35 15 *2	43.8 62.0 54.6 60.7 67.8 *51.3	43.5 46.8 43.5 53.9 49.3 *55.9	50.5 40.5 43.2 54.2 69.5 *61.2	41.5 29.7 36.5 30.5 25.3 *43.3	33.0 33.2 36.7 28.1 17.4 *10.3	29.2 39.2 33.0 29.9 26.7 *20.0	14.7 8.2 8.9 8.8 6.9 *5.4	23.5 20.0 19.8 18.0 33.3 *33.8	20.3 20.3 23.8 15.9 3.8 *18.8

Table 8. Estimated number of legitimate live births to women married once and percent distribution by wantedness status, according to color of mother, duration of marriage, and husband's income: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

		Tot	tal			Wh	ite			All ot	her	
Duration of marriage and husband's income	Legiti- mate live births in thousands	Wanted then	Wanted later	Un- wanted	Legiti- mate live births in thousands	Wanted then	Wanted iater	Un- wanted	Legiti- mate live births in thousands	Wanted then	Wanted later	Un- wanted
		Perc	ent distribu	Ition		Perc	ent distribu	ution		Perce	nt distribut	tion
Total	2,602	65.3	27.1	7.5	2,290	66.4	26.2	7.4	311	57.4	34.0	8.7
Under \$2,000 \$2,000-\$6,999 \$7,000-\$9,999 \$10,000 and over	176 815 715 896	54.5 60.9 66.3 70.7	38.0 33.0 26.2 20.4	7.5 6.1 7.4 8.9	117 686 651 837	59.1 61.8 66.7 71.1	36.3 32.6 25.8 19.9	4.6 5.6 7.5 9.1	59 129 65 59	45.5 56.4 62.6 65.6	41.3 35.1 30.2 28.2	13.2 8.5 7.2 6.2
0-11 months	363	50.9	47.8	1.3	310	51.7	47.0	1.3	53	46.5	52.5	1.0
Under \$2,000 \$2,000 \$6,999 \$7,000 \$9,999 \$10,000 and over	61 182 71 50	44.6 50.0 53.8 57.7	52.8 48.6 45.6 42.3	2.6 1.4 0.7	44 161 59 46	47.9 50.4 54.5 56.2	49.8 48.1 44.7 43.8	2.3 1.6 0.8	17 21 11 *4	36.0 47.1 50.2 *75.8	60.9 52.9 49.8 *24.2	3.2 - - -
12-47 months	908	73.8	24.4	1.8	799	75.1	23.4	1.5	108	63.6	32.0	4.4
Under \$2,000 \$2,000 \$6,999 \$7,000 \$9,999 \$10,000 and over	71 348 265 234	62.3 69.9 75.2 81.4	32.6 28.5 23.6 16.7	5.1 1.6 1.2 1.9	45 299 233 222	74.6 70.6 74.9 81.6	24.3 28.1 23.8 16.4	1.1 1.3 1.3 2.0	26 48 22 12	40.8 65.6 78.4 78.0	47.2 31.1 21.6 22.0	12.0 3.3 -
48-107 months	920	69.5	23.5	7.0	818	70.5	22.8	6.7	102	61.5	28.9	9.7
Under \$2,000 \$2,000 \$6,999 \$7,000 \$9,999 \$10,000 and over	33 203 276 409	57.5 62.9 68.5 74.5	28.7 29.0 24.9 19.3	13.9 8.1 6.6 6.1	20 164 256 378	55.8 63.6 69.4 75.1	36.9 28.3 24.0 18.8	7.3 8.1 6.5 6.1	13 39 19 31	60.1 59.9 55.8 67.6	16.1 32.1 36.0 25.9	23.8 8.1 8.3 6.6
108 months and over	411	50.1	23.2	26.8	363	50.5	22.4	27.0	48	46.6	28.6	24.7
Under \$2,000 \$2,000 \$6,999 \$7,000 \$9,999 \$10,000 and over	11 83 113 204	50.3 42.2 49.0 53.9	18.7 27.6 23.3 21.5	31.0 30.2 27.7 24.6	*8 62 101 192	*40.4 43.6 48.1 54.5	*27.7 26.0 23.9 20.3	*32.0 30.4 27.9 25.3	*4 21 12 12	*71.0 38.1 56.8 43.9	32.3 17.8 42.3	*29.0 29.6 25.4 13.8

.

Table 9.	Estimated	number	of le	gitimate	live births	and	percent	distribution	ı by	wantedness	status,	according t	o religious	preference	of
			moth	her and o	f father: I	Jnite	d States,	, 1968 and 1	969	National Na	atality S	Surveys			

	Legitim	nate live		v	Vantedne	ss status		
Religious preference	bir	ths	Wante	d then	Wante	d later	Unwa	nted
	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968	1969	1968
Mother	Num thous	ber in sands			Perc	ent		
Total	3,242	3,176	62.8	59.4	25.7	27.9	11.5	12.7
Protestant Roman Catholic Jewish Other None <u>Father</u>	1,864 1,014 61 194 109	1,857 1,021 60 141 97	62.5 62.5 76.8 62.2 64.4	59.1 58.7 79.7 65.6 49.3	25.3 26.9 17.8 25.2 26.4	27.3 29.6 15.0 23.0 36.7	12.2 10.6 5.4 12.6 9.2	13.6 11.7 5.4 11.4 13.9
Total	3,242	3,176	62.8	59.4	25.7	27.9	11.5	12.7
Protestant Roman Catholic Jewish Other None	1,817 977 69 172 207	1,840 924 62 159 192	63.0 61.5 77.0 62.1 62.5	59.0 58.4 79.1 69.0 53.1	24.8 27.7 19.7 24.0 27.2	27.9 29.1 14.0 21.7 30.9	12.1 10.8 3.3 13.9 10.2	13.0 12.5 6.8 9.3 16.0

Table 11. Percent distribution of legitimate live births by selected characteristics, according to wantedness status: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

	Wantedness status											
Selected characteristics	Total le	gitimate li	ve births	v	Vanted the	n	V V	Nanted late	er		Unwanted	
	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968	1972	1969	1968
······································			•		۰ ۲	Number in	thousands	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	
Total	2,839	3,242	3,176	1,832	2,035	1,886	773	833	885	234	373	405
						Percent dis	tribution					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Calor												
White	88.2	87.7	87.4	89.6	91.0	90.2	85.4	84.5	84.9	86.4	77.4	79.7
All other	11.8	12.3	12.6	10.4	9.0	9.8	14.6	15.6	15.1	13.6	22.6	20.3
Live-birth order			1									
First child	36.5	35.0	35.4	42.0	40.5	41.4	32.7	33.5	35.1	5.7	7.9	8.1
Second child	33.5	28.0	26.8	38.5	32.6	32.9	29.4	25.0	22.8	8.3	9.8	7.1
Fourth child	7.1	8.3	9.8	4.3	6.2	6.5	10.4	9.2	11.4	18.3	17.9	21.1
Fifth child and over	7.5	11.3	12.4	4.0	5.3	5.5	6.8	12.6	12.3	37.6	40.7	44.5
Median birth order	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.7	4.3	4.5	4.7
Age of mother]			
Under 18 years	4.4	3.1	3.8	4.4	2.8	3.3	5.3	4.4	5,9	1.4	1.8	1.7
18-19 years	10.4	10.2	10.5	9.6	9.2	10.3	13.2	14.3	13.8	7.1	6.1	4.6
20-21 years	12.9	15.0	15.3	12.7	16.2	15.7	15.1	15.9	18.0	6.9	5.8	7.6
22-24 years	20.0	23.5	22.2	32.4	30.3	24.1	24.0	24.3	22.0	27.0	23.2	25.3
30-34 years	12.7	12.6	12.6	11.6	10.9	11.2	12.7	11.3	11.1	21.8	24.9	22.8
35 years and over	5.9	7.3	8.1	4.6	5.5	6.0	3.7	3.8	4.5	23.7	24.6	25.5
Median age of mother	24.8	24.8	24.7	24.8	24.6	24.6	24.0	23.9	23.6	29.2	29.9	29.7
Age at marriage]				1	
Under 18 years	19.7	23.4	24.9	17.4	21.6	21.5	24.2	23.2	27.3	22.9	33.8	35.5
18 years	16.3	15.3	14.6	15.5	14.6	14.4	17.7	17.0	16.5	17.7	15.5	11.8
19-20 years	29.0	28.5	28.1	29.4	29.2	28.5	27.9	28.0	27.6	29.9	25.7	27.2
21-22 years	19.2	18.0	17.5	20.8	18.5	18.9	16,9	19.4	16.1	14.1	12.6	14.2
25-24 years	0.0 5.7	57	7.0	9.1	0.0	6.3	3.8	52	4.3	53	49	2.4
30 years and over	1.4	1.0	1.6	1.3	1.2	2.1	1.0	0.6	.9	2.9	0.8	1.1
Median age at marriage	20.0	19.8	19.7	20.2	19.9	20.0	19.6	19.7	19.5	19.6	19.1	19.2
Educational attainment of mother												
0-8 years	4.4	9.2	9.0	4,3	8.1	6.9	3.7	9.4	11.0	6.9	14.4	14.6
9-11 years	16.9	22.1	22.8	14.5	19.7	20.4	20.9	23.2	23.8	23.1	32.5	32.2
12 years	47.7	43.8	45.1	48.4	44.5	47.2	47.6	44.3	45.3	42.6	39.2	35.4
13-15 years 16 years and over	19.1 11.8	14.9 10.0	14.2 8.8	19.0 13.7	16.1	15.0 10.5	18.6 9.2	15.2 7.8	13.0 6.9	21.7 5.7	7.7 6.1	13.4 4.4
Median years of school completed	12.6	12.4	12.4	12.6	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.3	12.5	12.1	12.1
Husband's income												
Linder \$2,000	60							126	11.0		100	
\$2,000-\$3,999	8.5	14.4	17.9	5.0	13.0	16.0	5.0	18.2	22.2	5.9	13.4	17 8
\$4,000-\$6,999	22,9	31.8	36.5	21.6	32.0	35.7	27.3	32.5	39.4	18,9	29.2	34.1
\$7,000-\$9,999	27.2	25.8	23.1	27.7	28.0	24.8	26.1	22.0	18.8	27.7	22.3	24.1
\$10,000-\$14,999	25.7	14.1	9.2	27.6	14.8	10.3	20.1	11.8	6.1	28.6	15.3	10.7
\$15,000 and over	8.8	4.4	3.4	9.8	4.4	3.7	5.8	2.8	2.4	11.3	7.7	4.5
Median income	\$8,300	\$6,500	\$5,800	\$8,600	\$6,700	\$6,100	\$7,200	\$5,800	\$5,300	\$8,900	\$6,500	\$6,000

APPENDIXES

CONTENTS

L.	Technical Notes on Methods	- 33
	Background	33
	Sources of Data	33
	Sample Design	33
	Collection of Data	34
	Response Rates	35
	Processing of Data	35
	Imputation of Missing Data	36
	Estimation	37
	Reliability of Estimates	38
	Rounding of Numbers	42
II.	Source Forms	43
	U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth	43
	1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys	44
	1972 National Natality Survey	51

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

I.	Number of live births in the United States and number of births in the 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	34
11.	Response rates for mothers, by age of mother and color: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	35
III.	Item nonresponse rates for selected variables on mother's questionnaire: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	37
IV.	Age of mother, live-birth order, and color groups used for ratio estimation: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys	38
v.	Approximate standard errors for aggregates: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys	39
VI.	Approximate standard errors for aggregates: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	39
VII.	Approximate standard errors for percentages for total births: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys	40
VIII.	Approximate standard errors for percentages for white births: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys	40
IX.	Approximate standard errors for percentages for all other or black births: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys	41
x.	Approximate standard errors for percentages: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey	41

APPENDIX I

TECHNICAL NOTES ON METHODS

Background

This report is based on the findings of the 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys. The surveys were conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics to supplement data available from the birth certificate by obtaining additional social and demographic information from a sample of women who had babies during those years. In 1972, additional medical information was obtained from the attending physicians and from the hospitals where the babies were delivered.

Sources of Data

The original data source for these surveys was the live-birth certificate. The name and address of the mother of each infant in the sample was obtained from the birth certificate. The data in this report were derived solely from birth certificates and questionnaires mailed to mothers.

Facsimiles of the U.S. Standard Certificate of Live Birth and of the questionnaires sent to the mothers are shown in appendix II. Although most of the registration areas' birth certificates include the same basic information, the standard certificate is not used by all registration areas. The legitimacy item was omitted by 10 areas in 1968, 11 areas in 1969, and 12 areas in 1972, and legitimacy was inferred for their records as described in the section, "Sample Design."

The same questionnaire was sent to the mother in both 1968 and 1969 and was designed primarily to obtain information about the health care received by the mother and her newborn infant as well as social and demographic information. Although the 1972 questionnaire included much of the same information as in 1968 and 1969, some items were dropped and others were added.

Sample Design

The sampling frames for the National Natality Surveys were the files of microfilm of livebirth certificates received by the National Center for Health Statistics from the 54 birth registration areas of the United States. These birth registration areas included the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the cities of New York, Baltimore, and New Orleans, which had independent registration systems. Each of the registration areas assigns a file number to each birth certificate, and these file numbers run consecutively from the first to the last birth occurring during the year in that area. The samples for these surveys were based on a probability design that made use of these certificate numbers.

In 1968 and 1969, the sample was composed of 1 out of every 1,000 births of white infants and 1 out of every 500 births of all other infants. Two records were selected at random from each 1,000 consecutive records for each registration area. The second of these two records was rejected if the infant reported on this second record was white. This method of sample selection forced the sample to be representative by geographic area and time of occurrence for births of white and all other infants while preserving the probability design within each registration area. In 1972, each 500 consecutive records from each area constituted a primary sampling unit, and one record from each primary unit was selected at random. Thus, the sample of selected certificates represented 1/500th of the live births occurring in the 54 areas during 1972.

Sampled records for infants who were reported or inferred to be illegitimate were excluded from the survey and no questionnaires were mailed to the mothers. Thus, the statistics presented in this report pertain only to legit*imate* live births occurring in the United States during 1968, 1969, and 1972. The inference of illegitimacy was necessary for some of the certificates, since 10 to 12 of the registration areas did not have a legitimacy item on some or all of their certificates in these years. A birth was inferred to be illegitimate when any of the following conditions was present on the certificate: (1) the name of the father of the child was omitted; (2) the mother's surname as stated in the "informant" or "mailing address" section was the same as her maiden name and was different from the father's surname; (3) the mother's surname was different from her maiden name but also differed from the father's surname and differed from the baby's surname; (4) the mother's surname was missing from both the "informant" section and the "mailing address" section of the certificate and the baby's surname was different from the father's surname. Using these rules, 259 sample records were inferred to be for illegitimate births in 1968-69 and 261 were inferred illegitimate in 1972.

In addition to the cases excluded from the surveys due to illegitimacy, 121 cases in 1968 and 55 cases in 1969 had to be excluded because the States in which the mothers resided would not allow the survey to query these women or because the mother was not a resident of the United States. These "not-queried" cases were handled as though they were nonrespondents and data were imputed for them; the illegitimate cases were excluded entirely. Table I shows the number of live births in the United States and in the original sample, the number of legitimate births included in the survey, and the number of mothers to whom questionnaires were mailed.

Collection of Data

Data for the 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys were collected primarily by mail. Using the addresses given on the birth certificates, questionnaires were mailed to mothers and, in 1972, to hospitals and physicians as well. No questionnaires were mailed in cases where the birth was reported or inferred to be illegitimate.

In 1968 and 1969, followup procedures for nonresponses consisted of a questionnaire sent by certified mail 16 days after the original firstclass mailing and a second followup questionnaire sent by regular mail 3 weeks after the certified mailing. When the questionnaire was returned and certain items were incomplete or inconsistent, either a special letter was sent or a telephone call was made to obtain the missing data. A final followup was made by U.S. Bureau of the Census interviewers for mothers who did not respond or whose responses were largely incomplete.

In 1972, the mothers were sent the first as well as the followup questionnaire by regular first-class mail. Followup questionnaires were sent if the original questionnaire was not returned within 16 days. If after an additional 21 days the followup questionnaire elicited no response, an interview by telephone or in person was attempted. Incomplete or inconsistent items on the questionnaires from the mothers were fol-

ltem	1972	1969	1968
Live births in the United States	3,258,411	3,600,206	3,501,564
Births selected in the sample Illegitimate births excluded from the sample Legitimate births in the survey Mothers mailed a questionnaire Mothers not mailed questionnaire because of State restrictions Mothers not mailed questionnaire because mother not U.S. resident	6,505 816 5,689 5,676 - 13	4,205 539 3,666 3,611 42 13	4,082 487 3,595 3,474 113 8

Table I. Number of live births in the United States and number of births in the 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

lowed up by telephone or personal interview. The mother of the infant was the only person from whom the information on the mother questionnaire was accepted. In the telephone and personal interviews, no proxy respondents were accepted.

Response Rates

In 1968, the rate of response from the 3,595 mothers was 88.9 percent, and in 1969, 84.8 percent of the 3,666 mothers responded. By 1972 the response rate had declined to 71.5 percent of the 5,689 mothers. The response rates varied with age—the younger mothers had lower response rates. At each age, the response of white mothers was higher than that of all other mothers. The number of births in the sample and the response rates by age of mother and color are shown in table II.

Processing of Data

After all attempts to obtain completed questionnaires had been exhausted, the information from the questionnaires received by mail and through interviews was coded, verified, and transcribed onto computer tapes. The computer tape records were then edited for valid ranges of codes and consistency of answers within each data source. Where two or more items within one data source were found to be inconsistent, other information from that source could sometimes be used to determine which items could be kept and which rejected. When no such decision was possible, all the inconsistent items were considered to be nonresponses so that they could later be imputed utilizing other information that was known about the mother or infant.

No attempt was made to reconcile inconsistencies between different sources of information. For example, if the birth certificate stated the mother's age to be 25 and the mother's questionnaire said it was 27, the two ages were both recorded as stated with no resolution of the difference. It was neither possible nor desirable to decide which source had provided the "right" information and to change the other to conform.

Table II.	Response rates	for mothers,	by age of	mother and color:	United States,	1968, 1	19 6 9, ai	nd 1972	National	Natality	Surveys
-----------	----------------	--------------	-----------	-------------------	----------------	---------	-------------------	---------	----------	----------	---------

	19	72	19	69	190	58
Age of mother and color	Number in sample	Percent responding	Number in sample	Percent responding	Number in sample	Percent responding
Total	5,689	71.5	3,666	84.8	3,595	88.9
Under 20 years 20-24 years 25-29 years 30-34 years 35 years and over	833 2,137 1,681 692 346	57.5 70.7 76.9 74.7 77.2	495 1,375 1,057 451 288	76.2 84.9 88.7 86.0 82.3	569 1,289 1,026 434 277	85.6 88.2 90.9 89.6 90.3
White	5,007	73.6	2,852	87.2	2,766	89.7
Under 20 years	708 1,899 1,517 586 297	58.9 73.5 78.8 75.6 78.8	369 1,068 840 353 222	80.5 87.0 91.1 86.7 85.1	410 1,007 815 330 204	85.6 90.2 90.8 90.0 91.2
All other	682	56.0	814	76.4	829	86.1
Under 20 years 20-24 years 25-29 years 30-34 years 35 years and over	125 238 164 106 49	49.6 48.7 59.1 69.8 67.3	126 307 217 98 66	63.5 77.9 79.7 83.7 72.7	159 282 211 104 73	85.5 81.2 91.5 88.5 87.7

Imputation of Missing Data

In any survey where the participation of the subjects is not mandatory, there will be some subjects who do not respond to the survey questionnaire. In the 1972 survey, the mothers, doctors, and hospitals were all told, both on the printed questionnaires and by the telephone and personal interviewers, that they were under no legal obligation to participate in the survey, that their participation was completely voluntary. Some sources who were mailed questionnaires did not return them (unit nonresponse), and some who returned them did not answer all the questions (item nonresponse). Unit nonresponses were not deleted from the data file because birth certificate data was available. The missing information was imputed on the basis of information on the certificate and also given, in most cases, by at least one other source. For example, if a physician did not respond, but both the hospital and the mother did, information from these sources could be used along with the birth certificate to impute data that were missing data from the doctor.

In the 1968 and 1969 surveys, imputation procedures differed for unit nonresponse and item nonresponse. Unit nonresponse was imputed as a whole unit, taking the entire set of information from another questionnaire, matching that case's age, live-birth order, and color to that of the nonrespondent, which are available from the birth certificate. For example, if a mother did not return a questionnaire, the entire "mother section" for that case record could be imputed from the record of a mother with the same age, number of children, and color who did respond to the survey. This method of handling unit nonresponse has the advantage of assuring internal consistency of responses for a particular birth within that section of the record which is imputed. Since the respondent's record would have been checked for internal consistency prior to imputation, the nonrespondent would be receiving an internally consistent record. A disadvantage of this method is that all of a given respondent's answers would have greater weight in the final results. Furthermore, the respondent's record may have had some item nonresponse in it, and after unit imputation, the record would have to be handled again in order to impute for item nonresponse.

The method used in the 1972 National Natality Survey was to treat unit nonresponse as a series of individual item nonresponses and impute each item separately. This way, whole blocks of answers were not taken from one respondent and imputed to a nonrespondent. An advantage is that no one respondent's answers were given undue weight. Also, there is only one imputation process instead of two. The disadvantage to this method rests in the possibility of creating internal inconsistencies by imputing one item from one respondent, another item from a second respondent, and so forth. Inconsistencies were minimized by carefully selecting qualifying characteristics, which vary with the type of information being imputed. Since postimputation consistency checks must be made, to check for a valid range of responses, these same checks can be used to locate any inconsistencies that may have been caused by the imputation.

The item imputation process was accomplished by a program that constructed a matrix for each variable requiring imputation. The dimensions of this matrix were determined by the number of control characteristics used and the number of levels of classification of each characteristic. At the start, the cells of the matrix were filled with average or modal values, which were replaced as soon as a record was read from the file having a known value for that item and the appropriate characteristics for that cell. The cell values were continually replaced by successive known values as the file of records was processed. When a record was read that contained a nonresponse for a particular item, the nonresponse code was replaced with whatever value resided at that moment in the matrix cell corresponding to the qualifying characteristics of the nonrespondent. Some examples of the qualifying characteristics used for item imputation are: (1) to impute age of mother, the control items were age of father, mother's education, and mother's parity; (2) to impute age of father, the mother's age and the father's education were used; (3) to impute father's income, the father's race, education, and age were used.

Table III shows the item nonresponse rate for selected variables from the mother's quesTable III. Item nonresponse rates for selected variables on mother's questionnaire: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

Selected variables	1972	1969	1968
	P n	ercent it onrespor	em 1se
Wantedness status Expectation of additional children	1.3 0.9 2.6 0.8 0.6 0.9 0.2 3.8	7.0 0.8 3.4 0.8 0.7 0.8 0.2 5.1 0.8 0.5	14.6 1.2 5.0 0.8 0.7 1.0 0.4 4.1 0.8 0.7

tionnaire. These figures do not include cases where no questionnaire was returned or where a "don't know" response was allowed.

The increase in unit nonresponse between 1968 and 1972 was partially offset, for the item on wantedness of the pregnancy, by the decline in the item nonresponse such that total nonresponse for this item was only slightly higher in 1972 (29.8 percent) than in 1968 (25.7 percent). Since wantedness status was imputed for about 30 percent of the cases, the validity of the imputation was checked for the 1972 data by comparing the distribution of births by wantedness status for respondents with that for nonrespondents. When this was done for selected agebirth-order-education groups, it was found that the distributions were similar for respondents and nonrespondents. Therefore, it appears that imputation did not seriously distort the overall distribution of births by wantedness status.

Estimation

The weights that are used to inflate the sample statistics so that they represent national estimates of legitimate live births are calculated using a poststratified ratio estimation procedure. The purpose of ratio estimation is to take into account available relevant information, thereby reducing the variability of the estimate. The relevant information used in the National Natality Surveys was age of mother, live-birth order, and color. These three items are recorded on the birth certificate, and statistics showing the national totals are published annually in *Vital Statistics of the United States*. The birth certificates were first checked to be certain that these items were complete on all records. When they were not, the items were imputed, using other information from the certificate.

All certificates were classified as belonging in one of the 24 groups as shown in table IV. The number of births in the United States in each of these 24 groups was obtained from the vital registration data. The births in the "livebirth order not stated" category in the national data were distributed to known categories for each age and color group in the same proportions as the births with known live-birth order.

Twenty-four weights $(w_i, i = 1 \text{ to } 24)$ were then calculated as ratios of national statistics to sample statistics for each of the 24 groups. The number of registered U.S. births in each group (Y_i) was divided by the total number of sample births (legitimate and illegitimate) in each group (y_i) . Thus $w_i = Y_i/y_i$.

The estimates of characteristics are produced from the sample using the following formula:

$$X_i' = \sum_{i=1}^{24} w_i x_i$$

where X' is the estimated number of legitimate births in the United States with a particular characteristic, x_i is the number of legitimate births in group *i* of the sample with the characteristic, and w_i is the weight assigned to each birth in group *i* of the sample.

Group	Color and age	Live-birth order
	White	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Under 20 years	1 2+ 1 2 3+ 1 2 3-4 5+ 1-2 3-4 5+ 1-4 5+
	All other	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Under 20 years	1 2+ 1-2 3+ 1-2 34 5+ 1-4 5+ All

Table IV. Age of mother, live-birth order, and color groups used for ratio estimation: United States, 1968, 1969, and 1972 National Natality Surveys

Reliability of Estimates

Since the statistics derived from this survey are estimates based on a sample, they may differ from the figures that would have been obtained had all legitimate births been surveyed using the same questionnaire and procedures.

The probability design of the sample for the survey makes possible the calculation of sampling errors. The standard error is a measure of the sampling variation that occurs by chance because only a sample rather than the entire population is surveyed. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample differs from the value for the entire population by less than 1 standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference is less than 2 standard errors and about 99 out of 100 that the difference is less than 3 standard errors. The standard error of a difference between two sample estimates is approximately the square root of the sum of squares of each standard error considered separately. This formula represents the actual standard error quite accurately for the difference between separate and uncorrelated characteristics, although it is only a rough approximation in most other cases.

The variance of a statistic depends not only on the design of the sample, but also on the distribution of the statistic itself; the variance is greater for measurements that are highly variable from one individual to another, and lower for measurements that are less variable. Because the estimates of the sampling error are obtained from the sample data, they are themselves subject to sampling error, which may be large in some instances.

Estimates of sampling variability for the statistics derived from these surveys have been computed using 20 random half-sample replications. This technique yields overall variability through observation of variability among random subsamples of the total sample. It reflects both the error that arises from sampling and a part of the measurement error, but it does not measure any systematic biases in the data. More technical discussions of the development and evaluation of replication techniques for estimating variance have been published elsewhere.^{4,5} However, the procedures and computations required to estimate variances by this method in these National Natality Surveys are described briefly as follows.

Each record from the entire file of records in the survey was assigned systematically to a random group between 1 and 40. Twenty random pairs were created from these 40 groups. A halfsample was formed by randomly selecting one group from each of the 20 pairs. This process was repeated until 20 replicate half-samples were formed from which variance estimates were derived. The composition of the 20 half-samples was determined by an orthogonal plan.

After the composition of each of the halfsamples was determined, all the estimation procedures used to produce the final estimates for the entire sample were applied separately to each of the resulting half-samples.

NOTE: A list of references follows the text.

An estimated variance S_x^2 , of an estimated statistic x' of the parameter X is obtained by applying the following formula:

$$S_{x'}^{2} = \frac{1}{20} \sum_{i=1}^{20} (x_{i}^{*} - x')^{2}$$

where

x' is the estimate of X based on the entire sample

and

 x_i'' is the estimate of X based on half-sample i

Rules to determine the approximate standard errors for estimates derived from this survey are as follows:

1. Estimates of aggregates.—Approximate standard errors for estimates of aggregates are given in tables V and VI. Because different sampling fractions were used for white and all other births in 1968 and 1969, the standard errors of estimates including only white births or only all other births are shown separately in table V (standard errors of all other births are used for black births).

Example: Suppose 100,000 mothers indicated their pregnancy was unwanted in

Table VI. Approximate standard errors for aggregates: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

Size of estimate	Relative standard error (in percent)	Standard error
3,000	29.2	876
5,000	22.6	1,130
10,000	16.0	1,600
30,000	9.2	2,760
50,000	7.1	3,550
70,000	6.0	4,200
100,000	5.0	5,000
200,000	3.4	6,800
500,000	2.1	10,500
700,000	1.7	11,900
1,000,000	1.3	13,000
2,000,000	0.6	12,000
2,500,000	0.4	10,000

1972. From table VI, the relative standard error for an estimate of that size is 5,000. Therefore, the chances are about 68 out of 100 that this estimate of 100,000 from the sample differs from the value for the entire population by less than 1 standard error, that is, the number of mothers who had an unwanted pregnancy ranges between 95,000 105,000 (100,000 ± 5,000). The and chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference from the population value is less than twice the standard error, and that the number of mothers who had an unwanted pregnancy ranges between 90,000 and $110,000 (100,000 \pm 10,000).$

	Tot	al	Whit	e	All other or black		
Size of estimate (in thousands)	Relative standard error (in percent)	Standard error	Relative standard error (in percent)	Standard error	Relative standard error (in percent)	Standard error	
25	9.8	2446	13.6	3393	93	2329	
50	6.6	3296	9.3	4670	6.4	3204	
75	5.4	4035	7.5	5603	5.1	3845	
100	4.5	4545	6.1	6114	4.2	4196	
150	3.6	5369	4.9	7284	3.3	4999	
200	3.0	6031	4.1	8219	2.8	5640	
250	2.6	6595	3.6	8934	2.5	6132	
300	2.4	7088	3.2	9451	2.2	6486	
500	1.8	8805	2.5	12576	1.7	8631	
700	1.5	10788	2.3	15777	1.5	10827	
1,000	1.1	11144	1.6	16436	1.1	11280	

Table V. Approximate standard errors for aggregates: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys

2. Estimates of percentages in a percent distribution.—Approximate standard errors for estimated percentages are obtained in one of the following two ways, depending upon the source of the base of the percentage:

a. When the denominator is one of the 24 ratio estimation classes shown in table IV, the standard error of the denominator is negligible and the relative standard error of the percentage is equivalent to the relative standard error of the numerator, given in tables V and VI.

Example: Suppose that of the approximately 116,000 mothers who are white, age 30-34, and have had 3-4 live births, 26 percent, or about 30,000 had unwanted pregnancies in 1972. Since these women compose the 11th class of the 24 ratio estimation classes shown in table IV, the relative standard error of the per-

centage is equivalent to the relative standard error of the numerator. Table VI shows that the relative standard error for an estimate of 30,000 is 9.2 percent. Thus, 9.2 percent of the 26 percent estimate is 2.392 percentage points.

b. When the denominator is an estimate from the sample that is not one of the 24 ratio estimation classes, the approximate standard errors are given in tables VII through X.

Example: Suppose that 20 percent of mothers in some category had an unwanted pregnancy in 1972, and the base of that percent is 50,000. From table X, the 20-percent column and the 50,000 row indicate that 2.9 percent is the standard error. Therefore, the chances are about 68 out of 100 that this

Table VII. Approximate standard errors for percentages for total births: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys

Base of percent	Estimated percent									
(in thousands)	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 90	20 or 80	25 or 75	30 or 70	40 or 60	50		
	Standard errors expressed in percentage points									
30	1.7 1.3 0.9 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1	2.6 2.1 1.4 0.9 0.6 0.4 0.4 0.3	3.7 2.8 2.0 1.3 0.9 0.6 0.4 0.4	4.9 3.7 2.7 1.7 1.2 0.8 0.6 0.5	5.2 4.1 2.9 1.8 1.3 0.9 0.6 0.5	5.6 4.3 3.0 1.9 1.3 1.0 0.7 0.6	5.9 4.6 3.3 2.1 1.5 1.1 0.7 0.6	6.1 4.7 3.3 2.1 1.5 1.1 0.8 0.6		

Table VIII. Approximate standard errors for percentages for white births: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys

Base of percent		Estimated percent									
(in thousands)	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 90	20 or 80	25 or 75	30 or 70	40 or 60	50			
		s	tandard erro	ors expressed	d in percenta	ge points	1				
30	1.8 1.4 1.0 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.1	2.8 2.2 1.6 1.0 0.7 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2	3.9 3.0 2.1 1.3 0.9 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.4	5.2 4.0 2.8 1.8 1.3 0.9 0.6 0.5 0.4	5.6 4.3 3.0 1.9 1.3 1.0 0.7 0.6 0.5	5.9 4.6 3.3 2.1 1.4 1.0 0.7 0.6 0.5	6.3 4.9 3.5 2.2 1.6 1.1 0.8 0.6 0.6	6.4 5.0 3.5 2.3 1.6 1.1 0.8 0.6			

Table IX. Approximate standard errors for percentages for all other or black births: United States, 1968 and 1969 National Natality Surveys

Base of percent	Estimated percent									
(in thousands)	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 80	20 or 80	25 or 75	30 or 70	40 or 60	50		
		S	tandard erro	ors expressed	l in percenta	ige points				
30	1.3 1.0	2.0	2.8 2.1	3.7 2.8	4.0 3.0	4.2 3.3	4.5 3.5	4.6		
100	0.7	1.1 0.7	1.5 0.9	2.0 1.3	2.2 1.3	2.3 1.4	2.5 1.6	2.5 1.6		
500	0.3	0.5 0.4	0.7	0.9 0.6	1.0 0.7	1.0 0.7	1.1 0.8	1.1 0.8		
2,000	0.1	0.2 0.2	0.4 0.3	0.4 0.4	0.5 0.4	0.5 0.4	0.6 0.4	0.6 0.4		
4,000	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4		

Table X. Approximate standard errors for percentages: United States, 1972 National Natality Survey

Base of percent							
(in thousands)	2 or 98	5 or 95	10 or 90	20 or 80	30 or 70	40 or 60	50
••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		Standa	ard errors ex	pressed in p	ercentage po	oints	
3	4.1 3.2 2.2 1.3 1.0 0.8 0.7 0.5 0.3	6.4 4.9 3.5 2.0 1.6 1.3 1.1 0.8 0.5	8.8 6.8 4.8 2.8 2.1 1.8 1.5 1.1 0.7	11.7 9.0 6.4 3.7 2.9 2.4 2.0 1.4 0.9	13.4 10.4 7.3 4.2 3.3 2.8 2.3 1.6 1.0	14.3 11.1 7.8 4.5 3.5 3.0 2.5 1.8 1.1	14.6 11.3 8.0 4.6 3.6 3.0 2.5 1.8 1.1
700 1,000 2,000 2,500	0.3 0.2 0.2 0.1	0.4 0.3 0.2 0.2	0.6 0.5 0.3 0.3	0.8 0.6 0.4 0.4	0.9 0.7 0.5 0.5	0.9 0.8 0.6 0.5	1.0 0.8 0.6 0.5

20.0-percent estimate from the sample differs from the value for the entire population by less than 1 standard error, and the percent of mothers in the population who had an unwanted pregnancy ranges between 17.1 and 22.9 percent (20.0 percent \pm 2.9 percentage points).

3. Difference between two sample estimates.—The standard error of a difference is approximately the square root of the sum of the squares of the standard errors of the two estimates. This formula will represent the actual standard error quite accurately for the difference between mothers with separate and uncorrelated characteristics, although it is only a rough approximation in cases where the characteristics are correlated.

Example: Suppose that 700,000 mothers in group A had a birth in 1972 that was wanted then, and 500,000 mothers from group B also had a birth wanted then. The difference between these two estimates is 200,000. The standard errors for 700,000 and 500,000 obtained from table VI are used as follows:

$$\sqrt{11,900^2 + 10,500^2} = 15,870$$

This represents 1 standard error for the difference of 200,000, and 2 standard errors would be 31,740. Thus, a 95-percent confidence interval for the 200,000 estimate of difference is 168,260 to 231,740 (200,000 ± 31,740).

Note that linear interpolation will generally suffice when the table values do not correspond closely to the statistics being tested.

In this report an asterisk (*) is shown with numbers and percents that are based c less than 10-20 sample cases (5,000-10,000 weighted cases).

In addition to sampling errors, survey results are subject to errors in conceptual formulation; ambiguities in definitions in the wording of questions; biases due to nonresponse or incomplete response; and errors in coding, editing, and tabulation. Although there is no way of computing the magnitude of these errors, they were minimized as much as possible.

Errors in conceptual formulation and ambiguities were reduced by pretesting the questionnaires before the surveys began. The steps taken to reduce biases due to nonresponse were discussed in the sections, "Collection of Data" and "Imputation of Missing Data." Errors in coding and editing were reduced by independent verification and by the consistency and interval checks discussed in the section, "Processing of Data." Errors in tabulation were reduced, if not eliminated, by carefully cross-checking the tabulations and by comparing data from this survey with data from other sources when available.

Rounding of Numbers

- 000 -----

The original tabulations on which the data in this report are based show figures to the nearest whole unit. In the published tables, estimates of aggregates are rounded to the nearest thousand although they are not necessarily accurate to that detail. All percentages, ratios, and averages were computed using unrounded figures.

APPENDIX II SOURCE FORMS

	,			PTIFICAT			BIRTH					
PE, OR PRINT IN	LOCAL P	ILE NUMBER			E OF		ыктн		BIRTH NU	MBER		
SEE HANDBOOK FOR	CHILD- NAME	FIRST	мір	DLE	LA:	51	DATE OF BIRT	H (MONTH, DAY	(, YEAR)	н	DUR	
INSTRUCTIONS	1						20			21		٨
	SEX	THIS BIRTH	-SINGLE, TWIN, TRI	PLET, ETC	F NOT SIN	GLE BIRTH	BORN FIRST, SECON	D, COUN	TY OF BIRTH			
CHILD	3	40			6			5a				
	CITY, TOWN, OR LOCAT	ION OF BIRTH	INS	IDE CITY LIMITS HO	SPITAL-N	VAME	(IF NO	IN HOSPITAL,	GIVE STREET AND N	JMBER (
L L	56		5c	5d								
ſ	MOTHER-MAIDEN NAM	E FIRST		NDDLE	LAST		AGE (AT TIME THIS BIRTH)	OF STATE	OF BIRTH (IF NO	DT IN USA., N	AME COUN	41KA)
MOTHER	RESIDENCE STATE	COUNTY		TTY TOWN OF LO			INSIDE CITY L	IMITS STREET	AND NUMBER			
				,			ISPECIFY YES O	R NOI				
Ļ	70	76	7	<u> </u>			76	7e				
FATHER	FATHER-NAME	FIRST	*	AIDDLE	LASI		THIS BIRTH)	STATE	OF BIRTH OF NO	DT IN U.S.A., N	AME COUN	IIRT)
	80						86	80			-	
	INFORMANT							RELATIC	ON TO CHILD			
	90							95				
ſ	I CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE N STATED ABOVE	AMED CHILD WAS BO	DRN ALIVE AT THE PLA	ACE AND TIME AND ON	THE DATE	DATE SIGN	ED (MONTH, D	AY, YEAR I	ATTENDANT-	-M D., D O , MI	DWIFE, OTH	IER.
CERTIFIER	10a SIGNATURE					106	DBECS			. TOWN STATE	7/8 \	
	CERTIFIER - NAME		TYPE OR PRINTS			MAILING A	DURESS	Taikeer OK	KYD NO, CHIO	A 1044, 3442,	L (r)	
L	104					10e						
	REGISTRAR-SIGNATUR	E						DATE	RECEIVED BY LO	CAL REGIST	RAR	
	110							111.				
			CONFIDE	TIAL INFORMA	TION FO	R MEDICA	L AND HEALT	H USE ONI	LŶ			
٢		RACE-FATHER		EDUCATION-	PECIFY HIC	SHEST GRAD	E COMPLETED	PREVIOU	S DELIVERIES-H	OW MANY OT	HER CHILI	DREN
FATHER	WHITE, NEGRO, AMERICAN (SPECIFY)	INDIAN, ETC		ELEMENTARY (0,1,7,3,4, OR 8	HIG 1 11,2	H SCHOOL ,3, 08 41	COLLEGE +1,2,3,4, 0R 5 + 1	ARE NOW LIVE	NG WERE BORN A	LIVE - WERE BO	EATH AT AN	NY TIME
L	12			13]	14e	146	14		
ſ	· .	RACE MOTHER		EDUCATION-	SPECIFY HI	GHEST GRAD	E COMPLETED		ASILIVE BIKIM DAY YEAR		DAY	YEAR
	WHITE, NEGRO, AMERICAN	INDIAN, ETC		ELEMENTARY	HIG	H SCHOOL	COLLEGE					
	15 15			16		,		17a		176		
MOTHER	DATE LAST NORMAL MEN	ISES BEGAN	MONTH OF	PREGNANCY PREN	IATAL	PRENATAL	VISITS TOTAL NU	MBER LEGITIM	ATE BIRT	H WEIGHT		
DEATH	MONTH DAY	YEAR	CARE BEGAN	4 THIRD, ETC & SPECIFY 1		ITF NONE, S	O STATE I	1 SPECIAL	TTES OR NOT			
OF AGE			1					10				
ENTER STATE FILE	18		190	OFSCRIPT OF WRIT		AIRTH INJUI	NES TO CHILD	20	121	DESCRIBE C	R WRITE '	NONE
CERTIFICATE FOR THIS CHILD				(DESCRIPE ON MARK								
	22	LATER TO RECENT				23			ALLES OF CHILD	(DESCRIPT C	-	NONE
	COMPLICATIONS NOT RE	DATED TO PREGINA		I DESCRIPE OR WRIT	E NUNE I	LONGENIN	AL MALIORMANOI	NS OR ANOM	ALLES OF CHILD			
MINTIPLE RIPTHS	E.					25					<u></u>	
MULTIPLE BIRTHS	24											
MULTIPLE BIRTHS ENTER STATE FILE NUMBER FOR MATE(S)	COMPLICATIONS OF LABO	RC		(DESCRIBE OR WRIT	NONE 1							

FETAL DEATH(S)



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH. EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE WASHINGTON. D C 20201

NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

REFER TO:

L

Г

The United States Public Health Service is conducting a national study of families having babies during 1968. In this study, we are particularly interested in health care received by the mother and her baby. We are also interested in learning about the size and types of families having babies as well as about other family characteristics. This information is needed in order to plan medical care programs and to understand better the growth and changes taking place in our population.

This study will be based on information obtained from families which were chosen as a sample from among the nearly 4 million families having a baby during 1968. Your family was one of those selected. Please answer the questions on the following pages and return this form within five days in the enclosed postage-free envelope.

Since this study is limited to only one out of every 1,000 families in the United States having a baby during 1968, it is important that we receive a reply from every person who is sent a questionnaire. If you do not know the answers to some of the questions or if they do not apply, please write a note about those questions and answer the others. Even if the baby is not living with you or has died, we would appreciate your answering each question. You are assured that all information which you report about yourself and your family will be kept completely confidential in accordance with the regulations of the United States Public Health Service. The information will not be disclosed to any person or any other agency and it will be used for statistical purposes only.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert D. Grove, Ph.D. Director, Division of Vital Statistics

Name of Child	
Date of Birth	File Number
	28

CONFIDENTIAL - All information which would permit identification of an individual, or of an establishment, will be held confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purpose of the survey, and will be protected against disclosure in accordance with provisions of 42 CFR Part I.

NATIONAL BIRTH SURVEY

PART I. ME	DICAL CARE
 1. (a) Did you see a doctor about your pregnancy at any time before you went to the hospital to have your baby? Yes No (b) How many months pregnant were you when you first saw a doctor about your pregnancy?months 2. (a) Have you been examined by a doctor since you left the hospital after having your baby? Yes No Yes No (b) How long after your baby was born did you first go to the doctor for an examination?weeks 	 3. (a) Has a doctor examined your baby since he was brought home from the hospital? Yes (b) How old was your baby (c) Has your baby when you took him to been examined by the doctor for his first a nurse at home or at a clinic? weeks Yes Wes Yes No 4. (a) How many nights were you in the hospital after your baby was born? nights (b) Did your baby leave the hospital with you? Yes No (c) If no, what was the TOTAL number of nights the baby was in the hospital? nights
PART II. INFORMATIO	N ABOUT YOURSELF
 1. (a) Did you smoke cigarettes at all during the year before your baby was born? Yes No 	 2. (a) When your baby was first born did you breast feed him? Yes, breast fed, no bottle Yes, breast fed and bottle breast feed
(b) On the average, how many cigarettes A DAY did you smoke <i>before</i> you knew you were pregnant? cigarettes	(b) If breast fed, how old was your baby when you stopped breast feeding him? weeks or Still breast feeding
(c) On the average, how many cigarettes A DAY did you smoke after you knew you were pregnant? cigarettes	 How long after your baby was born did you start to menstruate again? weeks or Still haven't started
PHS-4425-3 (Page 1)	(GO ON TO PART III) Form Approved

Form Approved Budget Bureau No. 68-R0823

P		II. INFOR	MATION A	BOUT YOUR P	REGNAN	CIES	
In this part we as the child	re inter ren who	ested in knor have ever be	ving about all een born to you	the times you have u, even if they were	ever been p by a previou	oregnant an us marriag	d about all e.
1. Have you ever had	a misca es any have	urriage? e you ever ha umber	ad?	4. Were any of you baby was born? or college. Do living with rela	ir children (<u>Do not</u> list list those in tives, etc.)	living away t children a n the Arme	when your new way at school d Forces,
2. Have you ever had dead)?	a stillb	irth (that is	a baby born	Please lis	t here.		
🗌 No 🗌 Y	es			Name of C	hild	Sex	Date of Birth
How r	♥ nany hav	ve you ever h	nad?				
	nu	ımber					
3. (a) How many babic (Be sure to cou Number	es have y nt your i	you ever had new baby)	born alive?	5. Just before you did you want to	became pre become pre No, wante want	gnant with gnant? (Che ed another h to become	your new baby, eck only <u>one</u> box) paby, but did not pregnant yet
(b) Have any of the	se child	ren died?			No, did no	ot want ano	her baby
□No □Yes			 6. (a) After each birth, some couples feel that their families are complete while others expect more children. In your case, do you expect to have more children? 				
♦ Please list he	ere.			Definite	ly yes	🗌 Probabl	y no
Name of Child	Sex	Date of Birth	Date of Death	(b) When do you	y yes expect to h rs	Definite	ly no ext baby?
				(c) How many m	nore babies ies	do you expe	ect to have?

(d) If you expect to have more than one, in how many years do you expect to have your last baby?
 _____years

(GO ON TO PART IV)

PHS-4425-3 (Page 2) Rev. 4/68

PART IV. INFORMATION ABOUT YO	DURSELF AND YOUR HUSBAND
1. Is this your <i>first</i> marriage?	3. What is the highest grade (or year) of school that your husband has ever finished?
Yes - Please give the year of your marriage 19	(Circle highest grade COMPLETED) None0 Public or other j 1 2 3 4 5 6
Please give the year of your <i>first</i> marriage 19 Please give the year your <i>first</i> marriage and of	regular school 7 8 9 10 11 12 College or University 1 2 3 4 5+ Other (specify)
<i>Pirst</i> marriage ended 19 Please give the year of your present marriage 19 2. (a) What is the highest grade (or year) of school that you have ever finished? (Circle highest grade COMPLETED) None 0 Public or other {1 2 3 4 5 6 regular school {7 8 9 10 11 12} College or University 1 2 3 4 5+ Other (marries)	 4. What is your religious preference? Protestant Roman Catholic Jewish Other (specify)
Other (specify)	☐ Jewish ☐ Other (specify) ☐ None

.

PHS-4425-3 (Page 3) Rev. 4/68

.

(GO ON TO PART V)

PART V. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR HOUSEHOLD

In this part, information is asked about the members of the household uho lived with you when your new baby was born.

List below everyone who usually lived in your household at the time your new haby was born. Be sure to
list yourself, your husband (if he lived at home) and your newborn baby, as well as other children, relatives and nonrelatives living with you. Children who were away at school or college should also be listed.
Do not include persons who lived away (for example, persons in the Armed Forces). Also, do not
include persons who were only visiting in your house temporarily at the time your baby was born.

Enter your name on the first line;	For each pers	son, provide the ini	formation requested below.		
enter the names of every other person who lived with you, including	Relationship to you		Marital Status		
your newborn baby, on the following	(husband, daughter, son, father-in-law,	Date of birth	Single (never married)		
lines.	nephew, stepson,	Month-Day-Year	Married Separated		
(First name) (Last name)	lodger, etc.)		Widowed Divorced		
	Yourself				
······································					
	Enter your name on the first line; enter the names of every other person who lived with you, including your newborn baby, on the following lines. (First name) (Last name)	Enter your name on the first line; enter the names of every other person who lived with you, including your newborn baby, on the following lines. (First name) (Last name) Hodger, etc.) Yourself	Enter your name on the first line; enter the names of every other person who lived with you, including your newborn baby, on the following lines. (First name) (Last name) Yourself		

(If more space is needed, please continue on back)

2. At the time your new baby was born who was the head of your household?	3. At the time your new baby was born, was your husband serving in the Armed Forces?					
☐ Your husband ☐ Another person → Name of head	☐ Yes ☐ No					
PH8-4425-3 (Page 4)						

PHS-4425-3 (Page 4) Rev. 4/68 (GO ON TO PART VI)

These qu	estions cond busin	cernwork for pay, work in ness, profession or farm. I	own business, profession or farm, or unpaid work in family's Include full-time and seasonal work.
l.(a)Have	you worked	l since the birth of you	ir new baby?
ΠY	es		□ No
(b) How o	d was your	baby when you	(d) Are you planning to go to work?
returr	ned to work?	months	Yes No
(c)Are yo	ou working a	it the present time?	(e) How soon do you plan to go to work?
Ωy	es	No	months or years
2.(a)Did yo	ou work at a	ny time during your recen	it pregnancy?
🗌 Y	es	No	
1			
(b)How n	nany months	pregnant were you when	you stopped working?
(b)How n	nany months nonths or	pregnant were you when you when you when you worked until baby's h	you stopped working? birth
(b)How n	nany months	Worked until baby's k	you stopped working? birth
(b)How n n 3. Did yo Y	nany months nonths or ou work at a es	worked until baby's b Worked until baby's b worked until baby's b worked until baby's b worked until baby's b baby's b worked until baby's b	you stopped working? birth of your new baby and the one before it?
(b)How n n 3. Did yo Y 4. After	nany months nonths or ou work at a es you were fin	s pregnant were you when you when you worked until baby's have between the birth No	you stopped working? birth of your new baby and the one before it? before your first baby was born?
(b)How n n 3. Did yo Y 4. After Y	nany months nonths or ou work at a es you were fin es	s pregnant were you when you when you worked until baby's here were the birth No	you stopped working? birth of your new baby and the one before it? before your first baby was born?
(b)How n n 3. Did yo [] Y 4. After [] Y 5. Did yo	nany months nonths or ou work at a es you were fin es ou work at an	s pregnant were you when you when you worked until baby's here were the birth No rst married, did you work No ny time before you were fi	you stopped working? birth of your new baby and the one before it? before your first baby was born? irst married?
(b)How n 	nany months nonths or ou work at a es you were fin es ou work at an es	s pregnant were you when you when you worked until baby's here were the birth No rst married, did you work No ny time before you were find No	you stopped working? birth of your new baby and the one before it? before your first baby was born? irst married?

The following questions refer to the money income of a income of all the members of the family whom you listed	nll members of your family du leven if they were not living	uring 1967. Include all together during 1967.
 1. (a) Did any member of your family earn money from wages or a salary in 1967? Yes No (b) Did any member of your family receive any money from relief, welfare, or ADC from state or local government in 1967? Yes No (c) Did any member of your family receive income from his own farm, business, professional practice, or partnership in 1967? Yes No (d) Did any member of your family receive or earn money in any other way in 1967? (Include unemployment compensation, help from relatives, rent from property, Social Security, V.A. Benefits, dividends, etc.) Yes No 	 2. What was the total money ifrom all sources in 19 agrees with your best e None or loss Under \$1,000 \$1,000-\$1,999 \$2,000-\$2,999 \$3,000-\$3,999 3. Taken together then, wha received by your family (Check the box that agree None or loss Under \$1,000 \$1,000-\$1,999 \$2,000-\$2,999 \$3,000-\$3,999 	received by your husband 967? (Check the box that stimate) \$4,000-\$4,999 \$5,000-\$6,999 \$7,000-\$9,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$15,000 or more at was the total money from all sources in 1967? res with your best estimate) \$4,000-\$4,999 \$5,000-\$6,999 \$5,000-\$6,999 \$5,000-\$6,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$10,000-\$14,999 \$15,000 or more
PART VIII. PERSON COM	APLETING THIS FORM	
NAME	<u>,</u>	
ADDRESS		
TELEPHONE NUMBER	DATE OF COMPLETION	
PHS-4425-3 (Page 6) Rev 4 '68 NOTES AND	COMMENTS	GP 0 941-405

PART VII. FAMILY INCOME

1972 National Natality Survey



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

> NATIONAL CENTER FOR HEALTH STATISTICS

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 20852

1

The Public Health Service is conducting a national survey of medical care provided to mothers who have babies during 1972. We are trying to learn more about the medical care mothers received during the period before and after the birth of the child. Past studies have shown that medical care is related to the health of a mother and her baby. The information which mothers throughout the country give us will greatly aid in planning better medical care programs for all American women.

You are one of a small sample of mothers being selected to represent all mothers having babies in 1972. Because of this you play an important role in telling us about the medical care you received before and after the birth of your child.

All information you give us, as well as that provided by medical personnel and facilities listed by you in the questionnaire will be held strictly confidential. No information will be released to any other person or agency.

In giving answers to the first part of the form, please name every doctor, hospital, or clinic from which you received any care related to your pregnancy during the period specified in the question. It is necessary that we obtain as complete and accurate a picture as possible of all the medical care you received before and after the birth of your baby. If you do not know an exact answer to any of the questions in the form, give your best estimate. Please complete the form and return it within the next few days in the enclosed postage-free envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert a brack

Robert A. Israel Director, Division of Vital Statistics

NAME OF CHILD	DATE OF BIRTH

М

ASSURANCE OF CONFIDEN FIALTY - All information which would permit identification of an individual, or of an establishment, will be held confidential, will be used only by persons engaged in and for the purpose of the survey, and will be protected against disclosure in accordance with provisions of 12 CFR Part I.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION - Completing this form is voluntary, you are under no legal obligation to do so.

NATIONAL BIRTH SURVEY

PART I. SOURCES OF MEDICAL CARE

			PAKI	I. SOURCES	OF MED	ICAL	CARE						
This part i tion as you	is concerned wit u can.	th persons or plac	es which provi	ded medical care	to you. If yo	ou do not	t know a	complete a	lddress, pl	ease give us	as much informa-		
l. (a) Lis who	t the name and a delivered your	address of the doo baby.	tor, midwife, c	or other person	2. Were you seen by any other persons or places (hospitals, maternity clinics, etc.) for prenatal care (care related to your recent pregnancy)?								
	N AMF	List th	e names al care t	Nc []] Nc) (Go to qi resses of :	aestion 3) all persons	or places w	hich provided					
	ADDRESS	(Number)	(Stre	et)	<u></u>	NAME		(Furst)	·····	(Last)			
	(City or Te	n(n)	(State)	(Zip Code)	-								
(b) Hov	w many times we	ere you seen for m	edical care by	this person dur-		DRESS		(Number)		(Street	/		
ery	episode).			Number		(City of	r Toun)		(State)		(Zip Code)		
3. Did you lated to	see a doctor, r	nidwife, or other p v within THREE N	erson for any IONTHS AFTE	medical care re- R THE BIRTH	How m	any time	s were y	ou seen fo	r prenatal	care by the a	bove? (Number)		
	S N	o (Go on to Part)	(1)		В. :	NAME		(First)		(Last)			
List th	e names and add	trasses of all per	ans who provide	ded medical care	ADI	DRESS		(Number)	1	(Street)			
related baby.	to your pregnan	cy within three m	onths after the	birth of your	-	(City of	r Town)		(State)		(Zip Code)		
NAME	(F	rrst)	(Last)		How m	any time	s were y	ou seen fo	r prenatal	care by the a	nbove? mber)		
ADDRE	SS	(Number)	(Street)		If more sp	ace is n	veeded, c	ontinue be	low.				
(0	Lity or Toun)	(State)		(Zip Code)									
NAME	(Fi)	rst)	(Last)		-								
ADDRE	ss (Yumber)	(Street)										
(0	Lity or Town)	(State)	<u> </u>	(Zip Code)	1								
If more spa	ace is needed, c	continue below.											

PART II. INFORMATION ON HEALTH INSURANCE

1. Did you have	any kind of hea	lth in	surance	for hosp	ital or 1	doctor	bills at	any	5. (a) Did health insurance pay any par	t of t	he do	octor's	bill fo	r
time during th	e twelve months	befo	re your	oaby was	s born?		delivering your baby?							
Yes	[]No (Go	to qu	estion ()				Yes No	<u>_</u> N	o do	ctor's	ы11		
2. Did you have any kind of health insurance at the time your baby was born?									ł					
Yes									(b) What part of the doctor's bill did	your	insu	rance p	pay?	
									[] 1/4 or less] 07	er 1/2	to 3/4	
3. (a) Did health insurance pay for any part of the medical care you received during your pregnancy PRIOR TO the delivery?								ved] over 1/4 to 1/2] 07	er 3/4		
[] Yes	[_] No		N	o medica	l care b	ill durı	ng preg	палсу						
(b) What part	of the medical l	bills	during p	regnancy	did you	ır in sur	ance pa	ıy,	6. (a) Did any organization or agency (caid, welfare, lodges, unions, et the medical services connected s	such a c.),paj	s th y for	e Arme or pro	d Forc vide an	es, Medi- ly part of
[]]1/4 c	r less		-	over 1	2 to 3/	'4				· p				
over	1/4 to 1/2		۰ ب	over 3	<i>i</i> 4				Yes No					
4. (a) Did healt	h insurance pay	any i	part of t	e hospi	al bill	when y	our bal	by:	L .					
was born	, , , ,								(b) What part of the medical services the organization or agency?	s were	e pai	d for o	r provid	ded by
Tes [No		N	o hospit	al bill				1/4 or less	۲.] ov	er 1/2	to 3/4	
(b) What part	of the hospital	ыll d	lid your	insuranc	e pay?				= over 1/4 to 1/2 $=$ over 3/4					
<u> </u>	r less		-	over 1	2 to 3/	4			(c) What is the name of the agency or organization?					
over	1/4 to 1/2			over 3	/4									
					<u></u>		(GO	ON TO	PART III)					
			PART	III. IN	FOR	MATI	ON /	ABOU	IT YOU AND YOUR CHILDRE	N				
We are interesto child listed on	d in the outcome he front of the q	es of juesti	all the onnaire	regnanc	ies you	have (ever ha	d, even	if they occuried before your present marr	iage.	Plea	ise INC	LUDE	the
1. How many ch	ildren have vou	ever	had? (C	ount all	those th	nat wei	e bom		3. Were any of your children living aw	ay fro	m yo	u wher	the ch	nild listed
ALIVE to yo	u AT ANY TIME)					Num	nber	on the front of the questionnaire wa living with relatives, adopted by so	s bon meon	n? (F e els	or exa	mple, u he Arm	isually ed
							<u> </u>	J	Forces, etc.) Do not include childre college.	en who	o we:	re awa	y at sci	hool or
 Have any of were born de 	these children d ad.)	ied?	(DO NO	[count i	niscarri	ages o	r babie	s that	Yes No (Go to que	stion	4)			
Yes	[] No (Go	to qu	estion)										
Plance list h	elow the name	CAY	and dat	s of hir	th and d	leath o	feach	such	Please list below the name, sex, an child.	id dat	e of	birth o	f each	such
child.	crow, the nume,	35,	and dat		tir und v	icutii U	i cucii	Jucii	NAME OF CHILD	SI	x	DAT	EOFI	BIRTH
NAME C	F CHILD	SE	X DA	TEOF	BIRTH	DAT	EOFE	DEATH	(First) (Middle)	м	F	Mo.	Day	Year
(First)	(Middle)	M	r M	. Day	rear	M0.	Day	lear						
		\square								Τ				
	<u>-</u> · · · · · ·	+			+				4. (a) Have you ever had a stillbirth? (Th	hat is,	a ba	by that	was bo	rn dead)
									Yes No (Go to	quest	ion 5	5)		
		1 1			1							1		
		4		-			ł		(b) How many have you ever had?	-			Numb	<u>let</u>
		4				-			 (b) How many have you ever had? (c) Please give the date of your las 	+ t still	birth	 	Numb	

HSM-254-1 (PAGE 3) REV. 7-72

(Part III continued on Page 4)

PART III. Co	ntinued
5. (a) Have you ever had a miscarriage? (DO NOT include any stillbirth counted in Question 4)	7. Do you expect to have more children?
(b) How many have you ever had?	Definitely yes Probably yes
(c) Please give the date of your last miscatriage. (Mo. Duy) car)	Probably no
6. Thinking back, just before you became pregnant with your new baby, did you want to become pregnant at that time?	Definitely no
 I wanted this pregnancy <u>at an earlier time</u>, as well as at that time. I wanted to become pregnant <u>at that time</u>. I did not want to become pregnant at that time, but I wanted another child <u>sometime in the future</u>. 	
I did not want to become pregnant at that time, or at any time in the future.	
	(GO ON TO PART IV)
(Check ONE bo	v only)
1. Is this your first marriage?	
Yes>Please give the date of your marriage	
Please give the date of your first marriage No Please give the date of your present marriage <u>No</u> . Day Year	
 (a) What is the highest grade of regular school (elementary school, high school, two year or four year college or university) that you COM- PLETED? (DO NOT include business or trade schools, or other specialized training) 	3. (a) What is the highest grade of regular school (elementary school, high school, two-year or four-year college or university) that your husband COMPLETED? (DO NOT include business or trade schools or other specialized training.)
(Circle the highest grade of regular school completed)	(Circle the highest grade of regular school he completed)
0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18+	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18+
None Elementary school High school University or Graduate college school	None Elementary school High school University or Graduate college school
(b) Other specialized training;	(b) Other specialized training;
Yes No	Yes No
Specify:	Specify:
Circle years completed	Circle years completed
Less than one 1 2 3 or more	Less than one 1 2 3 or more

(GO ON TO PART V)

PART V. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR FAMILY

In this part information is asked about all relatives living with you when the baby listed on the front of the questionnaire was born.

1. List below all relatives who usually lived with you at the time of your recent delivery. Be sure to list yourself, your baby, your husband (if he lived at home), as well as any of your children and other relatives living with you. Include children who were away at school or college. DO NOT include relatives who lived somewhere else (for example, relatives in the Armed Forces). Also, DO NOT include relatives who were only staying in your home temporarily when the baby was born.

NAME	For YOURSELF and EACH RELATIVE, provide the information requested below.							
Enter your name on the first line; enter the names of every other relative who lived with you on the following lines. Be sure to include the baby. (First Name) (Last Name)		RELATIONSHIP TO YOU (Husband, daughter, son,	DATI	E OF BII	RTH	MARITAL STATUS Single (never married)		
		father, father-in-law, nephew, stepson, adopted daughter, etc.)	Mo.	Day	Year	Separated Widowed Divorced		
		YOURSELF						
n	<u></u>							
		to the second						
		1 						
		11						
	. <u></u>							
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·····						
	<u></u>							
	4.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1							
	<u> </u>							

2. Who was the head of this family? (This person must be you or one of the relatives who is listed above.)

Your husband

Yourself

Another relative ----- Name of head _

(GO ON TO PART VI)

HSM-254-1	(PAGE	5)
REV. 7-72		

PART VI. FAMILY INCOME

The following questions refer to the money income of members of your family during the TWELVE MONTHS before the baby was born. Include all incomes of members of the family whom you listed even if they were not living together during part of the twelve months. Include all income from wages, salaries, investments, property, Social Security, welfare, unemployment compensation, help from relatives, etc.

 What was the income (total income dues, insurance, etc.) received during the twelve months before include money from wages, sale business, professional practice If exact amount is not known, p 	ome before deductions for taxes, bonds, by YOUR HUSBAND from all sources e the baby was born? (This income should aries, commissions, bonuses, tips, own , farm, unemployment compensation, etc.) olease check your best estimate. Check one)	2. What was the total family income (before deductions for taxes, bonds, dues insurance, etc.) received by YOURSELF, YOUR HUSBAND, and ALL OTHER LISTED FAMILY MEMBERS from all sources during the twelv months before the baby was born? (This income should include money from wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses, tips, own business, pro- fessional practice, farm, unemployment compensation, etc.) If exact amount is not known, please check your best estimate.						
none or under \$1,000	\$5,000 to \$6,999	лопе or under \$1,000	\$5,000 to \$6,999					
\$1,000 to \$1,999	\$7,000 to \$9,999	\$1,000 to \$1,999	\$7,000 to \$9,999					
\$2,000 to \$2,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$2,000 to \$2,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999					
\$3,000 to \$3,999	\$15,000 to \$24,999	\$3,000 to \$3,999	\$15,000 to \$24,999					
\$4,000 to \$4,999	\$25,000 or more	\$4,000 to \$4,999	\$25,000 or more					
		(GO ON TO PART VII)						
_	PART VII. PERSON CO	MPLETING THIS FORM						
			anayinin da ata ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an					
NAME								
ADDRESS								
((Number)	(Street)						
	City or Town)	(State)	(Zip Code)					
TELEPHONE NO.		DATE OF COMPLETION						

NOTES AND COMMENTS

H SM-254-1 (PAGE 6) REV. 7-72

GPO 930-960

VITAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS Series

- Series 1. Programs and Collection Procedures. Reports which describe the general programs of the National Center for Health Statistics and its offices and divisions and data collection methods used and include definitions and other material necessary for understanding the data.
- Series 2. Data Evaluation and Methods Research.-Studies of new statistical methodology including experimental tests of new survey methods, studies of vital statistics collection methods, new analytical techniques, objective evaluations of reliability of collected data, and contributions to statistical theory.
- Series 3. Analytical Studies. Reports presenting analytical or interpretive studies based on vital and health statistics, carrying the analysis further than the expository types of reports in the other series.
- Series 4. Documents and Committee Reports.-Final reports of major committees concerned with vital and health statistics and documents such as recommended model vital registration laws and revised birth and death certificates.
- Series 10. Data From the Health Interview Survey.-Statistics on illness, accidental injuries, disability, use of hospital, medical, dental, and other services, and other health-related topics, all based on data collected in a continuing national household interview survey.
- Series 11. Data From the Health Examination Survey and the Health and Nutrition Examination Survey.—Data from direct examination, testing, and measurement of national samples of the civilian noninstitutionalized population provide the basis for two types of reports: (1) estimates of the medically defined prevalence of specific diseases in the United States and the distributions of the population with respect to physical, physiological, and psychological characteristics and (2) analysis of relationships among the various measurements without reference to an explicit finite universe of persons.
- Series 12. Data From the Institutionalized Population Surveys. -Discontinued effective 1975. Future reports from these surveys will be in Series 13.
- Series 13. Data on Health Resources Utilization.-Statistics on the utilization of health manpower and facilities providing long-term care, ambulatory care, hospital care, and family planning services.
- Series 14. Data on Health Resources: Manpower and Facilities.-Statistics on the numbers, geographic distribution, and characteristics of health resources including physicians, dentists, nurses, other health occupations, hospitals, nursing homes, and outpatient facilities.
- Series 20. Data on Mortality.-Various statistics on mortality other than as included in regular annual or monthly reports. Special analyses by cause of death, age, and other demographic variables; geographic and time series analyses; and statistics on characteristics of deaths not available from the vital records based on sample surveys of those records.
- Series 21. Data on Natality, Marriage, and Divorce.-Various statistics on natality, marriage, and divorce other than as included in regular annual or monthly reports. Special analyses by demographic variables; geographic and time series analyses; studies of fertility; and statistics on characteristics of births not available from the vital records based on sample surveys of those records.
- Series 22. Data From the National Mortality and Natality Surveys. --Discontinued effective 1975. Future reports from these sample surveys based on vital records will be included in Series 20 and 21, respectively.
- Series 23. Data From the National Survey of Family Growth.-Statistics on fertility, family formation and dissolution, family planning, and related maternal and infant health topics derived from a biennial survey of a nationwide probability sample of ever-married women 15-44 years of age.

For a list of titles of reports published in these series, write to:

Scientific and Technical Information Branch National Center for Health Statistics Public Health Service Hyattsville, Md. 20782

DHEW Publication No. (PHS) 78-1918 Series 21 - No. 32

NCHS

US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE Public Health Service National Center for Health Statistics 3700 East-West Highway Hyattsville, Maryland 20782

OFFICIAL BUSINESS PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

For publications in the Vital and Health Statistics Senes call 301-436-NCHS.

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEW HEW-396 THIRD CLASS BLK. RATE



,