Chapter V

INDIVIDUAL MODERNITY AND FAMILY PLANNING ACCEPTANCE

Theoretical importance of individual modernity in relation to family planning acceptance has been discussed earlier. A modern person will be open to new experiences, changes, planning, mass media and non-fatalism. Family planning program, being an innovative idea, calls for these kind of qualities. As a result, amount of these qualities should be associated with the degree of F.P. acceptance.

This chapter begins with an exploration of association between these five qualities and F.P. acceptance. An index of overall modernity, which combines all these qualities plus other themes measured through eight questions, is used for an overall assessment of relationship between individual modernity and F.P. acceptance. Later part of the chapter discusses independent, relative and cumulative effects of socioeconomic status, mother's education, her age at marriage, and her overall modernity on F.P. acceptance. With this brief remark, let us proceed to discuss each of the five subscales of overall individual modernity.

Planning Orientation and F.P. Acceptance :

Planning usually implies conscious, deliberate and rational efforts to evaluate various alternatives and arrange conditions in a manner which helps us to achieve desired goals with economy of time, energy and resources. Planning of a house, war or social welfare program shares these basic elements. In general, we can expect that if a person is favourably oriented to long-term planning, readily accepts fixed schedules as something appropriate or desirable and prefers present or future rather than past; Such a person is going to plan a smaller family.

TABLE XX : PLANNING ORIENTATION AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE

F.P. acceptance	Score for Planning Orientation				Total
	50 or more		49 or less		
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	91	49.5	41	41.0	132
Low	93	50.5	60	59.0	153
Total	184	100.0	101	100.0	285

$X^2 = 2.06$ df = 1 p > .05

G = .174 $r_t = .14$ $\phi = .085$

In our interview schedule, planning orientation was measured through four questions. First question, that was asked to them was whether they

preferred to plan most of the matters carefully or would like to let things come without worrying ahead. Second question was similar in nature. It asked whether a boy (children) should be taught to plan all things ahead or should he be taught to handle all things as they come up? Third question was about punctuality in appointments. After how many minutes would some one be considered late?Fourth question was about structuring time or time schedule of work in a factory or household work. Did they consider time schedule necessary or unnecessary?

Table XX presents the scores derived from the above mentioned four questions. Arithmetic Mean for planning orientation was 48.5 and Median was 50. It can be seen from the table that 184 respondents were more favourably oriented to planning. Almost half (49.5%) of them were high acceptors. But among 101 less planning conscious respondents, 41 (41%) were high acceptors. Association between planning orientation and F.P. acceptance was not significant at .05 level.

Why should there be such a low and insignificant association between these two variables? The fact that mothers who had already planned their families were similar (in their attitude towards planning) to those who had not; is really surprising. One plausible reason could be the nature of our questions. Perhaps punctuality, work schedule as well as

attitude toward socializing self and children in long term planning might have been remote non-comprehendable questions for our respondents.

Accepting that planning orientation (or the way we have measured it) does not help us to explain F.P. acceptance; let us move to explore attitudes of our respondents toward efficacy.

Efficacy and F.P. Acceptance :

Efficacy or non-fatalistic attitude is a theme closely related to planning or time orientation. Inkeles and Smith (1974, p.22) explained this theme in the following way :

> "In our view, the modern individual believes that man can learn how to exert considerable control over his environment. He thus advances his own goals, rather than being dominated by the forces created by more powerful men or by nature itself... The sense of efficacy is, of course, not limited to feelings concerning man's potential mastery over nature. It includes, as well, the sense that one can effectively do something if officials are proposing what one considers to be a bad law, and belief that care will help prevent accidents, that human nature can be changed, that man can arrange their affairs so that even nations can live in peace."

We measured sense of efficacy through the following four questions: First question asked was about relative importance

of hard-work of people and governmental planning or luck and God's help. Second question explored whether they found scientific research beneficial or harmful? Third inquired regarding relative importance of care or luck in preventing accidents. Last (fourth) was similar in nature. Did they believe that getting ahead in life depended on fate or efforts? Table XXI presents the score derived from these four questions.

TABLE - XXI : EFFICACY AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE.

F.P. acceptance	Score for Efficacy				Total
	76 or more		75 or less		
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	74	55.0	58	39.0	132
Low	61	45.0	92	61.0	153
Total	135	100.0	150	100.0	285

$X^2 = 7.452$ df = 1 $p < .01$

$G = .316$ $r_t = .25$ $\phi = .162$

The average efficacy score was 75.4 and median was 75. By dividing the respondents in two groups around median, we had 135 with high efficacy score and 150 with low score. Of the 135 highly efficacious respondents, 75 (55%) were high F.P. acceptors while among 150 low efficacious only 58 (39%) were high acceptors. The association between efficacy and F.P. acceptance

was positive and significant (X^2 = 7.452) at .01 level. Phi, Tetrachoric and Gamma coefficients of correlation were .162, .25 and .316 respectively. Thus, low but positive and significant association was indicative of the fact that efficacy had some significant and positive impact on F.P. acceptance. A similar theme of orientation to new experiences is discussed in the next pages.

Orientation to New Experiences and F.P. Acceptance :

An efficacious person will have confidence in his ability to organize his life and venture into the challenges of present and future. He will be open to and will consciously seek new ideas, new ways of feeling and acting which will enrich his overall development.

This readiness for new experiences may express itself in variety of ways. Four questions in this sub-scale included : their confidence in understanding a foreigner's way of thinking; their preference in meeting with new or known persons; their willingness to move to far off but lucrative places and the longest trip they had ever made. Table XXII presents the score derived from these questions.

The average score for orientation to new experiences was 52.4 and median was 50. The group of mothers (116) who secured

TABLE XXII : ORIENTATION TO NEW EXPERIENCES AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE

F.P. acceptance	Score for Orientation to New Experiences				Total
	51 or more		50 or less		
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	64	55.0	68	40.00	132
Low	52	45.0	101	60.00	153
Total	116	100.0	169	100.00	285

$X^2 = 6.270$ df = 1 $p < .05$

G = .293 $r_t = .23$ $\emptyset = .147$

higher score for orientation to new experiences had 64 (55%) high F.P. acceptors in their group. The low score group of 169 mothers had 68 (40%) high acceptors. The association between orientation to new experiences and F.P. acceptance was positive and significant ($X^2 = 6.270$) at .05 level. Phi, Tetrachoric and Gamma coefficients of correlation were .147, .23 and .293 respectively.

As a part of an overall modernity syndrome, openness to new experience seems to have relatively low but positive and significant place. Discussion of a similar theme of change orientation, discussed in next paragraphs, strengthens this feeling.

Change Orientation and F.P. Acceptance :

As Inkeles and Smith (1974, p.20) puts it, the readiness for social change or change orientation is intimately related to, but goes beyond, the openness to new experience.

> "The latter asks something for oneself, the former allows it to others as well... We defined the modern man as one who could more readily acknowledge the process of social transformation taking place around him in developing countries, and who could more freely accept the changed opportunities which others, previously more restricted, might now be enjoying. He is, in a sense, less rigid, less anxious about allowing others to do things in a new way, in sum, less rooted in tradition."

In our interview schedule, we asked our respondents to opine whether changes were taking place in the ways of working and would they consider them advantageous or disadvantageous? Similar questions were asked about merits and demerits of recent progress in transportation, communication and agricultural research. Table XXIII presents the scores for change orientation, derived from these questions.

The average score for change orientation was 76.4 and median was 75. The table reveals that of 142 respondents with high change orientation, 79 (56%) were high acceptors. But, among 143 respondents only 53 (37%) were high acceptors. The

TABLE XXIII : CHANGE ORIENTATION AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE.

F.P. acceptance	Change orientation score				Total
	76 or more		75 or less		
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	79	56.0	53	37.0	132
Low	63	44.0	90	63.0	153
Total	142	100.0	143	100.0	285

$X^2 = 9.883$ df = 1 $p < .01$

G = .361 $r_t = .29$ $\emptyset = .186$

association between change orientation and family planning acceptance was positive and significant ($X^2 = 9.883$) at .01 level. Phi, Tetrachoric and Gamma coefficients of correlation were .186, .29 and .361 respectively.

Alike other themes of modernity, discussed so far, change orientation also had low but positive and significant association with F.P. acceptance. It should be noted that it had relatively higher correlation than other attitudes. Now, before we discuss overall modernity let us have a look at exposure to mass media and F.P. acceptance.

Mass Media and F.P. Acceptance :

Communication is defined as a process by which an idea is transferred from a source to a receiver, with the intent to

change his behavior. Communication channels are the means by which a message travels from source to receiver (Rogers, 1973; p.261). Usually, the communication channels are divided into two broad categories : (1) Mass Media and (2) Interpersonal communication.

Communication theoriests have found that mass media, as a source of communication, is relatively more important in providing information about innovation and creating more favourable atmosphere for adoption of innovation. But for persuation and decision-making, interpersonal channels have greater importance.

Various studies have documented that modern individuals use mass media more frequently than the traditionals. Thus, exposure to mass media is one of the important themes for individual modernity.

We had asked our respondents as to how often did they get news from radio and newspapers and which kind of news interested them most? Table XXIV provides the score for exposure to mass media.

The average score for exposure to mass media was 29 and median was 33. We divided our respondents into two groups around median. Among 145 respondents, who had higher exposure to mass - media, there were 83 (57%) high acceptors; while among 140

TABLE XXIV : EXPOSURE TO MASS MEDIA AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE

F.P. acceptance	Score for Exposure to Mass Media				Total
	33 or more		32 or less		
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	83	57.0	49	35.0	132
Low	62	43.0	91	65.0	153
Total	145	100.0	140	100.0	285

$X^2 = 14.171$ df = 1 $p < .001$

G = .426 $r_t = .35$ $\emptyset = .223$

respondents with low exposure to mass media, there was 49 (35%) high acceptors. This percentage difference of 22 (57-35) was highly significant. The association between exposure to mass media and F.P. acceptance was ($X^2 = 14.171$) moderate, positive and significant at much above .001 level. Phi, Tetrachoric and Gamma coefficients of correlation were .223; .35 and .426 respectively.

This completes our analysis of five sub-scales of individual modernity. In addition, we had asked two questions on Active Public Participation, one on Citizenship, one on Growth of Opinion, one on Educational Aspiration for children, one on Family size, one on Religion and one on Information. All of these 27 questions, which comprised overall individual modernity are provided in appendix. Next Table XXIV provides the scores

on overall modernity.

Overall Modernity and F.P. Acceptance :

Our discussion of five themes or sub-scales of individual modernity, presented in Table XX through XXIV, should help us to foresee the relationship between modernity and F.P. acceptance. Almost all themes (except exposure to mass media) had low correlation with our dependent variable. When we add all these themes together, for a composite index, we cannot expect a spectacular improvement in the correlation. With this modest expectation, let us look at Table XXV, which presents overall modernity score.

TABLE - XXV : OVERALL MODERNITY AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE

F.P. acceptance	Overall Modernity Score				Total
	51 or more		50 or less		
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	84	58.0	48	34.0	132
Low	61	42.0	92	66.0	153
Total	145	100.0	140	100.0	285

$X^2 = 15.96$ df = 1 $p < .001$

$G = .450$ $r_t = .37$ $\phi = .237$

The average overall modernity score was 50 and median was 52 (There was a gap between 50 and 52. No body had scored 51).

Dividing them around median we are able to get almost dichotomous equal groups. Among 145 respondents with high modernity, there were 84 (58%) high acceptors; while among 140 respondents with low modernity there were only 48 (34%) high acceptors. The association between F.P. acceptance and modernity was positive, significant (X^2 = 15.960), and moderately high. The significance of the association was much above .001 level. Phi, Tetrachoric and Gamma coefficients of correlation were .237, .37 and .450 respectively.

Before we make any conclusive statement about the relationship between individual modernity and Family Planning acceptance let us very briefly review our findings, which will help us to assess independent, relative and cumulative impact of modernity on F.P. Acceptance.

(1) Among demographic variables, mother's age at marriage and her age at first birth were very highly correlated with F.P. acceptance. Both of these variables were highly intercorrelated. In other words, mothers who married early, started producing children at an early age. Therefore, we decided to take up only mother's age at marriage for further analysis.

(2) Among socioeconomic status variables, mother's occupation, her education, father's education and his socioeconomic status showed moderately high correlation with F.P. acceptance. Of

these four variables; we will take up only mother's education and socioeconomic status for further analysis. We have dropped mother's occupation on the ground that out of 285, there were only 27 working mothers. For cross-tabulation, this will be too small a number. We did not analyse father's education separately because it was already part of socioeconomic status scale.

(3) Of five subscales of individual modernity, none performed so well as overall modernity scale, which combined all these subscales. Therefore, further analysis of any of the subscales was not considered necessary.

With this overview, our next job is to assess independent, relative and cumulative effect of :

i) Socioeconomic Status and Individual Modernity on F.P. Acceptance.

ii) Mother's Education and Individual Modernity of F.P. acceptance.

iii) Mother's Age at Marriage and Individual Modernity on F.P. Acceptance.

<u>Individual Modernity and F.P. Acceptance When Controlled for Socioeconomic Status</u> :

Let us begin with the first question of independent effect. Is each of the two variables, i.e. socioeconomic status and

mother's modernity related to F.P. acceptance independently of other? This question is important because socioeconomic status and modernity are highly intercorrelated. This can be seen from Table XXVI. Among high SES group of 149 mothers, 106 (71%) had high modernity; while in the low SES group of 136 mothers, only 39 (29%) had high modernity. The association between socioeconomic status and mothers modernity was highly positive and significant (X^2 = 51.301; Gamma = .720; Tetrachoric = .63 and Phi = .424). Thus, we are justified in asking the question of independent effect of each of these two variables.

TABLE XXVI : ASSOCIATION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL MODERNITY AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE WHEN CONTROLLED FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

F.P. acceptance	HIGH SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUP					LOW SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS GROUP				
	Mother's Modernity					Mother's Modernity				
	51 or more		50 or less		Total	51 or more		50 or less		Total
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%		Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	70	66.0	18	42.0	88	14	36.0	30	31.0	44
Low	36	34.0	25	58.0	61	25	64.0	67	69.0	92
Total	106	100.0	43	100.0	149	39	100.0	97	100.0	136
X^2 = 7.395	df = 1		p < .01			X^2 = .314	df = 1		p > .05	
G = .460	r_t = .37		Ø = .223			G = .111	r_t = .09		Ø = .048	

Within both SES groups, mothers with higher modernity have larger proportion of high F.P. acceptors. Mothers with lower modernity have lower proportion of high acceptors. The per cent difference in high SES group was 24 (66-42) and in low SES group it was 5 (36-31). In other words, even when we control for socioeconomic status, mother's modernity has some independent effect on F.P. acceptance. Conversely, within each of the modernity groups, SES was related with F.P. acceptance. Among mothers with higher as well as lower modernity, high SES people have larger proportion of high acceptors than low SES people. The percent difference in higher modernity group was 30 (66-36) while in lower modernity group, it was 11 (42-31). Thus, even when we control for modernity, SES has an independent effect on F.P. acceptance. Both independent variables exercise their influence independent of each other. But it should be noted that because of high intercorrelation their independent influence is relatively small.

In continuation, the next question is which one of these two variables is stronger? SES or modernity? As discussed earlier, we will calculate relative effect in terms of "counter--directional" groups as well as average percentage difference.

Proportion of high acceptors among high SES but low modernity group was 42; while among low SES but high modernity

group it was 36. Thus, if mothers have high SES, even though belonging to low modernity group, there is high F.P. acceptance than if they have high modernity even though they belong to low SES group. Same conclusion can be drawn by calculating average percentage difference. The average effect of SES, controlling on mother's modernity is 20.5 (66-36 = 30; 42-31 = 11; average of 30+11 is 20.5). Conversely, the average effect of modernity, controlling on SES is 14.5 (66-42 = 24; 36-31=5; average of 24+5 = 14.5). The effect of socioeconomic status independent of modernity is thus greater than the effect of modernity independent of socioeconomic status.

Our third question of combined or cumulative effect can be answered now.The group of 106 high SES, modernity respondents had 70 (66%) high acceptors; but the group of 97 low SES and low modernity respondents had 30 (31%) high acceptors. Thus, the percentage difference between these extreme consistent group was 35 (66-31). SES alone had shown 27 (59-32) per cent difference. Similarly, modernity alone had shown 24 (58-34) per cent difference. When we combine both of these variables we are able to raise the percentage difference to 35. The smaller increase is the result of high intercorrelation among independent variables.

Individual Modernity and F.P. Acceptance when Controlled for Mother's Education :

Education is one of most powerful explanatory variables for modernity. Inkeles and Smith (1974; p.304) noted that :

> "Indeed, judged by the number of points on the OM Scale a man gained for each additional year of schooling, Education was generally two or even three times as powerful as any other single input. In this, our conclusions are not new but rather confirm findings in several other studies of modernity".

If education is such a powerful variable, then we are justified in hypothesizing that modernity may not have any independent effect on F.P. acceptance when we hold mother's education constant. The data are provided in Table XXVII.

TABLE XXVII : ASSOCIATION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL MODERNITY AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE WHEN CONTROLLED FOR MOTHER'S EDUCATION

F.P. acceptance	MOTHERS WITH HIGH EDUCATION — Mother's modernity					MOTHERS WITH LOW EDUCATION — Mother's Modernity				
	51 or more		50 or less		Total	51 or more		50 or less		Total
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%		Fre.	%	Fre.	%	
High	64	70.0	13	50.0	77	20	38.0	35	31.0	55
Low	28	30.0	13	50.0	41	33	62.0	79	69.0	112
Total	92	100.0	26	100.0	118	53	100.0	114	100.0	167
X^2 = 3.422		df = 1		p > .05		X^2 = .810		df = 1		p > .05
G = .391		r_t = .32		Ø = .170		G = .155		r_t = .12		Ø = .07

Dependence of modernity on education is very clear from the table. Among high education group of 118 mothers, 92 (78%) had high modernity; while in low education group of 167 months, only 53 (31%) had high modernity. The association between mother's education and her modernity was highly positive and significant (X^2 = 59.127; Gamma = .768; Tetrachoric = .67 and Phi = .455). Because of very high correlation among these two independent variables we are justified in raising the question of their independent effect.

Within both education groups, mothers with high modernity have larger proportion of high acceptors and mothers with low modernity have smaller proportion of high acceptors. The per-cent difference in high education group was 20(70-50) and in low education group it was 7 (38-31). In other words, even when we controlled for mother's education, her modernity had some independent effect on F.P. acceptance. Conversely, within each modernity group, education was related with F.P. acceptance. Among high as well as low modernity groups, mothers with high education had larger proportion of high acceptors than mothers with low education. The per cent difference in high modernity group was 32 (70-38), while in low modernity group it was 19 (50-31). Thus, even when we controlled for mother's modernity her education had an independent effect on F.P. acceptance. Though mother's education and her modernity exercise independent

influence on F.P. acceptance, it should be noted that their independent influence is relatively smaller because of high intercorrelation.

Relative influence of these two variables is also clear. Proportion of high acceptors among mothers with high education but low modernity was 50 but it was 38 among mothers with high modernity but low education. The average effect of modernity, controlling on education was 13.5 (70-51=20; 38-31=7; average of 20+7 is 13.5). Conversely, the average effect of education, controlling on modernity was 25.5 (70-38=32; 50-31=19, average of 32+19 is 25.5). The relative effect of mother's education independent of her modernity is thus greater than the effect of modernity independent of education.

Combined or cumulative effect of education and modernity can be seen from the percentage difference between the two extreme consistent groups. Among 92 mothers with high education and high modernity, there were 64 (70%) high acceptors; while among 114 mothers with low education and low modernity, there were only 35 (31%) high acceptors. The percentage difference between these two extreme group was 39 (70-31). Let us recollect that modernity alone had shown 24 (58-34) per cent difference and education had shown 32 (65-33) per cent differenee.

When we combine both of these variables we are able to get the difference of 39 (70-31).

Individual Modernity and F.P. Acceptance When Controlled for Mother's Age at Marriage :

After evaluating independent, relative and cumulative effect of socioeconomic status and mother's education in relation to her modernity; let us discuss these effects in terms of mother's age at marriage.

First, let us examine relationship between mother's modernity and her age at marriage. Table XXVIII provides the data. Among 132 mothers who married at high age, 86 (65%) had high modernity. While among 153 mothers who married at low age, 59 (39%) had high modernity. Association between mother's modernity and her age at marriage was positive, significant and moderately high (X^2 = 20.046; Gamma = .497; Tetrachoric = .41 and Phi = .265).

Among both groups of mothers - who had married at higher or lower age - more modern mothers were better F.P. acceptors than less modern mothers. The per cent difference in the first group (mothers who had married at high age) was 8 (73-65) and in second group it was 17 (36-19). In other words, when we controlled for mother's age at marriage, her modernity had some

TABLE XXVIII : ASSOCIATION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL MODERNITY AND F.P. ACCEPTANCE WHEN CONTROLLED FOR MOTHER'S AGE AT MARRIAGE

F.P. acceptance	MOTHERS WITH HIGH AGE AT MARRIAGE					MOTHERS WITH LOW AGE AT MARRIAGE				
	Mother's modernity					Mother's Modernity				
	51 or more		50 or less		To-	51 or more		50 or less		To-
	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	tal	Fre.	%	Fre.	%	tal
High	63	73.0	30	65.0	93	21	36.0	18	19.0	39
Low	23	27.0	16	35.0	39	38	64.0	76	81.0	114
Total	86	100.0	46	100.0	132	59	100.0	94	100.0	153
X^2 = .930		df = 1		p >.05		X^2 = 5.161		df = 1		p <.05
G = .187		r_t = .15		Ø = .084		G = .400		r_t=.32		Ø=.18

independent effect on F.P. acceptance. Conversely, within each modernity group, mother's age at marriage was related with F.P. acceptance. Among high as well as low modernity groups, mothers with high age at marriage had larger proportion of high acceptors than mothers with low age at marriage. The percentage difference in high modernity group was 37 (73-36) while in low modernity group it was 46 (65-19). Thus, when we controlled for mother's modernity, her age at marriage had an independent effect on F.P. acceptance. Both of these variables have their independent influence on the dependent variable.

Relative influence of these two variables is very clear from the table. Proportion of high acceptors among mothers who

had married at high age but had low modernity was 65. But the same was 36 among mothers with high modernity but low age at marriage. The average effect of modernity, controlling on mother's age at marriage was 12.5 (73-65=8; 36-19=17; average of 8+17 is 12.5). Conversely, the average effect of mother's age at marriage, controlling on her modernity was 41.5 (73-36=37; 65-19=46; average of 37+46 is 41.5). The relative effect of mother's age at marriage independent of her modernity was, thus, much greater than the effect of mother's modernity independent of her age at marriage.

Combined or cumulative effect of mother's modernity and her age at marriage is much stronger than either of them alone. We already know that mother's modernity alone had shown 24 (58-34) per cent difference. Mother's age at marriage had shown 45 (70.5-25.5) per cent difference. For their cumulative effect we should examine percentage difference between two extreme consistent groups. The number of high acceptors among 86 mothers who had married late and were more modern was 63 (73%); while among 94 mothers who had married early and were less modern, it was 18 (19%). The percentage difference between these two groups was 54 (73-19) which was stronger than either of the two variables showed when analysed separately.

SUMMARY :

(1) From the five subscales of individual modernity, planning orientation was not associated with F.P. acceptance. Orientation to New Experience, Efficacy or non-fatalism and Change orientation had low but positive and significant association (Gamma = .293; .316 and .361) with F.P. acceptance. Exposure to Mass Media and Overall individual modernity score had moderate, significant and positive association (Gamma = .426 and .450) with F.P. acceptance.

(2) Mother's modernity and socioeconomic status had their effect on F.P. acceptance, independent of each other. But the effect of socio-economic status, independent of mother's modernity was greater than the effect of mother's modernity independent of socioeconomic status. Cumulative or combined effect of SES and modernity was still greater (Gamma = .626) than their separate or independent effect.

(3) Mother's modernity and her education had their independent effect on F.P. acceptance. But the effect of mother's education was greater than the effect of her modernity. Cumulative or combined effect of mother's education and her modernity was greater (Gamma = .675) than their separate or independent effect.

(4) Mother's modernity and her age at marriage had their independent effect on F.P. acceptance. But the effect of mother's age at marriage was much greater than the effect of her modernity. Cumulative or combined effect of mother's modernity and her age at marriage was very high (Gamma = .816) in comparison to their separate or independent effect.