SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS CHANGING THE FERTILITY BEHAVIOR (A CASE STUDY OF VILLAGE PINDI BAHA UD DIN)

Balal Idrees, Anwaar Mohyuddin[i]**. Shahid Iqbal**
Department of Anthropology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

ABSTRACT: *The aim of the present ethnographic field work research was to explain the impact of socioeconomic factors on the Fertility Behavior of Married Women in village Pindi Baha-ud- Din. The locale of the present study was village Pindi Baha ud Din, Tehsil & district Mandi Baha ud Din. A sample size of 110 respondents was selected on the basis of purposive sampling technique.The mix method approach was administrated to collect the relevant information from the respondents. Seven indicators of socioeconomic factors such as income, family structure, ownership of house, housing conditions, items at home, education, occupation and eleven indicators of fertility behavior (age at marriage, duration of marriage, total number of children, etc.) among respondents were investigated. SPSS 16.00 was used as a tool for quantitative data analysis. The findings of the study depict that there is no association between Socio Economic Factors and Fertility Behavior of Women.*

Key words: Socio economic factors, fertility behavior, health [ii]facilities, education, occupation, monthly income, economic conditions,

INTRODUCTION

The civilization makes the idea of socialization and socialization united with the concept of household, which roughly based on the arrangements & efforts made by individual or group of peoples for each other for provision of services and the commodity essentials for living and there to form social unit. These arrangements overall impact the households which ultimately give effect the fertility behavior of couples [1]. All the indicators of socioeconomic status have been most widely used by demographers. Education of adults persistentlyemerges as the single most powerful predictor of their demographic behavior. Thus, length of schooling is associated with the start of reproductive life (age at marriage and maternity), with childbearing and the use of birth control, and with mortality.

Until the late 1970s, the pervasive influence of the educational background of individuals and couples on a range of demographic outcomes was thought by many researchers to reflect the close link between the extent of formal schooling and material circumstances; schooling was typically taken to be an indicator of socioeconomic status, and interest in its association with fertility and mortality was correspondingly diluted. The turning point was the publication of results from a survey in Nigeria that showed the schooling of mothers to be a more powerful predictor of child survival than economic characteristics of the family, such as the father's occupation [2] together with an extensive review of the educational fertility relationships that came to similar conclusions [3]. Subsequent research has confirmed that the schooling of the mother is generally a more decisive influence on reproduction than characteristics of the father. Advocacy of better schooling for girls as a means of achieving lower mortality and fertility has become embedded in the ideology of major international organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations Population Fund. It also emerged as one of the major themes of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development. Yet empirical support for the view that the enhancement of women's schooling is critical for fertility reduction is neither as strong nor as universal as is often implied.

Pakistan is the seventh most populous developing country in the world and has shown a controversial gentle decline in fertility despite a limited efforts have been made for the improvement. The onset of the fertility decline in Pakistan has engendered much interest since it has been suggested that Pakistan's fertility transition is controversial in certain important respects. Demographically fertility behavior is changing over time. The assessment of fertility behavior is based on certain measures. The relationship between women's schooling and fertility and particularly the effect of a modest amount of schooling is highly context-specific, varying by region of the world, the level of development and time [4]. It may also be affected by cultural conditions, particularly by the position women occupy in the traditional kinship structure [5].Women's education had very important effect on fertility behavior as well as the use of contraceptives, and it was also found that land ownership, household with TV, NGOs and child mortality was the most important variable which was affecting the fertility behavior [6].

Locale of the study

The universe of this study was village Pindi Baha-ud-Din, union council No 16, Tehsil & District Mandi Baha-ud-Din, Pakistan. Village Pindi Baha ud Din, District Mandi Baha ud Din is part of Punjab Province. This particular region is commonly known as Gondal Bar. It is situated within 32°36'0N 73°28'60E and has an altitude of 217. The village is located at 500 meters from the Mandi Baha ud Din. The summers are long and severe and cold weather is short. Punjabi language is most popularly spoken language. Descent group system prevails in the village and its membership continues only through the males. The exogamy marriages are discouraged. "Purdah" is observed in the village at different levels; as *naqab*, i.e. covering the body and face with a big veil or shawl.

The economic organization of village Pindi Baha-ud-din has undergone quite a few changes. At first the village had an agro-based economic system, but now other non-agricultural activities have been taken up by majority due to farming resources landholdings have reduced to a low percentage. This Region called "Gondal Bar" some of its land lying Barren was reconstructed and a great Irrigation plan was surveyed and dug out by manual work. The main route of the canal Lower Jhelum was dug. Water was released in 1902 in its main route.

Objectives

- To find out the socioeconomic factors of the respondents.
- To unearth the fertility behavior of the respondents.

- To find out the association (if any) between socioeconomic factors and fertility behavior of the respondents.

Hypothesis

H0: There is no relationship between socioeconomic factors and fertility behavior.

H1: There is a relationship between socioeconomic factors and fertility behavior.

MATERIAL & METHODS

For the present study 110 married women were selected through purposive sampling technique. Because the sampling frame of the present study was not available to the researchers. The respondents were selected after the informed consent because this was a very sensitive issue to investigate. The mix method approach was administrated by the researchers to collect the relevant information from the respondents. Further the quantity data were analyzed by using SPSS version 16.0. Percentage and statistical test were used to test the hypothesis and to draw conclusions. 15 respondents were also interviewed in pre-testing phase of development of new questions and inferences for further investigation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table No.1.1 reveals the age of the respondents. According to the data majority of the respondents (34.5%) belong to 36-42 age group, (27.3%) of the respondents belong to 29-35 age group, while (19.1%) of the respondents belong to 22-28 & 43-48 age group.

Table No.1.2 reveals the family members of the respondents. According to the table (41.8%) of the respondents had 7-9 family members, (39.1%) of the respondents had 4-6 family members, (10.0%) respondents had up to 3 family members, while only (9.1%) of the respondents had 10 or above family members.

Table No.1.3. indicates the family structure of the respondent. According to the table the majority, i.e. (72.7%) of the respondents were living in a nuclear family system, while (27.3%) of the respondents were living in joint family system.

Table No.1.4 reflects the education of the respondents. According to the table (25.5%) of the respondents had primary and secondary education, whereas (21.8%) respondents were illiterate, and (10.9%) had secondary education.

1.1 Age of the respondents			1.5 Occupation of the respondents		
Categories	F	%	Categories	f	%
22-28	21	19.1	Government Job	2	1.8
29-35	30	27.3	Private job	2	1.8
36-42	38	34.5	Self Employed	2	1.8
43-48	21	19.1	Labor	1	0.9
Housewife		103		93.6	
Total	110	100.0	Total	110	100.0
1.2 Family size of the respondents			**1.6 Monthly Income of the respondents**		
Categories	F	%	Categories	f	%
1-3	11	10.00	No income	104	94.5
4-6	43	39.1	Up to 10000	2	1.81
7-9	46	41.8	10001-25000	3	2.7
10 & Above	10	9.1	25001 & above	1	0.9
Total	110	100	Total	110	100.0
1.3 Family structure of the respondents			**1.7 Spouse Occupation of the respondents**		
Categories	f	%	Categories	f	%
Nuclear	80	72.6	Government Job	8	7.3
Joint	30	27.3	Private job	8	7.3
Total	110	100.0	Agriculturist	1	0.9
Self Employed		36		32.7	
Labor		37		33.6	
Died/Abroad		20		18.2	
Total		110		100.0	
1.4. Educational attainment of the respondents			**1.8 Family income of the respondents**		
Categories	f	%	Categories	f	%
Illiterate	24	21.8	Up to 10000	54	49.1
1-5	28	25.5	10001-20000	18	16.4
6.8	10	9.1	20001-30000	23	20.9
9-10	28	25.5	30001-40000	9	8.2
11-12	12	10.9	40001 & above	6	5.5
12+	8	7.2	Total	110	100.0
Toyal	1100	100			

Table No.1.5 reveals the occupation of the respondent. According to the table (93.6%) of the respondents are housewives, while (1.8%) of the respondents are doing private jobs, government jobs and self employed, only (1%) of the respondent is labor. This shows the majority of the respondents is housewives.

Table No.1.6. depicts the monthly income of the respondents. According to the table majority of the respondents (94.5%) have no income because they were house wife and have no earningactivity, (2.75%) of the respondents have 10001-25000 monthly income, (1.81%) respondents have up to 10000 monthly income, while only (0.9%) of the respondent have above 25000 monthly income.

Table No.1.7. shows the occupation of the respondent spouse. According to the table (33.6%) of the respondents' spouse are

labor, while (32.7%) of the respondents spouse are self employed, (12.7%) of the respondents' spouse are in abroad, and (7.3%) are doing government jobs and private employed, while (5.5%) are unemployed, and very narrow percentage of the respondents' spouse are agriculturist.

Table No.1.8. describes the family monthly income. According to the table (49.1%) respondents' family income was up to 10000, while (20.9%) of the respondent monthly income was 20001-30000, and (16.4%) of the respondent monthly income was 10001-20000, (8.2%) was 30001-40000, only (5.5%) respondents monthly income was 400001 and above. This table shows that majority of the respondent income was low.

2. Economic Condition of the Respondents					
2.1. Status of houses			**2.2. Bath Rooms**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Owned	96	87.3	Up to 3	107	97.3
Rented	14	12.7	4 & above	3	2.7
Total	110	100.0	Total	110	100.0
2.3. Refrigerator			**2.4. Television**		
Categories	**F**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Yes	80	72.7	Yes	106	96.4
No	30	27.3	No	4	3.6
Total	110	100	Total	110	100.0
2.5. Living Rooms			**2.6. House is Fulfilling Your Requirements**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Up to 2	52	47.3	Not at all	45	40.9
3-5	51	46.3	To some extent	46	41.8
6 & above	7	6.4	To great extent	19	17.3
Total	110	100.0	Total	110	100.0
2.7. Washing Machine			**2.8. Self Owned vehicle**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Yes	91	82.7	Yes	14	12.7
No	19	17.3	No	96	87.3
Total	110	100	Total	110	100
2.9. Gas Cylinder			**2.10. Telephone or Mobile**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Yes	45	40.9	Yes	107	97.3
No	65	59.1	No	3	2.7
Total	110	100	Total	110	100

Table No.2.1. reflects the status of the houses of the respondents. According to the table the majority, i.e. (87.3%) of the respondents has their own house, while only (12.7%) of the respondents live in rented house.

Table No.2.2. shows the number of bathrooms of the respondents. According to the table the majority (97.3%) of the respondents had up to 3 bathrooms, while only (2.7%) of the respondents had 4 or above bathrooms. It is concluded that everyone has the facility of bathroom in their houses.

Table No.2.3. reveals the refrigerator facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents i.e. (72.7%) hasa refrigerator facility, while (27.3%) respondents did not have a refrigerator facility.

Table No.2.4. indicates the television facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents (96.4%) has

television facility, while only 3.6% of the respondents do not have television facility.

Table No.2.5. depicts the living rooms of the respondents. According to the table (47.3%) of the respondents had up to 2 living rooms, (46.3%) of the respondents had 3-5 living rooms, while only (6.4%) of the respondents had 6 & above living rooms.

Table No. 2.6. describes the requirements of the house. According to this table (41.8%) of the respondents were agreed to some extent that house is fulfilling their requirements, and (40.9%) of the respondents did not agree with their housing facilities, only (17.3%) of the respondent were agreed to a great extent that their house is fulfilling their requirements.

Table No.2.7. shows the washing machine facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents (82.7 %) hasa washing machine facility, while (17.3%) of the respondents do not have washing machine facility.

Table No.2.8. indicates the self owned vehicle facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents (87.3%) does not have self owned vehicle, while (12.7%) of the respondent have self owned vehicle.

Table No.2.9. reveals the gas cylinder facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents i.e. (59.1%) does not have gas cylinder facility, while (40.9%) respondents have gas cylinder facility.

Table No. 2.10. depicts the telephone/mobile facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents (97.3%) has telephone/mobile, while (2.7%) of the respondents do not have telephone/mobile facility.

3. Economic Condition of the Respondents					
3.1. Air condition			**3.2. Electric Pump**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Yes	32	29.1	Yes	101	91.8
No	78	70.9	No	9	8.2
Total	110	100.0	Total	110	100.0
3.3. Motorcycle			**3.4. Bicycle**		
Categories	**F**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Yes	39	35.5	Yes	24	21.8
No	71	64.5	No	86	78.2
Total	110	100	Total	110	100.0
3.5. Satisfaction with Housing Facilities					
Categories	**f**			**%**	
Not at all	47			42.7	
To some extent	44			40.0	
To great extent	19			17.3	
Total	110			100.0	

Table No. 3.1. shows the air conditioner facility. According to the table (70.9 %) of the respondents do not have an air conditioner facility, while (29.1%) of the respondents has air conditioner facility. This shows that the majority of the respondent does not have an air conditioner facility.

Table No. 3.2. describes the electric pump facility. According to the table majority of the respondents (91.8 %) have an electric pump facility, while only (8.2%) of the respondent do not have an electric pump facility.

Table No. 3.3. depicts the motorcycle facility. According to the table the majority of the respondents (64.5%) does not have motorcycle facility, while (35.5%) of the respondents have motor cycle facility.

Table No. 3.4. reveals the bicycle facility. According to the table (78.2 %) of the respondents do not have bicycle facility, while only 21.8%) of the respondents have bicycle facility. This shows that the majority of the respondent does not have bicycle facility.

Table No. 3.5. indicates the satisfaction of the respondent with their housing facilities. According to this table (42.7%) of the respondents did not agree with their housing facilities, and (40.0%) of the respondents were agreed to some extent with their housing facilities, only (17.3%) of the respondent were agreed to a great extent that they are satisfied with their housing facility.

4. Fertility Behavior of the Respondents					
4.1. Age at Marriage			**4.2. Age at First Birth**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
16-20	71	64.6	17-19	30	27.3
21-25	35	31.8	20-25	67	60.9
26 & Above	4	3.6	26 & Above	13	11.8
Total	110	100.0	Total	110	100.0
4.3. Ideal Number of Children			**4.4. Abort any Pregnancy**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
2-3	51	46.4	No	96	87.3
4-5	59	53.6	Yes	14	12.7
Total	110	100	Total	110	100
4.5. knowledge about family planning			**4.6. Utilization of Family Planning**		
Categories	**f**	**%**	**Categories**	**f**	**%**
Not at all	19	17.3	Not at all	28	25.5
To some extent	15	13.6	To some extent	10	9.1
To great extent	76	69.1	To great extent	72	65.5
Total	110	100	Total	110	100
4.7. Pressure from husband & in laws.			**4.8. Son Preference**		

Categories	f	%	Categories	f	%
Not at all	26	23.6	Not at all	8	7.3
To some extent	44	40.0	To some extent	36	32.7
To great extent	40	36.4	To great extent	66	60.0
Total	110	100	Total	110	100

Table No. 4.1. reflects the age at marriage of the respondents. According to the table (64.6%) of the respondents belonged to 16-20 years age group at the time of marriage, (31.8%) of the respondents belonged to 21-25 years age group at the time of marriage, while only (3.6%) of the respondents belonged to 26 & above years age group at the time of marriage.

Table No. 4.2. reflects the age of the respondents at first birth. According to the data (60.9%) of the respondents belong to 20-25 age group at the birth of the first baby, (27.3%) of the respondents belong to 17-19 age group at the birth of the first baby, while only (11.8%) of the respondents belong to 26 & above age group.

Table No. 4.3 depicts the total number of children of the respondents. According to the table (52.7%) of the respondents have 3-5 children, (24.6%) of the respondents have 6 & above children, while (22.7%) of the respondents have up to 2 children. It is concluded that the majority of the respondents have 3-5 children.

Table No. 4.3. describes an ideal number of children of the respondents. According to the table (53.6%) of the respondents said that 4-5 children are the ideal number of children, while (46.4%) of the respondents said that 2-3 children are the ideal number of children.

Table No. 4.4 describe the respondent abort any pregnancy. According to the table (87.3 %) of the respondents do not abort any pregnancy, while only (12.7%) of the respondents abort pregnancy.

Table No. 4.5. reveals the knowledge of family planning services. According to this table (69.1%) of the respondents were agreed to a great extent that they have knowledge about family planning services, and (17.3%) of the respondents do not have knowledge about family planning, only (13.6%) of the respondent were agrees to some extent that they have knowledge about family planning services.

Table No. 4.6. indicates the use of family planning methods. According to this table majority of the respondents (65.5%) were agreed to a great extent that they use family planning methods, and (25.5%) of the respondents were agreed that they do not use family planning methods, only (9.1%) of the respondents were agreed to some extent that they use family planning methods.

Table No. 4.7. depicts the pressure of the husband and in laws about the number of children. According to this table majority of the respondents (40.0%) were agreed to some extent that they have pressure of their husband and in laws about the number of children, (36.4%) of the respondents were agreed to a great extent that they have pressure of their husband and in laws about the number of children, while only (23.6%) of the respondents were not at all agree that they have pressure of their husband & in laws about the number of children.

Table No. 4.8. indicates the son preference. According to this table majority of the respondents (60.0%) were agreed to a great extent that son preference is the main cause to increase the number of children, (32.7%) of the respondents were agreed to some extent that son preference is the main cause to increase the number of children, while only (7.3%) of the respondents were not at all agree that son preference is the main cause to increase the number of children.

Hypothesis Testing

Level of Significance: α= 0.05

Table No. 5.1. Statistical Test: Chi-Square

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.030a	1	.863	1.000	.520
Continuity Correction	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.030	1	.862	1.000	.520
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.520

Since the p value is used to determine the significance of a hypothetical test here it is found to be < 0.05 which shows that the Ho is accepted and H1 is rejected and hence it is concluded that there is no association between the level of fertility behavior and socioeconomic condition of in village Pindi Baha-ud-Din.

Socioeconomic Factors and Fertility Behavior

In order to understand the deep sense of socioeconomic condition and fertility behavior researchers have also used focus group discussion and in-depth interviews. The findings of qualitative data analysisare contrary to the prior researches. In most of the previous studies socioeconomic status had a profound impact on fertility behavior, but the present study suggests that there is no association found between two variables. In the present study respondents did not attach their fertility behavior to their socioeconomic status; Rather, they think that every newborn baby brings his/her food from the God. For example, one of the respondents said,

 *"we have no right to plan our family size on the basis of our socioeconomic status because Allah has promised to provide livelihood to every creation on the earth."*Male child is also considered as a sign of honor for their mothers. So females did not stop reproduction until unless they have a male baby.Another respondent quoted the same phenomena as,

 "I think we should not stop childbirth due to the fear of hunger and poverty because every new comer comes in this world with his/her own luck".

In the present study, researchers also found a striking factor behind high fertility behavior among respondents; is the male child preference. Couples did not restrict their family size until unless they have atleast one male child. It is considered that the family is incomplete without a male baby. During discussion respondents said,

"male child has much important because female have to leave their parents house one day and in the old age only male child can serve his parents. A male child is also important because he is considered as a predecessor of the family. All the properties and valuable belong to the son. So economic status is useless without the male child."

Finding of the qualitative data also clearly depicts that there is no association between socioeconomic status and fertility behavior among women of the locale of the present study. But it has opened a new predictor of fertility behavior in the form of male child preference.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

The findings of the present ethnographic study of village Pindi Baha ud Din strongly suggest that there is no association found between the socioeconomic status and the fertility behavior of the respondents. The results of the present study contrary to the finding of Bloom D et al. During the last century all over the world experienced various phases of the demographic transition, moving from high to low levels of mortality and fertility. While several socioeconomic factors have been shown to affect individual fertility decisions the pattern of fertility decline suggests that social interaction and diffusion processes are also at work. The movement to lower fertility tends to occur throughout a population, and not just among women of high socioeconomic status. This pattern occurred historically in Europe during its fertility transition and occurs today in developing countries [7].

REFERENCES

[1] Khatun, M. & Cornwell, G. T. (2009). Power Relations and Contraceptive Use: Gender Diffrences in Bangladesh, 5(1): 1-15.

[2] Caldwell. J. (1979). Education as a factor in mortality decline: an examination of Nigerian data', *Population Studies, 3 (3)*: 395-413

[3] Cochrane, S., (1988). 'The effects of education, health and social security on fertility in developing countries. *International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/the World Bank*

[4] Jejeebhoy, S. J. (1995). Women's Education, Autonomy and Reproductive Behaviour: Experience from Developing Countries. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[5] Cleland, J. (2002). Education and future fertility trends, with special referecne to mid-transitional countries. *Population Bulletin of the United Nations* Special Issue. (48/49): 183-194.

[6] Goni, A. (2008). The Effect of Women Education and some Socio-economic on Fertility and Contraceptive Use in Bangladesh, A District level Analysis, *Pakistan Journal of Socia.* 5(6): 639-647.

[7] Bloom E. David, (2008). Social Interaction and Fertility in Developing Countries, *PGDA working paper* No. 34, Harvard School of Public Health.

[i] Corresponding Author: Dr. Anwaar Mohyuddin, PO Box 3060, GPO, Islamabad 44000, Pakistan, unwaar@gmail.com
[ii]