

DEMOGRAPHIC DESTINIES

Interviews with Presidents of the Population Association of America

Interview with Paul C. Glick PAA President in 1966-67



This series of interviews with Past PAA Presidents was initiated by Anders Lunde
(PAA Historian, 1973 to 1982)

And continued by Jean van der Tak (PAA Historian, 1982 to 1994)

And then by John R. Weeks (PAA Historian, 1994 to present)

With the collaboration of the following members of the PAA History Committee:
David Heer (2004 to 2007), Paul Demeny (2004 to 2012), Dennis Hodgson (2004 to
present), Deborah McFarlane (2004 to 2018), Karen Hardee (2010 to present), Emily
Merchant (2016 to present), and Win Brown (2018 to present)

PAUL C. GLICK

PAA Secretary-Treasurer in 1962-65 (No. 11) and President in 1966-67 (No. 30). Interview with Jean van der Tak at Dr. Glick's home in Phoenix, Arizona, May 9, 1989.

CAREER HIGHLIGHTS: Paul Glick was born in 1910 in Columbus, Indiana, where he grew up. He received all his degrees in sociology: the B.A. from De Pauw University in 1933 and the M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin in 1935 and 1938. His career of more than 40 years at the Census Bureau, 1939 to 1981 (with 21 months out during World War II), included posts as Chief of the Social Statistics Branch (1949-62), Assistant Chief of the Population Division (1962-72), and Senior Demographer (1972-81). After retirement from the Census Bureau, he continued his research and publishing and served as Adjunct Professor of Sociology at Arizona State University in Tempe.

As a pioneering U.S. demographic authority on marriage, divorce, and the family, Dr. Glick has been called the "father of family demography." Besides dozens of anonymous Census Bureau reports, his publications include the 1950 census monograph, American Families (1957), two editions coauthored with Hugh Carter of Marriage and Divorce: A Social and Economic Study (1970 and 1976), a coauthored monograph on The Population of the United States for the 1974 World Population Conference, and numerous book chapters and articles in the professional and popular press. Among his professional honors, he has been president of the National Council on Family Relations and received the American Sociological Association Award for Outstanding Career in the Practice of Sociology. He died in Tempe, Arizona, in 2006.

GLICK [from the biographical introduction]: I was born in Columbus, Indiana, about two counties south of Indianapolis. That's where I went to high school and went on from there to De Pauw, like an older and a younger brother, all three of us having scholarships to go there, and all three of us eventually wound up with Ph.D.s.

VDT: Marvelous--of that wonderful family of eight children.

GLICK: Four are still living, two boys and the two girls of the family. It was quite a different family context from my own. My wife and I had only two sons, just enough to make a bridge foursome--something that we didn't do in the Bible Belt of Indiana where I grew up. We didn't bridge; we didn't dance; we didn't do a lot of things.

VDT: What led to your interest in the general field of demography? Did it start at De Pauw?

GLICK: At De Pauw, I was a sociology major, with a minor in psychology and a minor in zoology. I was interested in the biological aspect of human behavior as well as the intellectual and psychological aspect. My main interest, though, as an undergraduate and as a graduate student at Wisconsin was social psychology--what causes people to behave the way they do. How do motivations, attitudes, habits develop; what relation are they to body chemistry, social relations, and so on. I majored in that through the first two years of graduate school and a master's degree. Even in the fall of my second year, I took my final written examinations for the Ph.D. majoring in social psychology.

However, it happened that about that time, my statistics teacher, Sam Stouffer, moved from Wisconsin to Chicago and talked me into spending the summer quarter of 1935 at the University of Chicago, where--among other things--I took courses with Professors William Ogburn, Ferriss, and Leon Thurstone, who taught a course in multiple factor analysis. I had in mind using that technique when I went back to Wisconsin to study liberal and conservative attitudes of people. We had a data

set, 1,200 students, with lots of detail, so one could study attitudes toward religion, which was the original purpose of the study, and toward economics and the political system. I hoped to get a range of high to low attitudes and see how these items correlated among themselves and with other information--the students' IQs, grade point averages, and personality tests.

I found that there was no faculty member in the University of Wisconsin sociology department who knew what multiple factor analysis was. So, about that time, Professor Thomas McCormick, who had taken Professor Stouffer's place teaching statistics, had received the mammoth grant of \$1,200 from the university graduate school to make a study of birth rates in Wisconsin, with particular reference to how they were affected by the Depression. He said to me, "If you will be my assistant, you can get a dissertation from this study." I checked it out with my social psychology professor, Kimball Young, the grandson of Brigham Young, A Jack Mormon, and he said, "It's okay with me if it's all right with you." So that's the way I got to study the trend in the birth rate in Wisconsin from 1920 to 1935, with a big dip during the Depression years and upturn. One purpose of the study was to find out what kinds of groups were most affected by the Depression. To oversimplify, the groups that had the highest fertility changed the most. They were the Catholics, poor people, people on relief--things that we could measure.

VDT: How did you get the background data for the births?

GLICK: We had birth statistics from every county of Wisconsin for all those years. It was a time when birth registration was not very complete, so McCormick and I figured out a way for me to spend hours upon hours in the basement of the state capitol building with these birth records, testing the completeness of birth registration, based on periods of time when both births and deaths of babies and children were reported, on the assumption that deaths were more completely reported than births, which is a reasonable assumption. We used that information to calculate a correction factor.

VDT: But how did you get the socioeconomic data for those births, or did you have that just by county?

GLICK: We didn't have that birth by birth; it was only by inference. That is, the counties with the highest economic level, the oldest settlement, the most Catholic counties, that kind of indirect evidence.

VDT: And that became your dissertation?

GLICK: That's the way I got into demography. While I was still a graduate student, many of us, including my colleague Henry Shryock who was eventually one of my closest colleagues at the Census Bureau, took a social science analyst examination for federal employment. When we were taking this examination, I remember one of our colleagues a bit ahead of us, Calvert Detric, who got his Ph.D. at Wisconsin before us [and was already at the Census Bureau], told us, "When you make these applications, make them just as strong as you can, because other people are going to do the same thing. But just be sure you can verify everything you say." We made our applications and from that source, Shryock and I, among others, were selected to work on the 1940 census, beginning in 1939. I went there on July 31st, 1939.

VDT: You had received your Ph.D. by that time, in 1938?

GLICK: That's right, and I had taught two years, the first at De Pauw and the second at a small school, Whitman College, in Walla Walla, Washington. Along in the early spring [of 1939], I got a

letter from Philip Hauser at the Census Bureau, asking if I wanted a position with the Census for two and a half years, during what they called a decennial census period. Interestingly, I got another letter from Frank Notestein at Princeton University, asking if I wanted to come there to work on the Indianapolis study of fertility and its social and psychological correlates.

Well, Henry Shryock had finished graduate school a year ahead of me and he was at Princeton, where he was doing such things as proofreading the Population Index. He also got an offer to go to the Census Bureau and I could have gone to Princeton but I was concerned I might end up doing what Henry was doing, so I just decided to go to the Census Bureau.

VDT: You thought that was the better position?

GLICK: If it was Henry's better choice, I felt it should be my better choice. So that's the way I got there.

VDT: You must have already had a reputation in the field--the fact that Frank Notestein asked you to join the Indianapolis survey.

GLICK: Well, mainly because of Henry Shryock knowing me at Wisconsin and recommending me. Notestein probably didn't know too much about me; he took Henry's word.

VDT: You went to the Census Bureau with the famous "class of 1940."

GLICK: That's right. Many of us were former students in statistics of Sam Stouffer, either at Wisconsin or at the University of Chicago. Many of the rest were bright young people freshly though the bachelor's degree at New York University: Ed Goldfield, David Kaplan, Meyer Zitter, Abe Jaffe--well, of course, Jaffe was one of Sam's students at Chicago.

VDT: Jay Siegel has told me there were two "classes of 1940." He considers it two classes--that New York group you mention and he does concede there were the others who had just gotten PhDs, like you and Henry Shryock, and who were some of the others? Con Taeuber, of course, was not yet at the Census Bureau.

GLICK: Con came in 1948.

VDT: And Phil Hauser, of course, was already there, on his way to becoming the assistant director.

GLICK: I can almost count on one hand the professionals who were there before me. There was Leon Truesdell, chief of the population division, Phil Hauser, assistant chief, a fellow named James McPherson, who was a machine tabulation expert, Dick Lang, one of Sam's students from Chicago, Felix Moore, and that's about it. Dick Lang was my first supervisor, in the field of the family.

VDT: You were taken on as a family analyst?

GLICK: I was asked, "Would you rather be in charge of fertility or in charge of family statistics?" I said, "I guess I'll take fertility, because that's what I did my dissertation in." They said, "Well, Abe Jaffe is coming and he wants to be chief of the fertility branch." "Okay," I said, "then I'll go with Dick Lang in family statistics." And that's why I got into family statistics.

VDT: It wasn't really your deliberate choice.

GLICK: It wasn't my choice to get into demography; it was to be in social psychology. It wasn't my choice to be in family; it was to be fertility. But in the end, all these areas of specialization worked into my career. I worked quite a lot with fertility and people there who were eventually in charge of that. Family statistics was kind of a new field; family demography was considered a kind of off-to-one-side field. It's kind of hard to study, because family life changes in its life course. You have people in and out of different relationships. It's not like studying a woman and her fertility from beginning to end. But eventually, a lot of family statistics got analyzed in terms of, say, the head of the family or the family composition and social changes.

VDT: About your early Census Bureau colleagues. Did you work with Wilson Grabill right at the beginning?

GLICK: Initially, yes. He was deaf, as you know. He came to the Census Bureau before I did, in 1937 I believe, when Phil Hauser was conducting an unemployment survey through the Census Bureau. He moved from that survey into the population division, in the 1940 census. Grabill was a whiz at the calculating machine and was supervising people working with the old Marchand and Monroe calculating machines. Then he took a master's degree at American University in sociology and demography and worked in to be Abe Jaffe's assistant in fertility. When Abe left and my superior Dick Lang went to the War Department during World War II, Grabill and I moved up into their slots. That's how Grabill moved into fertility and he stayed in that area until he retired many years later.

VDT: What did you do on the 1940 census?

GLICK: The 1940 census produced about ten reports on families in three areas, family composition, which is my main area, and also family economics and housing. I was responsible primarily for four reports which had to do with things like types of family, size of family, and age of head. There was a special report on the population of military age and a report on institutional population. All those were kinds of reports that became basic and we had planned to continue them.

VDT: They were new with the 1940 census?

GLICK: There was one 1930 report called Families. It was about an inch thick and old Dr. Truesdell had planned it as one of his special reports on the 1930 census. There was also a heap of tabulations for additional reports that never got published. I analyzed some of those and put out some small reports on them.

One of my first jobs at the Census Bureau was to help change the designation of Mexican from "other race" into white. When we showed comparisons of the 1940 census with 1930, we added the Mexicans into whites for 1930 so it would be comparable to 1940. The Mexican people had been greatly upset that Dr. Truesdell had regarded the Mexicans as not white, and in fact most of them were white.

Another thing I did when I first went there was to make a study going back to the 1910 census to get material for fertility. I went to New York City and set up a group of WPA people to copy off a sample of women and their fertility . . .

VDT: Children ever born?

GLICK: Children ever born and whether they'd been married more than once, age at marriage, and their personal characteristics. That's where the 1910 census material came from that appeared in the

1940 census reports. It had never been published before.

VDT: Were you able to get these 1940 reports done before you left for 21 months during the war?

GLICK: Most of them were done. We had a string of, I think, seven fertility reports and Grabill was working on those. When he saw the rest of us being taken off into the service, he wanted to be in the service and he volunteered! They wouldn't take him because he was deaf.

VDT: During your wartime service, did you work on the Stouffer sociological study which became The American Soldier?

GLICK: I was one of those people who moved from the Census Bureau to the army during World World II, working with Sam Stouffer.

VDT: The program set up by Frederick Osborn?

GLICK: General Osborn was head of our Information and Education Division of the army.

VDT: Sometimes called the morale division.

GLICK: We were the information branch, otherwise called the morale branch. There was an education branch, which took a good deal of information that we collected from surveys among the soldiers, to find out what the soldiers thought--about their equipment, their relations with officers, their facilities, and their attitudes relating to the war. I remember about that time, John Lewis, who was head of the mine operators in this country, put on a strike, while the rest of us were in the army, to increase the income for the miners, who were not in the army. So we asked, "What do you think of John L. Lewis?; what do you think of Mr. Hitler?" They hated John L. Lewis more than they hated Mr. Hitler!

VDT: That affected their paycheck.

GLICK: That same group of people were responsible for the point system used to let people out of the service. Questionnaires were given to the GIs to see who should be let out first: according to length of service; if they had families; if they had been wounded, etcetera. A point system was worked up and it worked very smoothly. There were never any objections that I heard of about the way people got out, based on that.

One of my first assignments was to study people who were in a field hospital, not very far from the front line. They were wounded or became ill and were treated in a tent out in a field. I had a corporal--I was a sergeant by that time--driving me out to investigate this. We came to a Y in the road and an MP was standing there and said, "Where do you want to go?" We said, "We want to go down this way to that field hospital." "Well," he said, "They're fighting three miles away."

VDT: Oh, you were overseas?

GLICK: This was in Italy. He said, "Put the windshield of your jeep down so the sun doesn't reflect on it." I said, "Maybe that hospital is really back this way," and we turned around fast. It was back that way about a mile, over a hill, so just the top of the tent was visible. That was the closest I came to being in battle. Otherwise I was in the rear echelon, making studies of one kind or another.

VDT: That was amazing that they had such sociological studies going on during wartime.

GLICK: Later while I was in Italy, Arnold Rose, eventually president of the American Sociological Association, and I were buddies in one of these up-and-down bunk beds. Of evenings, we sat together and worked on projects. Arnold would make notes about ideas he might want to pursue after he got out. I made notes too and some resulted in an article called "The Family Cycle" [American Sociological Review, 1947]. That's the way I got started with that idea. I thought, "We have data from vital statistics and the Census Bureau with which we could trace people when they get married, when they have their children, and so forth." That was where I got the idea for it.

VDT: I was going to ask you later about your research innovations and number one on my list was the family life cycle. You thought of that in a bunk under or above Arnold Rose in Italy!

GLICK: I gave a paper on it at the American Sociological Society meetings. It was the American Sociological Society then. They changed the name because of the initials.

VDT: ASS! I had thought it was because . . . Well, I've just interviewed Dudley Duncan and he said that a society means that you are the pure scientific approach. When you change into an association you've become big business.

GLICK: That was not why it was done.

VDT: You've cleared up that point. Not many people are able to use their professional expertise during wartime to serve the service. When did you get back to the Census Bureau?

GLICK: Right after September 21st, 1945. I'd gone in January 4th, 1944. I well remember, because I got out just the day before my birthday. Soon after we were back, there was a rumor around Congress that maybe we had a few subversives in the government. This was maybe 1946 or 1947, well before the time of McCarthy. They said, "Social science analysts; sounds like socialism." So, we got our perfectly good title changed to "statistician" and we were all statisticians until I became Senior Demographer.

VDT: That was the first time you had "demographer" in your title?

GLICK: They had statistician dash [-] demographer somewhere along the line, but it was never just plain-out demographer. It was never plain-out sociologist, which any of us would have preferred. Personally, I liked social science analyst. I thought that was one of the best titles you could possibly have.

VDT: Did you begin then working on the 1950 census?

GLICK: A pretest for the 1950 census. I remember that we went back to the same families in the pretest to ask them how they would report on the same items, to see to what extent they gave the same answers.

VDT: Was that the first time that had been done on the pretest?

GLICK: There had been some pretests for the 1940 census, but that was pretty much done before I got there. I remember in our 1950 pretest we found only about half of one percent or maybe two

percent of the women reported themselves as head of the household. So we said, "That's such a trifling amount, we'll just make all the husbands the head of the household." And nobody said boo about it until the feminists came along.

When we asked marital status for the second time, some people who had said they were separated now said they were married. They said, "Well, we thought we were separated, but now we've gone back together, so we're married." I got the sense that whether you're married or separated is an attitude question. It's just not hard demography if it's not a clear status.

In that vein, the 1940 census showed no woman with children who was never married. The clerks, I heard, cleaned it up. They made all those women married so they could be a family head and "married with spouse absent." There was no such term as "separated" in the 1940 census. All the separated people were reported as married. If they had not become divorced, they were still married--that one term, "married."

When it came to 1950, I was in charge. Dr. Truesdell was gone. He was responsible for some of these earlier ideas, including that one person living alone was counted as a one-person family. That was gotten rid of too in later statistics. We fixed it in 1948. Government users of census data convinced us that there had to be two related people in order to make a family. We fixed that in the 1950 census and we also had "separated" and women "never-married with children" for the first time.

We had a question in there on duration of current marital status: How many years have you been in your current marital status? That was my idea and I remember Pat Whelpton and some other demographers said that sounded like a good idea. And for people who were married, we found out how long they were married and if they'd been married more than once and were currently married, you'd know how long they were in their second marriage, and so on.

One thing introduced in the 1940 census was what I called "husband-wife" families. They had been called "normal" families. I thought "husband-wife" families was descriptive. That was used in 1940, 50, 60, and 70. But by 1980 we called them "married-couple" families. That gets away from the word husband being used in front of wife. It was part of the movement away from sexism. That is the history of the identification of what was eventually called married-couple families. You'll find the term in the newspapers; they picked it up.

VDT: You were involved in every decennial census from 1940 through 1980 and the Current Population Survey and other Census Bureau surveys. What innovations did you have a hand in? You have listed a few. For example, what about adding the marriage questions to the Current Population Survey? You must have been the person who did that.

VDT: That was what we call marital and family history; it started in 1966. There was also a question on religion; it came back in the 1950s.

VDT: You got that into the 1957 CPS. Then you had proposals for religion questions in the 1960 and 1970 censuses and the 1977 CPS, but that never happened.

GLICK: In 1906 and subsequent years ending in six up to 1936, there had been what was called a religious bodies report. Each church filled out a questionnaire about their membership, Sunday school, finances, and so on. But in 1936 Roosevelt was President and there was quite a big opposition to him in the conservative South and those churches down there did not cooperate. They said, "That's a New Deal questionnaire." So the statistics were incomplete and they just never financed a Census survey on religion again.

I knew from my own experience that the church is quite an important thing in the social life of people and it would be useful to know how the country was divided among the religious bodies and the social and economic characteristics. So I arranged quietly to have a question--What is your religion?

Lutheran, Baptist, Methodist, and so forth; that was the whole question--put into the Current Population Survey. I think it was March 1957. And 99 and a half percent of the people answered the question; at least there was an answer for that many. Maybe some people with German names might be reported as Jewish in New York City without even asking, I don't know. But only half of one percent didn't have an answer on that.

We published one report from it. Wilson Grabill and I put that report out. It just had some elementary age, education, and race information by religion. We had a nice detailed tabulation which showed religious categories--mainly Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, but the different types of Protestants were also available--by education, occupation, income, that sort of thing. But before we got that second report published, there was a big uprising among people in New York City about this, saying, "You should not publish especially socioeconomic data about the different religious groups." They didn't come right out and say it, but I think they were concerned that certain groups might be shown to be higher status than others and there was a lot of talk about the Jews dominating the markets and so on. Well, I was just making this study from sociological interest, but the Census Bureau flinched.

So that fine report sat in my files until, in the mid-1960s, Congress passed a Freedom of Information Act. Con Taeuber, who was long since my mentor at the Census Bureau, then said, "We'll get this out and if people want it they can buy it for a dollar." It was about 20 pages of xerox copy, just tables, and lots of people bought it. Sidney Goldstein, another PAA president, published a fine article ["Socioeconomic Differentials Among Religious Groups in the United States"] analyzing this material in the American Journal of Sociology in May 1969. I personally could have done it but I didn't and I was pleased to see that Sidney did it. I was busy with other things.

VDT: You were not able ever again to get a religion question into any Census Bureau survey or the census?

GLICK: We came pretty close with the 1960 census. A political scientist named Foster from William and Mary College came up and made a study of how a government office makes a decision and this was the decision: not to ask a question on religion on the decennial census. I have a little monograph he prepared. He interviewed all of us. It got edited a bit along the line but essentially told how this happened.

We came fairly close again in 1977, which would have been 20 years after the 1957 study. Mr. Barabba was director then, a very fine Republican, by the way, who was very cooperative regardless of which party was in power. He was a marketing analyst; he was interested in religion from that point of view. Of course, I was just interested in updating this information. Barabba left right at the time the decision had to be made and the acting director was afraid that maybe whoever the new director was would not approve. He turned out to be Jewish, Plotkin or something like that, and probably would not have approved it anyway. The decision had to be made before he came. I don't ever expect that subject to come up again, but I hope they'll get away from this bugaboo about religion.

VDT: What about the marriage questions that you added to the CPS in 1966 and to the 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity, which you talked about in your 1967 PAA presidential address ["Permanence of Marriage," Population Index, October 1967]?

GLICK: In the early 1960s, COPS, the PAA Committee on Population Statistics, had among its members a very fine man by the name of Ronald Freedman. I give him credit for having persuaded us to get into this business of asking more questions about marital and fertility history. In 1966 the Office of Economic Opportunity, the special office to fight poverty, had \$2 million to spend on research and didn't know how to spend it. I said to Herman Miller, who was the chief of our population division at

the time, "How about this marital-fertility history? That's related to poverty and you could get that angle into it." So we got the \$2 million to make a study of marital-fertility history for the first time, asking: When did you get married, divorced, remarried, redivorced and remarried?--two different marriages, complete history. And when were each of your children born?--up to five children, or maybe it was four and then the last child, which means if there were five, you could get the continuous data for five children. That was first done in the OEO survey of March-April 1967.

VDT: It was repeated the following year?

GLICK: It wasn't repeated. The CPS didn't yet have a marital-fertility history. They considered it for a much larger sample survey in 1968, but that survey didn't materialize. But we developed some probabilities of marriage and remarriage and the like out of the 1967 survey, which were published. I'm not sure the programmer was completely sure of how he was doing. I remember he said, "Here's a tabulation. See how it looks." We published it, but I don't have too much confidence in it.

After that, we didn't go into that kind of tabulation. We just made some distributions--in 1971, 1975, 1980, 1985, and probably will again in 1990. It's a chain of questions in the June Current Population Survey. On the left side is a page of economic questions about employment and income and on the right are all these questions about marital and fertility history.

We found not only when each child was born but its sex and with whom it was presently living, the mother or father or some other relative or some non-relative. So from those basic data, we were able to develop distributions of age at marriage, divorce, widowhood, redivorce, and intervals between these marital events.

Which reminds me of a time I got into trouble with my family life cycle paper. I had shown the median age at marriage, median age at the birth of the first child, median age at the birth of the last child, so I just subtracted one median from the other and said, "That's the average interval between." A man named Ted Caplow, I think he's currently secretary of the American Sociological Association, was at that time a graduate student at the University of Minnesota and he wrote a scathing letter to the editor saying what poor statisticians we had working in the field, that you can't subtract one average from another to find the average interval. In a later study, I actually measured these and it came out the same bloody way.

VDT: Good for you! Showed it didn't have to be so fancy. So that's the way you do that wonderful family life cycle, which is such an interesting innovation--the median age of women at first marriage, birth of first child, last child, marriage of last child, the empty nest syndrome and so on. It's fascinating and it dates way back to your idea during the war. And the data for that came from the 1967 OEO survey and the 1971, 75 and so on CPS?

GLICK: Yes. We did double-check with the vital statistics. They don't always come out exactly the same way, partly because the CPS reports are retrospective and may not be precise. And the vital statistics are not complete, because not all states have central registration areas from which they can derive this kind of information. An interesting side story on that subject. When we were making the June supplement to the 1975 CPS, I was observing the interviewing for that survey in Atlantic City.

VDT: In 1975 or 76? These supplements are on the five or six year?

GLICK: They started out every four years--1967 [OEO survey], 1971, 1975. In 1975 they decided it would be nice to make it in the round, every five years.

In 1975 we went into this Negro home and on the wall it said, "God is the head of this household." I said to the interviewer, "You won't have to ask that first question!" That household had

an elderly woman, in her eighties. When the interviewer asked, "When did you first get married?" she gave the answer. The interviewer said, "You said you've been married three times. When did the first husband die or did you get a divorce?" She said, "I didn't get a divorce, I just married another man." That made me a bit suspicious about the quality of data on this subject for older people, particularly people with not much education--people who would give answers, but they weren't necessarily correct. So most of our information from then on has been limited to women who were 75 or younger.

VDT: You mean that based on that one field observation you decided the oldest should not be included?

GLICK: Well, you could tell this from other information. Also, above 75 you have a lot of people in institutions and these are not in the survey. I think Dan Levine cut them out of the CPS after the 1970 census. We used to have a half sample in institutions--about half as many people as you would ordinarily ask--but since they didn't have any economic questions, because people in institutions are not in the labor force, then what use was it. You get marital status, maybe, and some soft sociological information but no economic data. So it was discontinued.

The CPS is not good for the older population. It's just in the decennial census. And in the 1980 census, for instance, they've got about an inch and a half thick report on the institutional population with beautiful detail on age, type of institution, and social and economic characteristics. I was very pleased to see that because Mr. Reagan and Company had cut down on the 1980 census badly. We got less than before out of it in terms of detailed reports.

VDT: Besides your family life cycles, there are many other innovations about the family for which you're well known, for instance, projections of the percentage of first marriages likely to end in divorce. Were you the first to do that, which is now hot news whenever there's a new projection?

GLICK: I think the first time I used that was in the 1971 survey. We found about 29 percent were expected to eventually end their first marriage in divorce. The next time we surveyed, 1975, I believe it went up to 34 percent or so and now it's about 50 percent. In fact, 1985 data show that about 55 percent of first marriages are likely to end in divorce.

VDT: Teresa Martin and Larry Bumpass say in their article in the February 1989 Demography ["Recent Trends in Marital Disruption"] that adjusting for underreporting and adding in separation, it's now up to two-thirds of first marriages that will end in divorce or separation.

GLICK: Adding in separation is something they've done through the years and it probably has certain merits, but it does inflate the results somewhat. There's a relatively small percentage of people who become separated and never divorce. Their data may have come from the wonderful new National Survey of Families and Households, which was started in 1987 and finished in 1988, so their information would be updated from anything published from the 1985 source. [Martin and Bumpass's February 1989 article was based on June 1985 CPS data.]

VDT: Were you the first who did those projections, thought that up?

GLICK: I think I did the first ones on a national basis, based on the 1971 CPS. In 1984, based on the 1980 CPS, I not only projected the likelihood of divorce, but the likelihood of first marriage, of remarriage, rediocese. I made a whole series of projections assuming that as people at the time of the survey became five years older, they would add the same amount of marital experience as people five years older added during the five previous years. You incrementally add that up. It was a relatively

simple way, but I think the results come very close to those obtained by people who use more high-powered statistical methods.

VDT: I love the one where you show proportions of couples who will celebrate different marriage anniversaries, which you've updated from time to time.

GLICK: Conrad Taeuber asked me to put that into the report that you asked me to prepare.

VDT: The Population Reference Bureau Population Bulletin on "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together in the U.S. Today" [coauthored with Arthur J. Norton]. That was in October 1977. But you had done that already and updated it for that.

GLICK: No, I hadn't done that before [for both first marriage and remarriage]. Before the CPS eliminated the institutional population, Paul Jacobson at the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company talked me into asking a question about when did you enter your present marriage and to find out whether that was a first marriage or a remarriage. We published a report going all the way up to 85 years old and over. We estimated how many people lived together in a first marriage for ten years, 25 years, and so on up. I don't think the results are all that I would like them to be.

VDT: For instance, you and your wife before her death celebrated your 45th wedding anniversary and according to the table in your 1977 Bulletin, only one out of three couples reach the 45th anniversary of their first marriage. Then there are the proportions of children living with two parents, both natural parents or not, one parent, and so on. Was that also your innovation--living arrangements of children? It's become a standard and interesting statistic.

GLICK: I think I did something on that subject way back about 1953, when Hugh Carter had his Office of Vital Statistics pay the Census Bureau to ask some questions relating to marital history in the CPS. I think out of that I found out how many children were living with parents still in their first marriage and how many were living with parents in their second marriage. But for some reason we didn't repeat the same kind of analysis until this survey of marital and fertility history came along. Then you could find out when people got married and had their children, so you could determine where the children were living in the first marriage, remarriage, or with divorced parents, whether their parents had remarried or were still unmarried, separated, never married. All the marital and family composition combinations you can think of became possible.

VDT: Those are always such fascinating statistics, and depressing, because the blacks show less than half living with two parents.

GLICK: At the present time, nearly 60 percent of black children live with just one parent, most of the time the mother, but it's about 15 percent for whites. These are children under 18 years old. For all races, 22 percent of children now are born when the mother is not married. This has a lot of implications for children's concepts of fathers, the father's role in the family. That's the kind of thing I might comment on toward the end of the interview: What are some of some of the implications of the trends, changes in family demography?

VDT: I was indeed going to ask you what you think of trends for the future. Let's talk about cohabitation, unmarried people living together. I always recall the flak over the title of yours and Arthur Norton's Bulletin, published first in 1977. One of my favorite Bulletins, by the way. I reread it coming along through the desert yesterday and it's just great. It's "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living

Together" and you had to go up to the highest echelons of the Census Bureau to get permission to use "living together" in a title. Up till then, wasn't it, the Census Bureau called them POSSLQs--persons of the opposite sex sharing living quarters?

GLICK: That leads to a point I was going to make if you wanted some fillers; I have a whole list of humorous things I could talk about. One is--it wasn't humorous at the time--but when Nixon was in his second term, about 1972, the poverty rate--which had gone down, down, year by year--made an upturn. The man in charge of poverty statistics said, "We've got a story for the press." So he rushed out a one-sheet report on the increase in poverty, for the first time since 1959 when such statistics were first reported. And, wow!--the Commerce Department jumped onto this with two feet: "What do you mean? You should have cleared this up through the Commerce Department because it doesn't look good for the Administration. You should have compared it with about ten years earlier; then it was a lot higher than currently."

That was what apparently stimulated them to hire a young fellow who had lost an election in Michigan and made him--well, we called him a spy. He sat in an office right next to me and was supposed to keep track of every publication going out to see if it would make some kind of damage for the Administration. And it came up with me. I had a report that had come out for many years, Marital Status and Family Status. I said "family status" sounds stodgy, let's make it Marital Status and Living Arrangements. This title came across this guy's desk and he blew a fuse: "That sounds mighty sexy." And he went up the line and when he got to Con Taeuber, Con said, "What's wrong with that?" Con backed me up and we've kept it to this day.

VDT: You have indeed. That's interesting.

GLICK: I had another experience, with the 1970 census. Herman Miller, our income expert, was supposed to make a speech downtown to a group of people interested in federal statistics, but he couldn't go so he asked me to do it. I made a speech about census income statistics and trends and so forth. Afterwards, Judith Martin from the Washington Post said, "You have just completed the 1970 census. I understand it's possible you may not have counted everybody." I said, "That's probably true. I've been with the Census Bureau a long time and every census we try harder to get everybody to cooperate and be counted. But there seems to be a growing antipathy to government and people's invasion of privacy. They just don't think it's necessary, all of it." "Well," she said, "how many do you think you missed?" I said, "We don't know; it's entirely too soon to tell. It may take us a couple of years to find out." "Do you have an estimate?" she says. I said, "Let me put it this way. In the previous census, we estimated we missed about 3 percent of the people. Considering everything, we think if we did that well in the 1970 census, it would be doing pretty well."

Next morning, headline in the Post: "Census Official Says 3 Percent of the People Were Missed in the 1970 Census."

VDT: Oh, lordie.

GLICK: And they came clawing into my office! The head of information in the Census Bureau--I don't think he liked the assignment in the least; he was really a pretty nice guy, John Casserly--but he was called from the Secretary of Commerce's office, "This should not have been done." Of course, the whole story was in the article, about it may be two years before we know. This fellow came and said, "Didn't you know better than to say such things?" I said, "I told them we may not know for two years and the only number I gave was for the previous census."

VDT: Headline writers are always impossible!

GLICK: It really made me sore. I said to him, "I've been here for over 30 years and I have never once had anybody speak to me the way you have. I think I have just done my plain duty." Well, he went away and I never had many relations with him after that. By the way, Con Taeuber backed me up 100 percent. He was my mentor.

VDT: Let's talk about some of the people you worked with. I do want to ask about your relationships with the public. You've always stressed the importance of collecting and reporting data to suit the changing needs of the public and policymakers. But let's talk about some of your colleagues. You say that Con Taeuber came to the Census Bureau in 1948 [actually 1951].

GLICK: He came from the Food and Agriculture Organization, which had its headquarters in Washington. Before that, he'd been in the Department of Agriculture, head of their population research. Margaret Hagood followed him and Calvin Beale after her. FAO was transferred to Rome and he wasn't about to go to Rome. So then he was hired by the Census Bureau to fill in where Phil Hauser had left. Phil had been Assistant Director of the Census Bureau and then he was made Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, who was none other than Henry Wallace.

VDT: Actually, he claims that he had those positions simultaneously. Con Taeuber moved into what position?

GLICK: He was called Assistant Director. They had other Assistants, who had specialties like machine tabulation. Con was in charge of things like population, housing, and agriculture. Those were things he knew about and he kind of gave the last word in these areas.

VDT: You've spoken of Con a number of times as your mentor. He gave the approval, so everything would be okay?

GLICK: Yes. Like, for instance, in 1970, soon after the census, three feminists barged in on Con and he asked me to sit in with him. They were objecting to the "head of household" concept as sexist. One of them said, "You have this question on relationship to head of household. The first question is, 'Who is the head of the household?' I put myself down as the head and my spouse I just put down as my husband." The second one said, "I put both my husband and myself as heads, joint heads." The third one said, "I left that question blank, because I didn't know what to do with it." And between them they said, "You have to do something about this. We can't have you following this practice of not letting the wife be the head. We know what you do: you just change all these wives who are heads to make the husband the head. Anyway, we don't like the term 'head of household.' That sounds like the other spouse is some kind of second-class citizen--the wife is just also a member of the household."

So Con said, "Well, we'll do something about it." But we didn't--until 1975, when I said, "Look, we're going to get into the 1980 census and we had better do something about this issue." So I arranged in 1975 to have a test in one of the eight what we call rotation groups in the Current Population Survey. It's divided into eight groups; they change in different cycles. We had a special page of questions asked of every married couple: Who is the head of this household, you--whoever the respondent is--your spouse, both of you, someone else, no one. And the highest count was they liked joint heads of household. Second to that was to let the husband be the head--the usual.

Well, my reaction to this was, you can't have two heads of a household, because the sister of one is a sister-in-law of the other; the father of one is the father-in-law of the other; son, son-in-law. If you want to get into relationships like that--and we do--well! So we said you have to have just one person.

Arthur Norton claims he joined with me in creating that when you first ask for the listing of

people in the household, you start with the person, or one of the persons, in whose name the home is owned or rented. If the home is not owned or rented, then start with one adult, any adult. So that was adopted in tests for the 1980 census and in the CPS before the 1980 census. It was accepted and there were no arguments about it.

Actually, before this decision, there were two incidents. Mary Grace Kovar, one of our leading demographers, asked me to come to a meeting at her home when this was boiling. She said, "There will be some women there." I assumed there would be some men, but there was just a roomful of women--with claws. A little exaggeration. "Why do you have to do this? There must be some other way." They did not want the term "head of household." They did not want anybody in the household to be the number one.

Then in a second incident, Barbara Bergmann of the University of Maryland economics department, head of our advisory committee on economic statistics, put this topic on the agenda for one of their meetings and I went and talked it over with them. Barbara said, "If you don't get rid of the term 'head of household', I personally will lead a sabotage of the 1980 census."

VDT: She's now at American University and I've seen her at Harriet Presser's monthly seminars [at the Center on Population, Gender, and Social Inequality, University of Maryland].

GLICK: They were both in this meeting. But when the solution came up, everything was just as quiet as could be. By the way, we called this first person in our report the "householder." That's important. I think I thought that up. Art thinks he joined me in thinking it up, but anyway--between us. No objection to the term "householder." It kind of fits in with "whose place is this?", not "who is the top dog?"

VDT: There was no objection when you finally did use it in the 1980 census?

GLICK: Jim Sweet pointed out that it was hard to relate it to earlier data. He said, "Suppose you have an old widow who can't run things; her son-in-law lives with her and runs it. It may be that previously he would be counted as head of the household. Now you'll make her the householder [owner of the home] and maybe you'll change the concept in that respect."

We agreed, but stuck to whoever is listed first will be left as the householder. So we get about 4 percent in husband-wife households, now called married-couple households, where the wife has reported herself first. And that's the way the statistics come out. Characteristics of the householder? Okay, she's in there, or he's in there. Actually, there are not an awful lot of significant things where this matters. But once in a while you want to classify households by the age of the householder, so you know about where in the family life cycle they are. For items like family income or number of children in the household, it doesn't make any difference who's the householder. And if you want to identify a household as a married-couple household, you don't even have to inquire as to who's the householder. So we get away as far as we can from the designation.

Now, we had thought that with the regeneration of feminism, there might actually be more households in which the wife would consider herself the number one, the householder, so with the change, we'd be getting in step with the times. But we found that many of the wives who were householders had a husband who was incapacitated. Or he's unemployed; she's employed. She has more income, more education, superior characteristics, and apparently a man who has a superior woman, he's married to her, lives with her, may let her be the dominant person in the household. Actually, in the first relevant analysis I made, back in 1960, I found about 7 percent of women had more income than their husbands.

VDT: That's one of the interesting things you've had in your studies over the years.

GLICK: Now we know about 18 percent are in the same bracket or have more income than their husbands. In fact, it's over 20 percent if you include families in which the husband has no more than one or two thousand dollars of income more than the wife. In such families, the husband has very little, if any, more than the wife. That reflects changes over time in that respect.

VDT: You obviously enjoyed your time at the Census Bureau. It is certainly not a stultifying government agency.

GLICK: No. I was given quite a bit of freedom in the things I did, which apparently made sense to the people up the line who had to review these things. For instance, we started to talk about cohabitation. By the time of the 1950 census, I had a sneaky feeling it would be interesting to know--just out of sociological curiosity--how many men and women lived together without benefit of clergy. So, from the 1950 census, I had one table with a very obscure title like "unrelated individuals living together."

VDT: Wasn't it "sharing living quarters"?

GLICK: That comes later. This was just a table which showed how many men were living with women not related to them. In the box head were the women's characteristics; in the stub were the men's characteristics. That was where there were just two adults in the household. They may or may not have children, but we did show whether there were children. We found out if they were listed as partners or lodgers or employees of the head of the household. Most of them were just the roomer or lodger type and eventually we just lumped them all together, because that's what most of them were. In the Current Population Survey and elsewhere, it's mainly just grouped together; can't tell them apart. We found only about 400,000, which is a very small proportion--about 1 percent--of all couples of man-woman combinations were unmarried to each other. Now it's moved up to 4 percent. It was about 500,000 in 1960 and so on up. The first time we really featured it was in the "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together" Bulletin in 1977.

VDT [looking at Bulletin]: Then it was 947,000 unmarried couples living together. It made a tremendous jump in the early 1970s.

GLICK: And it has jumped on up. Today it's about 2.6 million and that's about 4 percent of the total number of couple households.

VDT: You've always gone back and updated each time the new CPS data come out?

GLICK: Yes. I don't remember all the numbers, but it's kept going up. Actually, it dipped a notch, about 5,000 in absolute numbers, about 1985, but it's going on up now.

VDT: And you were the first to put out these data?

GLICK: First national data. We didn't even feature it in our earlier publications, because it was not regarded as very important. But with the increase in postponement of marriage and the increase in divorce and increase in postponement of remarriage--those are the demographic things that were related to the increase in cohabitation. Of course, all kinds of social and economic changes were going on which are really the fundamental causes.

VDT: As I said before, you've always felt it was important to collect and report data to suit the changing needs of the public and policymakers. It seems to me that you were ahead. You had been collecting those data and when the time came, it was there to be used.

GLICK: Yes. I never did collect data to reform anybody or a situation. It's just my intellectual curiosity, in the context that, "Here is something the public deserves to know about and we're in a position to find out what the answers are." And at least to get some basic information, which other people may want to enlarge upon and scrutinize in greater detail.

VDT: You've also said that there are data that could help, for instance, marriage and family counselors. In your wonderful 1967 PAA presidential address ["Permanence of Marriage"], you said there are data that if used correctly by marriage counselors and for family life education courses in high school and college, they could help people choose the right mate--people who would be most likely to stay together in a marriage. Is that how you saw your role? Well, you've just explained-- "Here are the data which the public deserves to know, which can be of some use."

GLICK: About that paper, the title was "Permanence of Marriage." I asked Ross Eckler to introduce me, who was then director of the Census Bureau. He was one of the "class of 1940." He came in as an economist and was in charge of employment and income data and moved up the line gradually and eventually became the director, when Johnson was President.

I said things like: Wouldn't it be wonderful if we had detailed tabulations of the characteristics of spouses who lived together for a long time and those who lived together for a short time and see what the mix is, so you could have a sort of encyclopedia for the counselor and he can say, "Now, you have these characteristics and she has those characteristics. You have about x percent chance that your marriage is going to last." And others have only y percent, and so on.

VDT: You called that a marriage quotient.

GLICK: I said that for the combination of this particular pair, that is your marriage quotient. Well, nobody's ever used that concept, including myself. But I introduced the idea that it would be good to have a more scientific selection of marriage partners and have questionnaires sent out to as wide a group as you could gather and assemble them and use the computer to put groups together to see how they match up. In fact, there was a group at the University of Maryland who were already doing this [in 1967] and I reported on what they were doing. Today, that's widely used. I know people who have done very well in that, and you probably do too.

VDT: Using data from the Census Bureau?

GLICK: No. The concept of couples being matched by those commercial people. Men report; women report; they match them up. One of the professors at our own ASU [Arizona State University] sociology department recently used the procedure of advertising in an upbeat newspaper and she's getting married very soon; she's real happy about it. Not that she's probably ever heard about my idea in this context, but it's a development that's come along.

At the end of that paper, I said something like this: "Now, I'm a demographer; I consider myself a scientist. It's my purpose to report facts and inform people. It's not my duty, as a social scientist, to do anything about it. But, if I were to do so" . . . Then I went on to say things like: fix it so that people make a better choice of spouses and make it harder to get married but easier to get divorced, even. And that there should be more positive propaganda or education about the values and virtues of marriage and not so much information that's so degrading about marriage.

Well, that's the closest I came to taking to the stump. But if I were to take to the stump for anything else, it would be in relation to a footnote in that same paper, which had to do with the sex of children. My wife and I wanted a little girl so badly we could taste it, but the second was also a boy. And we quit there. So I put a footnote: If couples can know how to limit the number of children, they should also be able to determine the sex of their children, with a blue pill for a boy, a pink pill for a girl, and a white one if they don't want any.

VDT: You didn't go on and try for a third?

GLICK: No. The doctor said he wouldn't help us get a girl even if he could.

VDT: I did and got a third son--who is an enchantment, so, okay. Did you get married before you got your Ph.D.?

GLICK: Sam Stouffer told us grad students, "I'm going to kick you in the rear if you get married before you get your Ph.D." So, what did I do? I got the Ph.D. in the morning, got married in the evening, the same day.

VDT: I have a note in my file that I shouldn't say out loud--that you said you were almost 28 when you got married and you were itching! (Laughter)

GLICK: Well, that was the situation.

VDT: Nowadays, things are done very differently. My oldest son is nine years married and struggling to finish his Ph.D. His wife is very much the head of the household and she is earning a handsome income and he's earning none at all.

Do you think of yourself as a demographer or a sociologist? Like others, Kingsley Davis for instance, do you think of sociology as important in revealing the background to demographic behavior? You have written that Census Bureau survey data and the census can't tell the whole story of marriage. Psychological traits and attitudes are also important in the story of marriage and the family and they cannot be collected by the census. But you started off that way and you've added your bit.

GLICK: That's not to say that the kind of research that I and others like me have done is worthless.

VDT: On the contrary! It just does not tell the whole story, you've said.

GLICK: Again, I go back to something my friend Sam Stouffer once told us graduate students. He said, "I'm in the business of making surveys and that's one of my specialties. But if I could pick half a dozen people who are as smart as Ralph Linton"--who was the number one anthropologist in the country and on the faculty there at the University of Wisconsin--"and send them out to spend several weeks on a given project just to get the sense of what's going on, I think you would get more out of that than you would from some expensive surveys, where you have a set questionnaire and so on." Well, that's another way to do it. It's good to have interviews with not necessarily a closed questionnaire and you get into some of this more subtle information that way. That's part of what I had in mind.

VDT: Which of your publications do you consider the most important and why?

GLICK: I made a list of about 20 items before you came. It's topped with the Population Reference Bureau Bulletin, "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together in the U.S. Today." [This list went astray after the interview, but Dr. Glick commented on several of the items, as follows.]

There is my PAA presidential address, "Permanence of Marriage." After that speech, a lady in front of me, Margaret Martin, said, "Do you believe those things you were saying about how to get people to select the right mate?" I answered, "Well, I tried to be interesting." She said, "You definitely were interesting!"

VDT: It was fascinating--the most different PAA presidential address I've read and I've read most of them.

GLICK: On that occasion, the Census Bureau let me hang loose and say what I had in mind. But I would never have said most of those things in a Census publication. Later on, Meyer Zitter especially, when he was the chief of our population division, encouraged us to speculate on what we thought was likely to happen in the future. Leon Bouvier was working with a congressional committee and asked me to make a presentation in front of Representative Scheuer on the future of the American family in 1979. I said to Leon, "I don't know all that much about the future. If I wrote a paper, it would mostly be about past history, with maybe some projection into the future." He said, "That would be fine." And that's what I did.

Once you develop an audience and people call on you, they expect you to have this wisdom that goes beyond what is known. My sense of science is that its main purpose is to give guidance as to what is likely to happen in the future. My experience in testifying before Congress a number of times was that they want to know what the trends have been and where they are going if nothing intervenes. So that has encouraged me in my writing to try to give a bit of historical context, to show at least where it has started somewhere back, and where it's going. The essence of science is the practical side of it.

VDT: Your writing is also so clear and straightforward. You have lots of tables and charts. I remember when we were working together on the "Marrying, Divorcing" Bulletin, you said you loved to have tables and charts, with simple, non-jargonistic text, and descriptive rather than too analytical, although now, you say, you speculate on what future trends can be. Has that been a deliberate effort--to have a style of that kind?

GLICK: Yes. I had a fine background in English grammar and composition. Got an A in freshman English, which was the only one in the class. I couldn't understand how those other people didn't have as good a high school background as I.

VDT: Are you talking about high school or college?

GLICK: I got an A in college English, primarily because I had an excellent background in junior and senior high school English.

VDT: Why was that--good teachers?

GLICK: Excellent teachers. They had you be careful about things, to write clearly and coherently and with force. If you can't be understood, there's no point in writing. Now, if you took the straight script of this interview, it wouldn't always make sense. That's the way my interviews go. I hope it will be edited. But in writing, you can go over a draft and clarify it and that's what I like to do. There's no point in writing unless you have some purpose and it's stated clearly.

VDT: You have tables and charts--simple, straightforward.

GLICK: Yes, that gives a tangible element to it. I taught for a couple of years, sociology and psychology, at De Pauw and Whitman College. I had the feeling oftentimes that there's a lot of opinion and guesswork about what you were teaching; that if you just had more factual information, you would be more effective. So I always felt, as I was producing statistical compilations and analyses, that I was feeding something into the hands of college teachers--and to the general public. I usually try to make it interesting on something that's of current importance. I just have little interest in people who deal only in abstractions.

VDT: Let's talk about some of your other publications. There was *The American Family*, the 1950 census monograph [1957].

GLICK: It's not "The American Family." It's called American Families, intentionally. On page one, I pointed out that only some 20 percent or so of families have a husband and wife and at least two or three children, which is the conventional notion of a family. And you have all these other families that haven't any children yet or used to have children or have only one parent or goodness knows what other combination. So American Families was chosen as the title. When President Carter had the White House conference in 1980, it was called the White House Conference on Families. It was picking up the same idea. I don't know whether that traces back to me.

VDT: And, of course, there is Marriage and Divorce: A Social and Economic Study, the book you did with Hugh Carter. Why did you have the second edition so soon after the first, just six years apart [1970, 1976]?

GLICK: It got started as one of about sixteen 1960 census monographs that were financed by the American Public Health Association. Most of them dealt with topics like specific causes of death and all the socioeconomic relations that went with that. There were three other reports [using 1960 census data; published by Harvard University Press]. One by Evelyn Kitagawa and Phil Hauser on socioeconomic characteristics related to mortality [Differential Mortality in the United States: A Study in Socioeconomic Epidemiology, 1973]; one on fertility by Clyde Kiser, Wilson Grabill, and Arthur Campbell [Trends and Variations in Fertility in the United States, 1968]; and then Carter and I had one on marriage and divorce. We didn't get started on this until about 1965 and by 1968 we had a draft, but it wasn't until 1970 that it got published.

VDT: It was 1960 census data, but it got published in 1970?

GLICK: It had a heck of a lot of Current Population Survey data, updated information, by the time we sent it for publication about 1968. Well, this book was popular and probably sold more copies than any other in the whole series. It was reprinted a number of times and by 1975, thereabouts, the Harvard University Press said, "How about some kind of an update for this?" They didn't want the whole thing rewritten, so they said, "You have a chapter that is a straight summary of all that went before. Suppose we just drop out that chapter and replace it was an updated chapter." Which was what was done.

In that 1976 chapter, one of the Princeton folks who reviewed it noted that there was quite a difference in tone as compared with the 1970 edition. 1970 had shown kind of a progressive development in the marriage situation. You had the baby boom, you had everybody getting married, the divorce rate hadn't gone up so much. And then the whole sky fell, pretty fast. So in this second edition, the last chapter doesn't jibe with the rest, because they didn't change the first part of the book

at all. They didn't sell all that much of the second edition. But Andy Cherlin came along with Marriage, Divorce, Remarriage [1981], which updated it--smaller and less expensive and a very fine book.

VDT: You mentioned already your family cycle article, published in the late 1940s, which must have been one of your outstanding publications, when you think back. What others?

GLICK: A totally unrelated article. John Durand was in the United Nations and had a tie-in with the very fine lady from Sweden, Alva Myrdal, who was in UNESCO. She wrote me--I'm sure John Durand had directed her--asking me to give a paper at the Second World Congress of Sociology in Liege, in 1953. I accepted and, for whatever reason, I chose to do something that had never been done before--it's been done quite a bit since that time--and that was to project the lifetime earnings of people with different amounts of education. Herman Miller, our income expert, saw this paper and said, "I think I could make some modifications of that and we could get a paper out of it." So he figured out how much earnings people lost for the time they went to college and assumed a certain percent, 3 percent increase, in inflation--stuff like that. And we jointly published a paper, I think in 1956, on education and potential income. That paper got more publicity than most anything else I've written, except this "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together." I even found a match cover that says something on the inside about the value of a college education!

VDT: That's become such a familiar statistic and you were responsible! I'm glad to know that.

GLICK: Well, Herman promised to update this study periodically. Now this had to do with men and some women would say you should do it for women. And more recently, they have come up with something for women that's relatively comparable. That's, as I say, one of the papers that got the most publicity, and it had nothing exactly to do with family life, which is my specialty.

Another was a paper which Irene Taeuber asked me to write for the AAAS meeting in 1959. I invited Jack Beresford and David Heer, who were my assistants in family and marriage for the 1960 census, to join me in a paper on family trends and prospects and in that paper appears for the first time the word "marriage squeeze." It was my idea that with the baby boom going on, there are women born in a given year who want to marry men who are older, born in a year when the birth rate hadn't gotten up that high yet. So there's an excess of women in the so-called usual ages to marry, as compared with men in their usual ages to marry. That was the marriage squeeze; it's hard for a woman to get one of those men. I said, "Either there's going to be a delay of marriage or women are going to marry men who are passed over"--one or two things like that.

VDT: Marry men younger than themselves.

GLICK: Yes. I don't know if we contemplated then that if this situation ever turned around because of a decline in the birth rate, you would have women who were born when the birth rate's gotten lower wanting to marry men born when the birth rate was higher, so you have the reverse--a squeeze on the other sex. That's what we're in now. It turned over about 1980.

VDT: The peak birth year was 1957.

GLICK: You have to add 20 years or so to adjust for ages at marriage. So at this point, instead of an excess of women, you have an excess of men. The same situation occurred as the birth rate went down in the U.S. until the Depression. The people who were born during the Depression married about 20 years later, in the mid-1950s. The marriage age for women was then the lowest it has ever been and all

but 4 percent of women and 5 percent of men married. Now what do you have? Twice to three times that many are projected never to marry--in the neighborhood of 10 percent are likely never to marry. I estimated in my last projections, based on projections of 1980 data, that 88 percent of men and 92 percent of women will marry.

So you have this marriage squeeze. It never received much publicity till somewhere around 1980. My first record of it is in a 1980 Newsweek article, but Art Norton, my former assistant at the Census Bureau, tells me it had come out somewhat earlier than that. In 1980 a news reporter asked Norton, "What do you call unmarried people who live together?" He said, "Persons of Opposite Sex Sharing Living Quarters." "Oh," the reporter said, "that's POSSLQs." Oh, that has to do with cohabitation. I'm getting off the subject.

VDT: On marriage squeeze. You say it first appeared in an article you did with David Heer and Jack Beresford at the end of the 1950s. Did it get publicity then?

GLICK: It didn't stir up much excitement until around 1980, I don't know exactly when. I was then telling about the delay in marriage and increase in divorce. I said, as long as there's an excess of women, why should men hurry to get married. And if men did get married, why should they stay in this marriage if they don't like it; there are a lot of women out there "in the woods" who are willing to get married--or to cohabit without being married. That's where cohabitation fits into this marriage squeeze. I think there is a connection between the marriage squeeze and cohabitation, delay in marriage, and delay in remarriage.

VDT: And you said that this 1977 Bulletin, of which we had several reprints and an updated reprint, "Marrying, Divorcing, and Living Together in the U.S. Today," which you did with Arthur Norton, had a lot of press coverage. I certainly remember that. It was lovely.

GLICK: I think it mentions the marriage squeeze in there.

VDT: Right.

GLICK: The attention probably began with this booklet. I said around 1980, but it was showing up in the late 1970s.

VDT: I already knew of your marriage squeeze when I was studying at Georgetown in the late 1960s, so the demographers knew about it.

GLICK: It was there. The trouble is, it depends on some influential journalist that gets hold of it. Going back to Sam Stouffer again. Somebody asked him, "What do you consider a good piece of research?" He said, "One that would get a good lead article in the New York Times." That's something I kind of kept in the back of my mind. I haven't hit the New York Times every year, but from time to time--and lots of other newspapers.

VDT: Written for them? You have written articles for the newspapers.

GLICK: I wrote an article for the New York Times only once. I did try one for the Sunday edition, but it didn't take. It's just that journalists will have a foot-long piece, reporting facts and commenting on something that I've done research on. It's satisfying to see that.

It's also satisfying to go to all these conferences that I go to and hear people say, "You wouldn't know how valuable the things you publish are to us in teaching our classes." And I say, "That helps to

keep me going." And I like to go to conferences to hear questions raised about something that hasn't been developed yet. I go back and I do something about it.

I don't know whether it was a result of one of those situations, but there is another article I like very much. It was published not too long ago, in 1981. It was my idea, but between Graham Spanier and me--he and I got five or six articles out of one summer's experience with him under my supervision at the Census Bureau, in 1978. One paper was entitled "Marital Instability in the United States" [Family Relations, July 1981]. In that paper is a table from which I developed evidence that married couples who have sons are more likely to stay together than those who have, quotes, "nothing but girls." A critical statistic in a whole line of statistics was if a woman has two children and they are both sons, she is 18 percent more likely still to be in her first marriage at the time of the survey than a woman who has two children and they're both girls.

VDT: Another famous statistic!

GLICK: Feminist editors had cut that out of my manuscripts twice. I had it in one of my articles that got lots of coverage, called "Children of Divorced Parents in Demographic Perspective," in the Journal of Social Issues in 1979. The female editor said, "I don't think that is relevant," and she cut it out. One other time, I can't remember what the situation was, it was cut out. But I put it in a chapter, with a female editor again--and a male editor--and I was holding my breath, but they didn't cut it out. That book was called Children of Divorce, edited by two psychologists, Sharlene Wolchik and Paul Karoly, here on the ASU campus. I did a chapter on the role of divorce in family structure and I put in this point. That was only published in 1988, but it was supposed to be out in 1986 or 87.

VDT: What accomplishments in your career have given you the most satisfaction? You really have already said quite a bit about that. You just mentioned going to conferences and having people tell you how important your research is in their teaching.

GLICK: And being invited to be on programs and to be able to find an audience for what I've put in lots of time on--not just 40 hours a week, but weekends, holidays. I never did use all my annual leave. I just enjoyed what I was doing and enjoyed what response I got from it. That's the way it was.

VDT: Great! Who have been the leading influences in your career? You have mentioned Sam Stouffer many times and Con Taeuber, as your mentor at the Census Bureau. And Henry Shryock, who was your peer at the Census Bureau. Can you think of others?

GLICK: I can even go back to my family. My mother was a schoolteacher, in a little red schoolhouse. Drove a horse and buggy two or three miles to teach and she had these big boys in her classes. She always encouraged us in our education. My father always supported us in our education.

VDT: You said of the eight children, three went to De Pauw and, you mentioned, on scholarship?

GLICK: On scholarship; paid our whole tuition for four years. It was called a Rector scholarship. It was founded by a wealthy Chicago lawyer who took a liking to De Pauw University. He gave all these millions of dollars. Back in those days when I went to school, in the middle of the Depression, it was only \$200 each semester and for four years it was--\$1,600?--that's what we got for free. And it didn't cost me but \$1,600 besides that to go four years to college. I scrounged and did some summer work and the like to support myself, being the Depression. My father had helped my older brother go through De Pauw six years earlier than I. By that time, he was teaching and he contributed to that \$1,600 for me. Six years, later I was teaching and I gave money to my younger brother to finish his

degree, at least undergraduate.

VDT: A strong family.

GLICK: We all three were teachers. My mother's family was full of teachers. I had scholarships for graduate study at the University of Wisconsin. Paid my entire expenses; I didn't ask anybody for a nickel.

VDT: Who were other influences?

GLICK: My major professor at De Pauw, Lester Jones, recommended me to the University of Wisconsin, which helped me to get a scholarship there. Sam Stouffer, who was teaching at Wisconsin, knew my brother at the University of Chicago when they were in graduate school, and through the combination of these contacts, plus my own credentials, I got a fine scholarship at Wisconsin. Then there was Kimball Young. I could go on about what all I learned from him in social psychology.

But none of my professors at Wisconsin ever helped me get a job. My first job after I finished my Ph.D. was to go back to De Pauw and teach while one of my former professors was on sabbatical leave. At the end of that year, I got another job teaching at Whitman College--through Professor Ogburn of the University of Chicago, with whom I had taken one course during the summer of 1935. He also knew my brother Clarence, who had gone to the University of Chicago. So I had a university connection in there that helped me along.

Then Phil Hauser--Clarence knew Phil--helped me get to the Census Bureau. See these many connections. So I owe a lot to my brother Clarence. I communicated with him on all my problems as I went through college, graduate school, and I just owe him no end. When I got the American Sociological Association honor last year [Outstanding Career in the Practice of Sociology], the one person I mentioned was my brother Clarence--I knew sociologists knew him, at least a lot of them did--because of his great influence on my getting started in my career.

Another person is Arthur Norton. As I moved up the line at the Census Bureau, he took over the marriage and family statistics branch. Then eventually he became assistant chief of the population division, in charge of demographic and social statistics, just as I had been--the same two spots I had been in. He's still there. We have continued to write articles together. As recently as 1986, we published an article on one-parent families, a very significant development in our demographic situation and a sad one in many respects. On the other hand, hopeful in the sense that it does allow leeway for people who get into impossible marital situations, at least they think they are. So it's sort of a tradeoff between a greater degree of freedom, options, on the one hand and the handicaps, sacrifices, difficulties people get into when they do split up marriages.

VDT: Others at the Census Bureau?

GLICK: Well, Henry Shryock was really effectively the chief of the population division, between you and me. Howard Brunsman for something like 20 years after Dr. Truesdell was the chief of the population division. He was a housing expert. In the 1940 census, he was chief of the housing statistics branch. We had a population and housing division in 1940 and then in 1950, there was a population division and a housing division. I thought that Brunsman would become chief of the housing division and that would let Shryock become chief of the population division. But Howard instead chose to be chief of the population division. So for about 20 years, Henry was the assistant chief. But Brunsman didn't know that much about what was going on among us folks, so Henry was the one who gave final approval on all our papers and reports as they were going up the line. I owe a lot to Henry also because from time to time he'd be on PAA nominating committees and got me

nominated for offices in PAA. I've served in all of them.

But I remember that Dudley Kirk was chairman of the nominating committee when I was nominated for president-elect and Ansley Coale was my opponent. Now today, in retrospect, it seems absurd but I won easily. The ballots were counted and I knew about it. I called Ansley--I was secretary-treasurer [1962-65] at the time--and said, "The people have spoken. I don't know that they've spoken wisely, but they chose me." "Oh," he says, "I think they chose wisely." What else could he say!

VDT: And he became president the year after you [Glick, 1966-67; Coale, 1967-68]. I never knew that they have people run immediately again.

GLICK: Well, not often do they do that. I've been on nominating committees a number of times and I would never do that. I don't think it's right for a person to run the possibility of being defeated twice in a row. That's impolite.

VDT: That was a point I was going to bring up about PAA, but we're talking about leading influences. What about Hugh Carter?

GLICK: Hugh and I had many contacts. He was 15 years older than I. Back in the late 1940s, I believe, he had come to what's now the National Center for Health Statistics--it was then the Office of Vital Statistics--in charge of marriage and divorce. [Carter left the Immigration and Naturalization Service for this position in 1952.] I put in a request to civil service for someone to assist me in my marriage and family activities and Hugh Carter came up on top of the list of candidates. Well, he was 15 years older. He was well known already for his work at the Immigration and Naturalization Service and maybe also with marriage and divorce. But I just passed over; I didn't request anyone until later.

But in the early 1950s, he had me help him make some studies that he wasn't able to get information about, on marriage and divorce, through our Current Population Survey. Then in the early 1960s when the decision was made to have a monograph on marriage and divorce, Hugh, of course, being in charge of marriage and divorce statistics [at NCHS], was a natural. And I was collecting and publishing all these retrospective data about marital trends. So the two of us were chosen to be the authors. It wasn't until the book was ready to go to print that anybody said anything about whose name should go first. And Mort Spiegelman, who was the man in the American Public Health Association who fed the money out to all of us doing the monographs, said, "Well, why don't we just make it alphabetical: Hugh Carter and Paul Glick?" So that's the way it turned out. But everybody--excuse my immodesty--regarded that as my book.

VDT: Yes!

GLICK: A footnote on that. My secretary of 13 years, who worked with me on that, referred to it as "our book." She really got interested and would say, "Do you really want to say it that way?" You don't find secretaries like that much anymore. She was wonderful.

VDT: How did you work--longhand, and your secretary typed it?

GLICK: Oh yes. I wrote everything longhand. My secretaries typed the copies of my papers that went out to reviewers. Another note. On my 1957 monograph American Families, one copy--the last of about seven carbon copies, apparently--went to Fred Stephan at Princeton University, a big name in demography back in the 1950s. He claimed that reading that manuscript gave him a split retina; at least he said that with a straight face.

VDT: Have you ever gotten into typing or word processing?

GLICK: I write in longhand and they word process all my papers at ASU. I refuse to take up word processing. I like the kinetic feel of writing, which I don't get when I type. I learned to type before I went to college and could do the touch method. I could make perfect copies with all my papers. And I typed family letters--six, eight perfect copies. But when the family sort of split up, I got tired of typing and went back to handwriting. I like it. I can cross out. I can make a rough draft, a second draft, a third draft.

VDT: And save them all?

GLICK: No, no. I have all my last copies, but I don't keep all the crap.

VDT: Back to influences. Jay Siegel has told me about the group of sociologists who were gathered in Washington in the 1950s, perhaps already in the 1940s after the war, who used to meet informally at each other's homes to discuss their research. What are your recollections of the group? He said it was called the Sociology Discussion Group and included himself, you, Margaret Hagood, Abe Jaffe, Calvin Beale, Henry Shryock, the Taeubers.

GLICK: That's pretty much it. Those were people who had PhDs in sociology, with one exception, and that was Jay Siegel [also Calvin Beale]. Jay Siegel took his M.A. at the University of Pennsylvania and I think it was Margaret Hagood's bright idea to give him a dry run at a final Ph.D. examination. So all of us guys just twisted that fellow in one of these meetings. Jay Siegel never did get a Ph.D.

VDT: He's very sensitive to that.

GLICK: I credit some it to this mock Ph.D. exam. He didn't think it was going to be that tough. Margaret Hagood was in charge and he took the guff. Of course, with all due respect, Jay has published a lot of first-class material, but he's kind of slow on publishing. That may have contributed to his never getting the Ph.D. But I like the idea that maybe there was some contribution also from this rough treatment we gave him.

VDT: He didn't tell me that story! But he told me about the group. You were also involved with the D.C. Sociological Society and have been president of it, along with many other outstanding demographers, though now they seem to have gotten away from demography. I think it was you who recommended me to be their newsletter editor, which I was, for a couple of years.

Also, I have to put on record the lovely story about the one time I was to give a paper at a professional meeting. It was a D.C. Sociological Society meeting in the early 1970s and Irene Taeuber got the Stuart Rice Award that year. It was a beautiful Saturday at Howard University, a well-attended meeting, and everyone stayed to hear Irene give her speech. My paper, coauthored with Murray Gendell, on illegitimacy in Washington, was to be given in the afternoon. But everybody left--except you, the two Taeubers, and Murray Gendell. I've always been grateful to you for that!

GLICK: Well, that's on record now. (Laughter)

VDT: You were elected to IUSSP [International Union for the Scientific Study of Population] in 1949, one year after it was reconstituted on an individual membership basis and you and Henry

Shryock are often there. Have you attended most IUSSP general meetings?

GLICK: No. The first one I attended was in 1954, in Rome. At that meeting, the Russians and the satellites all made the same speech: There is no population growth problem if you have the right political and economic system. It was just tiresome to hear one after the other. When we were out at the airport ready to leave, this one big fellow looked around and said, "When we meet again, we'll have another speech for you"--implying they knew what they were saying, but one does what one must.

At the IUSSP meeting in 1965 [held in conjunction with the UN World Population Conference in Belgrade], Ron Freedman told me that he had met a USSR ethnographer, Kozlov, who had an atlas that he wanted to get into the hands of somebody at the Census Bureau who might make use of it, so Ron had mentioned me. I met this fellow and he had this big book with a brown cover. We went over to one side of the room and we looked at some of the tables and he had little images to show how many ethnic people were in different parts of each countries. I said, "Maybe I could send you some of our Census reports in exchange." He said, "I think we have most of those. What I'd like to have is some American science fiction books." His wife was teaching English. They had two sons, and I figured they were trying to get the sons to read more interesting material in English. We sent him some and Toby Bressler gave me some to send. We sent several times.

At a later meeting in London, 1969 I think it was, I didn't know he was there but he came up and gave me a big Russian bearhug and kiss on each cheek--he was about four inches taller than me, big fellow--and said, "I'd like to talk to you." My wife was with me, so we went to another room and he says, "There is a book by Kingsley Davis that costs \$25. They wouldn't let me bring much money out of the USSR. Could you help me?" I just reached in and gave him a ten-pound note, which at the time was worth \$25. No questions asked.

The next day at a session he caught up with me and gave me all kinds of gifts. He had a set of coins and a set of stamps from the USSR for my sons and beads for my wife and tie clips and cufflinks for me. He was so grateful. Before the day was over, I said, "Let's go around the corner and have something to drink." Which we did. While we talked, he looked around one way and the other and didn't see anybody and he says, "You know, my country does a lot of things that I don't agree with, but it's my country so what can I do?" I never heard of him again after that. Not too long ago, I told this story to someone else and he said, "You should have said, 'My country does a lot of things that I don't like. What can I do about it; it's my country.'"

VDT: What do you consider leading issues in U.S. demography over the years you've been involved?

GLICK: Well, obviously the baby boom and all of its repercussions. I was asked to testify before Senator Mondale about some legislation proposed by a commission on children. Barabba was the new Census Bureau director then, so when he didn't know the answer, the questions were shunted to me. When the list of questions was finished, Mondale turned to me and asked, "How long have you been at the Census Bureau?" I said, "Over 30 years." He asked, "Tell me in your own words what you consider the main things that have happened in demography during that time." I wasn't prepared, but I did the best I could for a couple of minutes. Obviously, the baby boom and the aftermath of that were high on the list. Also, of course, the delay in marriage, increase in divorce and cohabitation, the delay in remarriage--all these things that are written about extensively were of topical interest, of importance. I felt a duty to write about them in an understanding way. Not that I ever said anything bad, but I like to tell it like it was.

About four years ago, I was asked to make a speech before 250 Catholic bishops in Dallas. They were from the U.S., Canada, and Latin America. They had a couple of nuns in the back of the room translating into Spanish what was going on in English. The man who spoke before me was straight out of the Pope's office, said all the things that the Pope says, that most demographers don't

agree with. And I was asked to talk about changes in fertility, in family life, divorce and cohabitation, and the like. Later the bishops told me it was useful to them to have updated, factual information and not just pronouncements from the Pope's office. They asked this Pope's representative questions, "What if a woman has a baby by incest or by rape?" This Catholic spokesperson said, "Every birth is an act of God. Nothing should be done to interfere with life." Anyway, those are some of the kinds of experiences I've had.

VDT: Great. Now let's turn to PAA. Do you remember the first meeting you attended?

GLICK: Yes, 1940. I went to the Census Bureau in July 1939, so I missed the Washington, D.C., meeting [May 1939]. I went in 1940. Dr. Truesdell was the president of the Association that year. That meeting was in Chapel Hill. I've never missed any meetings after that.

VDT: From 1940?!

GLICK: Well, let's see [looking at meeting list]. I never missed a meeting until I came to ASU in 1982. They were having a meeting in San Diego at the same time as I was moving and I couldn't go. All the rest of the meetings I have been to.

VDT: From 1940 you have missed only one! I think you must hold the record.

GLICK: And I have the same record with the American Sociological Association. I missed one in 1986 in New York City that I could have gone to. I had been asked to give a paper at a meeting in New Delhi, India. That's halfway around the world, so I decided I might just as well go right around. I could have arranged to attend the American Sociological Association meeting in New York at the end of my trip, but I thought I would be tired of attending meetings, so decided, "I'm going to spend my last three days in Geneva, Switzerland." And I did. I can't remember any other ASA meeting I've missed.

VDT: Amazing! Can you give me a quick idea of the early PAA meetings? Of course, many people have told me about the small intimate group that usually met at Princeton. The ambiance was very different from what it is now.

GLICK: I remember one time, maybe it was 1941--who was president in 1941? I think it was Pat Whelpton.

VDT: He was president in 1942.

GLICK: Yes. In 1941 he came back from the meeting and my superior Richard Lang asked who was elected president for the next year and Pat said, "I was," in a very casual way. He didn't make a big thing out of it. Pat was quite a man. Of course, I had a lot of dealings with him through the years. He was at Scripps [Foundation for Research in Population Problems]. He made all these projections of the future U.S. population. It was supposed to start going down about 1960. And as the birth rate began going up, he said, "Well, it's just temporary. It will just be for a little while." He had worked so hard, cross-classifying all the characteristics and projecting them, it just had to be right. That was a sad thing. He finally had to say, "I guess you just can't predict under certain circumstances." At the PAA meeting in Cincinnati in 1953, Phil Hauser made a statement about if you can accurately predict when the peak and the trough of trends are going to happen, you could become a rich man.

The next time the meeting was in Cincinnati, I was president. That was 1967. We could not go

into the South because blacks couldn't go into the same hotel as whites and Cincinnati was as close to the South as we could go, so I helped to arrange to have it there. A secondary reason was it was near my home where I grew up, in southern Indiana.

VDT: Tell about your time as secretary-treasurer, 1962-65. You've written a wonderful vignette about the Committee on Organizational Management ["PAA Committee on Organizational Management: 1966-67," PAA Affairs, Summer 1982], the big issue that flared up when you were president in 1966-67. But can you recall issues that were important when you were secretary-treasurer? You are, I think, the only one who's been secretary-treasurer and then immediately president. You just said that you ran against Ansley Coale for president.

GLICK: Of course, I had been second vice-president and first vice-president before I was secretary-treasurer. So there was a lot of personal exposure. I worked hard. I remember Chris Tietze helped in saying at the end of my time as secretary-treasurer that the members were very grateful for my good work during those three years.

VDT: The secretary-treasurer's work was beginning to increase enormously because the membership numbers were increasing with Don Bogue's promotion of Demography [first published in 1964].

GLICK: Another of my bits of humor. All the money from all the dues came into my office and my secretary said she felt it was like her money she was carrying downstairs to the bank in the basement. Yes, it was getting burdensome. I figured about 20 percent of my secretary's time was going into the work on that. We had to make announcements and programs and so on. I had to arrange for the printing and the like. Then Andy Lunde was the next one [secretary-treasurer 1965-68] and the last one who had this burden at the expense of a government agency. Finally, they decided to negotiate with the American Statistical Association to take care of such logistics.

VDT: That partly came out of the recommendations of the Committee on Organizational Management that you set up during your presidency. But they went beyond simply recommending that there should be a paid business office. The other proposals, that you wrote about so well in your vignette, included active recruitment to expand the membership, establishing professional standards for PAA membership, including two classes of members, and a small grants research program. And it was all shot down by Ansley Coale [incoming president] and the membership.

GLICK: Yes. Well, I did my duty by getting that committee together to make this appraisal of future directions of the organization. When I went in as secretary-treasurer, there were about 600 members [660 in 1962]. But by the time I was president-elect and president, it was up to about 1,200 [1,283 in 1965; 1,375 in 1966; 1,435 in 1967]. One reason was Don Bogue got in the act and sent out 30,000 announcements of PAA's benefits and he got oodles of people to join the organization during those years.

VDT: So that's how he built up his subscription list to Demography?

GLICK: Yes, the new journal, which Cal Schmid [president 1965-66] and I got money for.

VDT: You got a \$30,000 three-year grant from the National Science Foundation [after the first year of publication].

GLICK: Yes, and we had to work out some figures to show how, when the three years of the grant

were over, we could take the load on from there, would jack up the dues a certain amount. Actually, I think they didn't quite use all of it in three years and they stretched it out another year or two and then they phased it out. Lived happily from there on out and haven't had any money problems, I don't think, for many, many years.

VDT: Of course, there was Don Bogue's infamous last issue ["Progress and Problems of Fertility Control Around the World," special issue of Demography, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1968], the big thick white one with the inverted Indian family planning red triangle on it, that was violently objected to. But he paid all the bills for that from his Community and Family Study Center.

GLICK: We had a bit of a problem from time to time with Don Bogue when he was editor. And then our executive committee would meet with him and tell him how we thought things should be done. He would argue some and then he did it the way he wanted to do it. As long as he was paying the bill, what could we say? But he gave us a good start. The first editor after him was Dudley Duncan's wife Beverly. She was my pick for that. I thought she was a businesslike person and would do a good job. And she did.

VDT: What do you think of Demography as it's developed over the years? It's a very sober and scholarly publication.

GLICK: Well, it's done fine. The only problem is--I haven't published anything in there for a number of years simply because of the kinds of statistical analysis one has to do to get published in it. I remember even back in the time when Charlie Nam was editor [1972-75; following Beverly Duncan, 1969-72], that was when they were beginning to get these high-powered statistical procedures into the articles. He said, "I always put those articles at the end of the issue." I liked that. I guess I'm just too old to start learning all that. I heard somebody make a speech here at ASU the other day, a retiree from the faculty. He said the same thing.

I still don't have too much trouble getting stuff published. I don't publish in Demography or American Sociological Review or in the American Journal of Sociology where I used to. But I publish in the family journals and I have very rarely, if ever, had one rejected by their editors. As a matter of fact, I've had four articles published by them in the last two years and another one coming up. I published one last November called "Fifty Years of Family Demography." 1988 was the 50th year of the National Council on Family Relations and I was asked to be one of four authors of special articles about developments during those 50 years. They have four issues a year and there was one special article in each. Mine was in the November issue.

VDT: What's the name of their journal?

GLICK: Journal of Marriage and the Family. You probably wouldn't know any of the other three journals. They're mostly for family sociologists, home economists, and family counselors.

VDT: Back to PAA. Could you tell me about Kurt Mayer, who was secretary-treasurer just before you [1959-62]? He's one I will not get to interview in this series; he lives in Switzerland.

GLICK: I didn't know too much about him. But I remember when I was about to follow him as secretary-treasurer, I went to a meeting where he was giving his finale and he gave me a check--all the money that belonged to the Population Association--and I carried it in my pocket even to De Pauw, where my son was a student at the time. It wasn't a lot, \$350 or so. He had apparently done a reasonably good job as secretary-treasurer. PAA was in the black, but only three or four hundred

dollars.

VDT: And Cal Schmid [president immediately before Glick]. He is again someone whom I will not get to interview.

GLICK: Cal Schmid once said he regarded me as one of his best friends. He was at the University of Washington umpteen years and the father of census tract statistics in that area for many, many years--and in the U.S. too. He would go to Hawaii for a spring holiday. My brother Clarence is out there, professor of sociology at the University of Hawaii. Clarence is retired now. I talked to him on the phone just two or three weeks ago when I came back from Australia and New Zealand. We had a fuel stop in Hawaii.

Cal Schmid attended many meetings of our Census advisory committee on population statistics, something the population division carried on for years. I was the coordinator for about ten or 15 years before I retired. Cal was well advanced in census tract technology. That's the main thing I can remember about him.

A little footnote. There came a point when Howard Brunsman was offered a candidacy to be president-elect of PAA. Irene Taeuber and I were on the nominating committee and we offered it to him. He said, "I have some other things I want to do" and he turned it down. So we offered it to Calvin Schmid--might have done it anyway, but that's the way it worked out.

Calvin Schmid was president the year before I was and he did something that may make you amused at what I say. My last act as secretary-treasurer was to send out a six-by-eight card to each PAA member with questions about their background and professional experience to be returned when they sent in their dues. I had in the back of my mind that if I ever got to be president, I would like to use that information for my presidential address. But Cal Schmid asked me if he could have that for his presidential address ["Some Remarks Concerning Contemporary American Demographers and Demography," Population Index, October 1966]. And he did use it and he did it very effectively. He also got out a nice little brochure with all the statistics about the membership. He knew I had collected this information. It didn't occur to him that I might want to publish it myself. Anyway, we've been good friends ever since.

VDT: It seems to me that the Census Bureau and other federal government demographers used to be more prominent than they now are in the PAA leadership, especially among the presidents. Now they're almost all academics, though the secretary-treasurers seem to have been mostly non-academics. What do you think accounts for that? Well, you had your little coterie in the Census Bureau when you first went there.

GLICK: You know how many departments of demography there are in the United States? Darn few. I don't know the answer, but I know that there aren't very many and demography is always sort of a tag-on of sociology. That's one thing we found from that study. About 60 some percent in the PAA are sociologists, then some 30 percent or so are economists, and the rest trail off.

VDT: That was in the mid-1960s.

GLICK: It probably isn't far from that today. I remember the Footnotes of the American Sociological Association about four-five years ago published a table showing how many requests they had received for jobs teaching certain subjects and how many were offering to teach certain subjects. The number offering to teach demography was very small, but the number asked to teach demography was at the top of the list! What I'm saying is demography is new, relatively speaking. And now it comes more in the vein of academia than it does in the government and elsewhere.

VDT: What do you think of PAA meetings nowadays? You continue to come--you don't want to break your record. But now we're up to 84 sessions, eight overlapping, Saturday afternoon sessions, all these splitoff workshops, and over 1,200 people at the last meeting in Baltimore. Do you still enjoy them?

GLICK: Just to illustrate the strength of my interest. I was all set to go on this trip to Australia and New Zealand on the third of April, but the PAA meeting in Baltimore ended on April first. I went to the meeting for the first two days and then I came back early. But I wanted to be there for that Wednesday night bash, which is one of the best parts of the whole meeting. And then, of course, all the other chances to see and talk to people. It's always a great treat. There's getting to be a little skimpier number of people of my vintage who are there. In fact, there are hardly any demographers of my age at the ASA meetings anymore.

VDT: Well, I hope you will go on and on. Our meetings couldn't go on without you. You've just pointed out that demography is rather a new field. It's still rather elitist. There are just about 2,600 members in PAA [2,679 at the end of 1989]. Of course, 1,200 people--not all members--attend the meetings. The membership has been stuck about that number since the mid-1970s, which is far smaller than the ASA, for instance.

GLICK: I don't see anything wrong with that. When I was president of the National Council of Family Relations in 1979 they had 5,500 members; now they have 3,700 members. It actually declined. It's just that there's been a slacking off. I think the American Sociological Association doesn't grow much anymore. People have other ways to spend their money. They have, goodness knows, a myriad of other associations and demands on their income.

It doesn't bother me if the PAA is in a sort of stagnation. I think that it constitutes a significant body of intellectuals who are interested in an important field. As a matter of fact, you're not going to see the college enrollment go up much anymore because of the decline in the birth rate. So what's wrong with that? I've heard speeches along that line: Don't worry about zero population growth.

VDT: I was going to ask that: What do you see as the outlook for U.S. population trends? You've just said don't worry about zero population growth. Are you still an optimist that marriage is here to stay, despite rising cohabitation, divorce, out-of-wedlock births?

GLICK: I could refer you to an article that was published in the December 1987 issue of the Journal of Family Issues, where the editor asked 16 of us to write what we thought of the trend in family life. He said, "Be brief, off the cuff, informal." I wrote a three-page item, which I entitled "A Demographer Takes Another Look at American Families." The title was going back to a paper I had read at a meeting of the National Council on Family Relations in 1974, entitled "A Demographer Looks at American Families." The journal editor analyzed the small papers. He classified them as either sanguine or concerned about the trends. I was one of three classified as still sanguine.

What do you expect? We're not back in the 1920s. Other things have changed so much, why shouldn't family life change? You may not like some of the consequences, but there are tradeoffs. You have obviously oodles of benefits from being able to control the size of family. And it may not be long until you can control the sex of offspring close to 100 percent. I just think it's a shame that people have to go through life without having the sex of children they like.

I wrote a paper which was presented on Friday the 13th of January, 1989, called "American Families: Where They Are and Were." It was given in Sarasota, Florida, at the first of a series, presumably, of conferences, organized by Evelyn Duvall. She had me give the number one speech.

My finale in that paper was something to the effect that there are those who think the trends are just a consequence of social changes and something to live with and others who think it's pretty bad and something important should be done about it. I said I thought there's much to be said on both sides. That's the way I have written from the beginning, a sort of balanced view. I don't take sides on issues. I just try to describe what the facts are on either side, maybe more so than to interpret them in terms of norms. Many people are so critical of the family trends that if you say anything otherwise, you're put in the sanguine pigeonhole.

But I said that if I were to recommend something, it is simply to exert effort toward supporting people in whatever type of family they are, whether they're married, single parent, alone, or whatnot. Just take the situation the way it is and do the best we can with it. And if divorce declines, I'll be perfectly happy with that. If cohabitation declines, I'll be happy with that. I'm not out to stomp to do anything to change that or any other aspect of the situation.

VDT: Great. Obviously, your own work now, continuing to write and publish and be asked to give papers, is all bound up with the question I asked: What do you see as the outlook for U.S. population trends and the family? You've told me you don't plan a new book, but you're still very much in demand for meetings and papers.

GLICK: I may have pretty much reached a turning point. I think that I'll be writing much less from here on out. I find myself frequently these days going to meetings and not even offering to write a paper. But that's okay; I haven't run out of invitations to write papers. I still have a research assistant, who is working on a project which I'm not sure feminists would like but it appeals to me. That is what are the characteristics of women who are employed in so-called men's occupations and what about men employed in so-called women's occupations. My research assistant has done some tabulations that begin to show what the results might be. Primarily with respect to their marital and family characteristics, naturally--that's my pet topic. I'm using the tape from that National Survey of Families and Households, which has a long list of topics that I want to relate and see how chosen characteristics apply to these 8 or 10 percent of men who are in women's occupations and 8 or 10 percent of women who are in men's occupations. Many of the others are in mixed occupations, but the majority of men are employed in traditional men's occupations and the majority of women in traditional women's occupations.

VDT: Still a new question! That's great. You've had a really fine career and life. And you are making some time for travel. Are you going to the IUSSP meeting in New Delhi in September?

GLICK: I should say not! I was at the international sociological meetings in Delhi in 1986 and that is such a bad place to breathe and live that I don't want to go back. It's sultry and uncomfortable, especially in August when I was there. One of the main reasons I accepted was to go and see if the Taj Mahal is as beautiful as it's pictured to be. And it is.

VDT: Have you got some final things that you would like to add? You said, for instance, you had prepared a list of little humorous touches.

GLICK: I have sort of worked them in as I went along. I thought there was no reason an interview like this shouldn't have some interesting spots. Maybe I have my maternal grandfather to thank. He was born in Northern Ireland, a Scotch-Irish man, and the Irish are supposed to have a sense of humor. And I always think of myself as having a sense of humor and I try to work those things in.

VDT: Sense of humor, yes. The Irish are not always noted for their optimism about life, but you

certainly have that.

INTERVIEW CONTINUES

VDT: We're just talking about the birth rate in the U.S. It now rounds off to 1.9. It's been 1.8, so it's up a notch.

GLICK: The latest reports from the National Center for Health Statistics show the birth rate up a small amount. But they haven't yet published this information by age and that would show, I hear, that the people in their thirties are coming along with their delayed births. The 17-, 18-, and 19-year-olds are a small crop these days and they're not producing many births.

VDT: I interviewed Richard Easterlin a few days ago and he still stands by his prediction that because the baby-busters are going to have it much easier than the baby-boomers did when they get to working ages, they will have higher fertility. But I don't think that's what accounting for our little upturn so far.

GLICK: I have said that I think the change in the direction of the marriage squeeze may make for a bit more stability too, because in those times when women are scarce, historically, they've had more family stability. When they've been in the excess, you've had more instability. There's a book called Too Many Women. It goes way back into history and it supports the same general idea.

VDT: And right now we're in a period when because of the decline in the birth rate 20 years ago, the baby bust . . .

GLICK: We have a scarcity of young women now.

VDT: More men than women in the marriageable ages. The men are born a few years ahead of the women.

GLICK: An excess of men, yes. So this should be a good time for women . . .

VDT: To find a man and stick with him. Okay! Thank you.

Published in The Arizona Republic on Jan. 24, 2006.

Dr. Paul C. Glick

Dr. Paul C. Glick was born on a farm Sept 22, 1910 near Columbus, Ind. to Elmer and Mattie Glick. He passed away Jan 19 after an almost 3 week struggle with pneumonia. BA (1933) DePauw U (Phi Beta Kappa), MA (1935) & PhD (1938) U of Wisconsin-Madison all in Sociology. WWII veteran 1944-45, US Census Bureau – Family Analyst 1939-43 & 1945-48, Chief of Social Statistics Branch 1949-1962, Senior Demographer 1972-81. Adjunct Professor, Arizona State U, Sociology 1982-92. Silver Medal US Dept of Commerce 1953. Gold Medal US Department of Commerce 1970, Fellow, American Public Health Association 1970, E.W. Burgess Award, National Council on Family Relations 1973. Stuart A Rice Award, DC Sociological Society 1976. Award for A Career of Distinguished Contributions to the Practice of Sociology, American Sociological Association 1988. Fellow, American Statistical Association 1990. President of the District of Columbia Sociological Society 1960-61. President of the Population Association of America 1966-67. Chairman of the American Statistical Association 1977. President of the National Council on Family Relations 1978-79. Author of "American Families" 1957, "Marriage and Divorce: A Social and Economic Study" with Hugh Carter 1976, "The Population of the United States of America" 1974. "The Population of the United States: Trends and Prospects, 1950 to 1990" 1974. Dr Glick also was the author of chapters in seven other books and had over 100 articles published in professional publications. Married to Joy Victoria Usher in 1938 and was

widowed in 1983. Two sons: Paul Jr 1943 and David 1946, Two grandchildren: Wendy Glick and Colleen Head & two great grandchildren: Jessica & Austin Turner. A memorial will be held on Sat Jan 28 at 3 PM at Friendship Village at 2645 E Southern Ave, Tempe, AZ.



Permanence of Marriage

Author(s): Paul C. Glick

Source: *Population Index*, Oct. - Dec., 1967, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1967), pp. 517-526

Published by: Office of Population Research

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/2732328>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Office of Population Research is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Population Index*

JSTOR

C U R R E N T I T E M S

PERMANENCE OF
MARRIAGE*

Several of us demographers now on the staff of the Bureau of the Census began our careers with the Bureau

back in 1939. During the intervening period of nearly three decades, we and our colleagues have shared a common interest in searching for new ways to develop information on population that would be more and more responsive to the statistical needs of our times. With each turn of national events, a new emphasis has emerged in the demands for population facts to guide administrative decisions and to satisfy the demographic needs of the academic and business community.

At the present time, several surveys are being made by the Bureau for the light they can throw on various aspects of poverty. One of these surveys, for the Office of Economic Opportunity, was designed to study the relationship between poverty and problems of married life, such as early marriage, broken marriage, and difficulty in becoming married. But besides serving the central purpose of the study, the survey will make contributions also by increasing our general knowledge about married life. The results will significantly extend the progress made in the 1960 Census toward a better understanding of the close relationship between marriage patterns, on the one hand, and social and economic factors on the other./1

Current and Future Research

This Survey of Economic Opportunity, as it is called, is being conducted by the Bureau of the Census at the request, and with the financial assistance, of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In March and April 1967, the Bureau collected data for the study from a special sample of 30,000 households. These households were living at the same addresses as households that had been visited a year earlier in connection with a survey conducted by the Bureau for the OEO. In the 1966 survey, data had been obtained on several of the usual census questions, including marital status, age, race, education, occupation, and income.

The 1967 survey contains many of the same questions, plus questions on the marital history of each adult and on reasons for change, if any, in residence during the past year. The reasons for a change of residence include marriage, divorce, or a death in the family. The questions on marital history provide the first information the Bureau has ever collected in a single survey on several critical points in the person's adult life: date of first marriage; when and how the first marriage ended, if it is not still intact; whether married once, twice, or three or more times;

Editor's Note.—This is the revised text of the address delivered by Paul C. Glick, U. S. Bureau of the Census, President of the Population Association of America, at the banquet on the evening of April 28, 1967, at Cincinnati, Ohio, as part of the annual meeting of the Association.

*The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect official positions taken by the Bureau of the Census.

date of most recent marriage; and when and how the most recent marriage ended, if it is not still intact.

This group of questions is rather formidable, yet it was strongly recommended to the Bureau by the Population Association's Committee on Population Statistics in a statement prepared by Ronald Freedman. The questions were also endorsed by the Bureau's Census Advisory Committee on Population Statistics for inclusion in the 1970 Census, if certain questions are to be asked of a sample smaller than 25 per cent. The questions asked in 1967 were carefully selected to show, among many other things, the characteristics of persons in relation to how long their marriages last.

But this series of questions would have been still further strengthened in its usefulness to predict permanence of marriage if it had included a few additional queries. These additional questions, which we shall keep in mind for future surveys, cover a few "unchanging" but key characteristics of absent or former spouses, regardless of how long ago the spouse left or when the marriage was dissolved. They are simply date of birth, race, and education of each absent or former spouse. These questions would fill a gap in the information on the permanence or impermanence of marriage by telling us how many husbands and wives of given ages, races, and education entered marriage together a given number of years ago (5, 10, 20, or 30) so that the proportion of marriages remaining intact could be determined for each cohort.

The potential value of the research already in process on the 1967 survey on factors in the permanence of marriage seems likely to be quite substantial. To illustrate, tabulation plans have been designed to yield, among other things, national figures on the probabilities of marriage, dissolution of marriage, and remarriage. More specifically, the tabulations will show: the probability that single persons of given age and educational level will marry within a year; the probability that persons who entered their first marriage at a given age, who have been married a given number of years, and who have a given amount of education will end their first marriage in divorce within a year, or will become widowed within a year; and the probability that divorced persons (or widowed persons) whose most recent marriage was dissolved at a given age, whose marriage has been dissolved a given number of years, and who have a given amount of education, will remarry within a year. The tables will be expanded to show the same detail but to replace education with income and presence and ages of children. Still other tabulations will show what proportion of persons of a given age and education have ever been divorced or ever been widowed or both, and how many children under 18 years live with a parent who has ever been divorced or widowed or both. All these tabulations are being designed to show separate data for persons living below the poverty level and for those above that level.

The proposed tabulations, plus others that can be readily made from the 1967 survey, should help answer numerous questions about the relationship between poverty or affluence, on the one hand, and permanence of marriage on the other. A few examples of such questions will be given here.

1. Do the negative effects of poverty on permanence of marriage

show up more distinctly in one phase of the marriage cycle than in another? Thus, does poverty disturb the marriage process most by keeping men from marrying at all? Or by causing them to end their first marriage—but not their second marriage—in divorce? Or by causing them not to attempt remarriage at all after having once or twice experienced divorce?

2. How much change in income level between 1966 and 1967 was required to produce a significant change in the marital status distribution? Thus, how much larger was the 1966-1967 average increase in income for men who married during the year than that for men who remained unmarried? Likewise, how large was the gap between the average income of men who remained married and the average income of those who became separated or divorced during the year? Were upward or downward changes in income more significantly correlated with changes in marital status among those with incomes below or near the poverty level or among those with incomes at successively higher levels?
3. Do relatively poor men have relatively permanent marriage if they have demonstrated steadiness in such other respects as having completed high school, postponed marriage until a mature age, risen to at least the average income level for men in their occupation, and shown evidence of planning the number and spacing of their children?

Perhaps one of the most valuable by-products of the 1967 survey, aside from the study of poverty, will be the estimates of trends in rates of first marriage, dissolution of marriage, and remarriage by age over the last two decades, for input to the Census Bureau's demographic model. This input will greatly facilitate the preparation of projections of various aspects of marriage, fertility, and family behavior. Moreover, these rates can be used to update and improve available actuarial tables on attrition from one marital status to another. Such tables are excellent tools not only for marriage research analysts and advanced students of demographic methods but also for marriage counselors, as will be discussed more fully in a later section.

The next step in the study of permanence of marriage is to collect data for a larger sample so that we can make tabulations similar to those just described for geographic areas below the national level. This goal would have been accomplished in 1968 if plans for a survey containing questions similar to those in the 1967 survey and covering a much larger nationwide sample had materialized. This survey would have covered about three million households, one half of this number being asked the questions on marital history in addition to some standard census questions and some new questions on ethnic origin. Marital data from this large sample (about three per cent of all households) would have greatly strengthened the statistical reliability of the national figures, compared with those from the 1967 study. The relatively small numbers of widowed and divorced persons in the age range for remarriage would have limited the amount of cross-classification one could show from the 1967 study at the national or regional level before "running out of cases." But the 1968 survey could have shown at least some of the more elementary details on marital history for each State, each metropolitan area, and each of one hundred

or so poverty areas.

Although the 1968 survey did not materialize, there is a strong probability—at the time of the revision of this address, August 1967—that the 1970 Census will include more detail on marital history than the 1960 Census. The questions to be asked in the 1970 Census will become rather firmly set by the fall of 1967. Looking beyond the 1970 Census, we see more and more favorable prospects for a full-scale 1975 Census. If that census should materialize, part of the data on marriage history may be updated at that time. With foresight and long-range planning, the Bureau should be able to use the various means at its disposal to satisfy most of the legitimate needs for additional research on the permanence of marriage. Like everything else, the patterns of marriage change over time, and that means that we cannot expect to learn all we need to know about permanence of marriage from the data in a single survey. By means of successive surveys we can keep up with the changes in these patterns through the decades.

“Mere Demography”

What we have been discussing here is limited to demographic research on permanence of marriage. Although we socio-economists may think highly of this research for the light it throws on social behavior, others may be inclined to scorn it as “mere demography.” They would not necessarily throw away what we develop but would want to see us add a lengthy battery of psychological questions on intelligence, temperament, attitudes, and the like. So would I. It would be most desirable to add not only an intelligence test but also a test of the person’s authoritarian versus equalitarian temperament, plus measures of his or her degree of achievement orientation and desire to be liked; also it would help considerably to have measures of conservatism or liberalism with respect to economics, politics, and religion. All these measures are being studied by the clinical and social psychologists because they appear to have great promise for increasing our understanding of the varied nature of personality organization both in and out of marriage./2

We should not be surprised if the Bureau of the Census and the National Center for Health Statistics do not add such questions to their surveys and vital records in the near future. This fact does not detract from the considerable potential of such questions for enriching the factual background on permanence of marriage. In other words, there is plenty of room for private research organizations to contribute the findings of their current and future research to the growing body of fact about what comes the closest to describing the ideal combinations of husbands and wives.

The willingness of the Office of Economic Opportunity to invest a substantial amount of its research funds in the 1967 survey for investigating the relationships between permanence of marriage and so-called “mere demographic” characteristics provides evidence that the Federal Government considers the research important. Such support reflects the deep concern of the OEO about the way in which marital and economic problems fit together, the way these problems develop and vanish, and the role of administrative agencies in providing solutions to these problems. Certainly, insofar as these solutions require additional funds to alleviate

the problems of the poor, the more relevant "hard facts" that can be presented on the subject, the more convincing should be the arguments of those in charge of the poverty program.

Optimum Mate Selection

If we take another point of view, we see that further research on permanence of marriage should facilitate the process of judicious mate selection. The findings should be especially useful to those who lack the perspective and insight to make the most of their potential for entering into and continuing in a permanent marriage with a partner who comes reasonably close to being an ideal husband or wife for "persons like them." Even those who have a good understanding of their own strengths and weaknesses may not possess reliable intuitive knowledge about the types of persons of the opposite sex who are most likely to have permanent marriages with "persons like them."

Of course, not all the questions concerning the achievement of permanent marriage will be answered by the results of the surveys described above. But the results should help considerably at various levels of presentation to correct false impressions and reinforce reliable evidence about the permanence of marriage. Summaries of the results could be incorporated in popular magazine articles, and the facts could be treated more intensively in sociology and family life courses in high schools and colleges as well as in handbooks for marriage and family counselors. Also, the methodology for collection and analysis of the data could be covered in appropriate courses on population.

Research on the permanence of marriage would not have as one of its goals the elimination of divorce, but it would be designed to help adults take a more rational approach to marriage. Hopefully, the findings of this research would help minimize preventable divorce and separation. Certainly, such research can be expected to add greatly to the evidence on the large proportion of marital failures that are associated with marriages formed at an early age and under more or less haphazard circumstances. With this evidence before them, young persons could be more effectively informed of the high rates of successful marriage among those properly matched and the high rates of divorce among those ill-equipped to make any marriage last. To the extent that research provides reliable information about the combinations of husbands and wives that make for the most permanent marriages, and to the extent that people act in accordance with this information, some divorces should be prevented, whereas others may be generated. There will always be instances of marital failure that occurs despite objective, rational, and deliberate efforts to bring together "the right kinds of people." /3

One of the first steps in any program for getting "the right kinds of people" together is to acquaint them with a number of the "best" potential marital partners in the local area. This matching process, instead of occurring informally, through chance meeting, should occur well ahead of the time that the couple decide to marry. Moderately aggressive persons generally succeed in finding a tolerable-or-better partner to marry, and the number of moderately aggressive persons is large, inasmuch as projections indicate that all but two to four per cent of today's young

adults will eventually marry. The problem, therefore, is not so much to help young adults avoid lifelong bachelorhood or spinsterhood as it is to help them select an appropriate partner while they are in the optimal age range for marriage.

The electronic computer is now being used to help unmarried persons living in metropolitan areas meet the kinds of persons they would like to date. One such commercial enterprise, known as Date-List, was started over a year ago near the University of Maryland campus. For five dollars per year an adult can obtain the services of this dating bureau, which has files on thousands of "datables" from three dozen cities in the Middle Atlantic states. Each member is required to complete a well-conceived eight-page Dating Compatibility Questionnaire, covering a host of ingenious questions organized in seven sections:

Section 1. Personal profile (your demographic characteristics and those of your ideal date).

Section 2. General characteristics (your personality traits and physical appearance, and those of your ideal date).

Section 3. Attitudes and preferences (your own and your ideal date's attitudes toward various types of social behavior, opinions, and goals).

Section 4. Interests (your degree of interest in a variety of recreational and family-type activities that might be shared on dates or engaged in individually).

Section 5. Personal philosophy (the importance you attach to various types of experience that reflect your ideas about maturity, success, happiness, and stability).

Section 6. Situations (what you would do in specified situations that test your integrity, and how important it is for your date to react as you would).

Section 7. Psychological imagination (a kind of Rorschach test of fastidiousness, degree of energy, and emotionality).

This summary of the subjects covered by Date-List's questionnaire shows what can be done by a computerized dating bureau that makes no claim to a scientific origin and has no research interest, no foundation support, no affiliation with any parent organization, and no announced intention of becoming a matrimonial agency. Date-List is simply a thriving commercial organization committed to helping people, most of them college educated, find others whom they would enjoy dating. Date-List is now expanding its services to arrange parties for its members at Washington, Baltimore, and Richmond night clubs. At least one couple who has used this service has become happily married, much to the satisfaction of the company's President, Mrs. Rayetta Gregory.

The evident success of this and other similar ventures in match-making shows that sophisticated persons have accepted this form of introduction. If the managers of these introduction services were to add the results of research on the permanence of marriage to their other resources, they would be able to make even more appropriate decisions about the kinds of persons who match each other. They would undoubtedly find that some types of persons match a wide range of potential partners while others match only a narrow range.

The research under discussion should really do more than assist in mate selection. The research should also provide information on the

importance of optimum relationships after marriage. Thus, the relative importance of various factors that make a marriage permanent could be assessed through census research in process and other research under consideration. Prominent among these factors would be the husband's ability to maintain a moderate-to-good income level for the family, the number and spacing of the children, the agreement of the husband's and wife's religious affiliations, and the types of recreational and social activities in which the husband and wife participate jointly or separately.

Marriage Quotients

I suggest the use of the term "marriage quotient" to refer to the probability that certain unmarried persons, when married, will become permanent marital partners, and the probability that certain couples already married will remain permanently married. Suppose I were to ask the question, "What is your marriage quotient?" How would the question be interpreted?

If you are already married, your marriage quotient is the probability that married couples similar to you and your partner will remain married "until death do ye part." If you are single, widowed, or divorced, you have as many marriage quotients as you have kinds of potential marriage partners. For example, if you are a single man of type A, your marriage quotient would be 100, or about average, if you were to marry a woman of type Z. But your marriage quotient would be 125, or very high, if you were to marry a woman of type Y and 75, or quite low, if you were to marry a woman of type X. Thus, to repeat, the unmarried person has as many marriage quotients as he has kinds of eligible marriage partners.

Moreover, the marriage quotient for a given couple would change over time if something significant were to change the relationship between husband and wife. For example, a 50 per cent increase in the husband's salary, or a deliberate discussion between the husband and wife, could produce a very significant change in the couple's marriage quotient.

A marriage quotient could be as fixed or as flexible over time as the economic climate in which the couple live, or as the husband and wife are fixed or flexible in their individual ways of living. Much would depend on the value that husband and wife place on permanent marriage, and much would depend on their ability to find acceptable means of passing over marital hurdles.

Treating Marital Problems

The thesis presented here is that valuable help in the diagnosis and treatment of marital troubles could be obtained from a large number of carefully designed statistical tables on probabilities of permanent marriage, provided that these tables were made available to experts who know how to use them. We can imagine, for instance, how much more effective a good marriage counselor would be if he and his technical assistants could add to their numerous reference materials a series of books containing such marriage tables, each book covering a different subgroup of the population or a different phase of the marriage cycle. Armed with

such research products, counselors could deal more confidently with problems of prevention, cure, and rehabilitation in the marriage field. In time they might proceed with as much confidence in their field as physicians, surgeons, and psychiatrists in theirs—and these last three groups are still short of 100 per cent. It has taken medical science a long time to arrive at its present stage, and it could take at least several decades for marriage counseling to arrive at a similar stage of maturity.

Potential clients of the marriage counselors could take action on the basis of simplified versions of these aids to marital health. People using these aids could “professionalize” their approach to their marriage problems. They could observe their marriages as objectively, intelligently, and sympathetically as the calm parents who apply first aid to their ill or injured child. They could decide whether their marital situation could be treated by home remedies or whether it called for consultation with a marriage counselor. The time may come when people contemplating divorce will accept the advice of a highly skilled and trusted marriage counselor just as readily and confidently as they now, if suffering from physical illness, accept the advice of a trusted physician.

One could expect that the marriage counselor would have difficulty treating marital problems resulting from the inability of the husband and wife to provide food for their undernourished children. But the physician would find it equally difficult to prescribe medical treatment for these undernourished children. Another situation beyond the control of a marriage counselor is that of the middle-aged widow or divorcee who wants to remarry but is faced with a deficit of eligible men./4

Resistance to treatment of marital health problems may take many forms. For example, the married couple with a very low marriage quotient may accept their situation because they feel their religious training encourages endurance in marital adversity, or because they regard the professionalizing of attitudes toward one’s own marriage or toward that of a near relative as too cold and calculating. Certainly one would expect to find the most objective attitudes about marriage among well educated married couples, though poorly educated couples generally need more help to make their marriages last.

Maximum resistance could be expected from unmarried persons whom the marriage counselor would objectively, yet sympathetically, advise not to marry until they had brought their conceptions of themselves into focus. Some of these persons underestimate their own worth and, accordingly, are prone to marry someone they do not respect; others overestimate themselves and, as a consequence, fail to find a person “worthy” of them. Whether these misguided persons, their parents, or others are responsible for their erroneous self-evaluations may be quite relevant to the understanding of how the misconceptions developed and how they can be corrected.

Summary and Conclusion

The foregoing discussion has ranged well beyond the opening discussion of current research in the area of social and economic factors related to permanence of marriage. Looking beyond the compilation of

research findings on these "mere demographic" factors has served to set forth some of the practical uses of these findings. These uses include the provision of additional factual information to help people help themselves, or their students, or their clients, to understand the kinds of husbands and wives who, when most of the relevant factors are considered, are optimum marital partners for each other.

Several uses of research on permanence of marriage, to facilitate optimum mate selection and to minimize divorce and separation, have been described. The term "marriage quotients" has been introduced to refer to probabilities of permanent marriage that can guide the mate-selection process and aid in the recurrent evaluation of the viability of marriages.

Appropriate education or re-education, grounded in experience and documented by research, has been proposed as a means of cultivating "professionalism" in adults' attitudes toward their marital problems. Marriage counselors, family life teachers, and journalists have been viewed as the ultimate agents in this educational process, and these agents are likely to be most effective if their words and actions are supported by facts instead of "individual experience, colorful assertions or authoritarian pronouncements." /5

FOOTNOTES

- 1/ Five special reports of the 1960 Census present detailed cross-classifications of data on marital status, age at first marriage, and related subjects. See U. S. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population: 1960, Volume II: 4A, Families; 4B, Persons by Family Characteristics; 4C, Sources and Structure of Family Income; 4D, Age at First Marriage; and 4E, Marital Status. Also a book-length monograph, based largely on these 1960 Census reports and to be sent to print in 1968, has been drafted by Hugh Carter and Paul C. Glick, Marriage and Divorce: A Social and Economic Study. This is one of a series of monographs being sponsored by the American Public Health Association.
- 2/ See the work of the Harvard professors, Talcott Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1956) and more recent articles by these authors in various publications.
- 3/ Illustrations of earlier research on scientific match-making and on predicting success in marriage are: Ernest W. Burgess and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1939); Lewis M. Terman, et al., Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938); Karl Miles Wallace (with Eve Odell), Love Is More Than Luck: An Experiment in Scientific Matchmaking (New York: Funk, 1957); Jessie Bernard, Remarriage: A Study of Marriage (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1956); Harvey J. Locke, Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of a Divorced and a Happily Married Group (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951); Robert F. Winch, Mate-Selection: A Study of Complementary Needs (New York: Harper and Row, 1958); and Hyman Rodman, Marriage, Family, and Society

(New York: Random House, Inc., 1965).

- 4/ This deficit of middle-aged men who are eligible to marry could be reduced, eliminated, or even changed to an excess by various steps, perhaps all of which would have demographic "side effects." Thus, couples a generation or two hence may be able to take advantage of progress in applied genetics to reduce the number of unwanted children through control not only of the number and spacing but also of the sequence of their children by sex. ("Take a pink pill if you want a girl, a blue pill if you want a boy, and a white pill if you want none.") It is assumed that this step would reduce fertility but, in the process, increase the proportion of babies who are boys. From the standpoint of middle-aged persons, the optimum result would occur when such control had raised the proportion of boy babies just enough so that the surplus of eligible middle-aged widowed, divorced, and never-married persons who wanted to marry would be reduced to zero. One of the probable side effects for young adults would be a gradual increase in the excess of the average age of the husband over that of the wife at first marriage; another side effect might be a higher average age of the wife, than of husband at remarriage during middle age. Besides changing the sex ratio at birth, another way—with a minimum of side effects—to alleviate the deficit of eligible middle-aged grooms would be to promote measures designed to reduce death rates among young adult and middle-aged men. This alternative was advanced in a letter, dated May 5, 1967, from Herbert I. Sauer. Another alternative would be to permit women to share more fully in the tension-producing occupations that take a heavy toll of men's lives. This last step, however, would probably have the negative demographic side effect of increasing death rates for women from more causes than it would lower; at the same time, the more nearly equal sharing of occupations by the two sexes might lower the death rates for men.
- 5/ From a statement by Kerr L. White, M.D., of the Johns Hopkins University on decisions reached by State health planning councils: "Medical Care Statistics and Health Services System," presented at the Eleventh National Meeting of the Public Health Conference on Records and Statistics, Washington, D. C., June 22, 1966.

GRADUATE TRAINING
PROGRAMS IN DEMOGRAPHY
UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The University of Southern California's Department of Sociology and Anthropology and its Population Research Laboratory announce a graduate training program in the

Demography of Social Disorganization. This program is supported by the Social Sciences Research Training Program of the National Institute of Mental Health and is designed to provide an integrated four year course of studies leading toward the Ph.D. in Sociology, with specialization in population studies and social disorganization. National Institute of Mental Health Training Fellowships are available. Awards are for \$1,800 to \$3,000 per year for up to four years with \$500 annual allowance for each dependent and remission of all tuition and fees. Summer Research Internships and training are provided in the Population Research Laboratory, Youth Studies Center, and Rossmoor-Cortese Institute for the Study of