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## CONTRACEPTIVE UTILIZATION AMONG CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN 15-44 YEARS OF AGE: UNITED STATES, $1973^{1}$

An estimated 18.5 million, or 69.6 percent, of all the married couples in the United States in 1973 were using contraceptive methods to plan their families, according to results from Cycle I of the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG). These figures represent a continuing increase in the proportion of married couples using contraception which has been observed through the sixties. In 1960, 50.4 percent of currently married women were using contraception, as indicated by a nationwide sample survey taken in that year. ${ }^{2}$ The National Fertility Studies of 1965 and 1970 showed the proportion of couples currently using contraception had continued to rise to 63.9 percent and 65.0 percent in the respective years. ${ }^{3}$

In addition to an increased proportion of couples using contraceptive methods, the type of methods used has also been changing (figure 1). In 1973, 12.8 million couples were using the pill, the intrauterine device (IUD), or steriliza-

[^0]tion. For convenience, since they have been known or widely accepted as methods of family planning only since 1960 , these methods are referred to in this report as the modern methods of contraception. As seen in figure 1 , the use of modern contraceptive methods increased 13.9 percent among currently married women between 1965 and 1970 and 10.5 percent between 1970 and 1973. In other words, the proportion of couples using contraception (contraceptors)

who were using modern methods rose from about 37 percent in 1965 to almost 70 percent in 1973. This represents an increase in use of methods which have been shown to be more effective in preventing accidental pregnancies among married couples. ${ }^{4,5}$ The more traditional methods of family planning, including the condom, the diaphragm, foam, rhythm, withdrawal, douche, and other methods, ${ }^{6}$ correspondingly declined during this period.

The statistics presented in this report are the latest nationwide statistics on contraceptive utilization. They are results from Cycle I of the NSFG, conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics. The NSFG was designed to provide information about fertility, family planning, and those aspects of maternal and child health that are closely related to childbearing. Data on these topics were collected by personal interviews with about 9,800 women aged 15-44 years who had ever been married or who had children of their own living in the household. The statistics in this report refer to the 7,566 women who were currently married at the time of the interview. The interviews were conducted between July 1973 and February 1974, and centered on September 13, 1973. Respondents were selected by a multistage, area probability, crosssectional sample of households in the conterminous United States. Further discussion of the survey design, definition of terms, and sampling variability will be found in the Technical Notes at the end of this report.

In data presented here the contraceptive status of currently married women and the methods they reported refer to the time of the interview. In an effort to plan their pregnancies, the proportion of couples currently using contraception ( 69.6 percent) is therefore smaller than the proportion who have ever used a method and smaller than the proportion who regularly use a method. The 14.3 percent of women who were pregnant at the time of interview, who were seeking pregnancy, or had just

[^1]completed a pregnancy (postpartum) included many who had previously used contraception and many who will return to the practice. Since these women, along with those who are completely sterile, are not "at risk" of an unplanned pregnancy, they are not included when measuring the current use of contraception to avoid unplanned births. In 1973 contraceptors comprised 89.0 percent of currently married women "at risk" of an unplanned pregnancy at the time of interview.

The percent of currently married women using contraception was not significantly different between wives $15-29$ years of age and wives 30-44 years of age (tables A, 1, and 2). Differences between the age groups in the reason for not using contraception largely reflect differences in stages of the life cycle. Most noncontracepting younger wives, those 15-29 years of age, were pregnant, postpartum, or trying to become pregnant; most noncontracepting older wives were sterile or other nonusers. Among these "other nonusers," the reasons for not using contraception included indifference to the risk of pregnancy, a low risk of pregnancy due to some impairment of fecundity, and religious or personal objections to contraception.

White wives ( 70.5 percent) were more likely than Negro wives ( 60.0 percent) to be using a contraceptive method. Among white wives aged 15-29 years, 70.7 percent were using a contraceptive method, and among Negro wives aged 15-29 years, 63.7 percent were using contraception. For the age groups $30-44$ years, 70.3 percent of white wives and 56.8 percent of Negro wives were using contraception.

Negro women were more likely than white women to be noncontraceptors for reasons other than childbearing and sterility. The proportion of women either currently pregnant, seeking pregnancy, postpartum, or sterile were about the same for Negro and white wives. However, 17.9 percent of Negro wives were not using contraception for other reasons compared with only 7.8 percent of white wives.

The modern methods of family planningthe pill, sterilization, and the IUD-dominated contraceptive practice. They were used by 69.2 percent of all currently married contraceptors (tables B, 3, and 4). The pill, the most popular method, was used by 36.1 percent, about 6.7 million women. Female sterilization for contra-

Table A. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to race and age: United States, 1973

ceptive reasons accounted for another 12.3 percent and male sterilization, for 11.2 percent. Altogether, about 4.4 million couples had one or the other partner sterilized for contraceptive rea-
sons. The IUD was used by 9.6 percent of contraceptors, about 1.8 million couples.

The more traditional methods (diaphragm, condom, foam, rhythm, withdrawal, douche,

Table B. Number and percent distribution of currently married women $15-44$ years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to race and age: United States, 1973

| Race and age | ```Number of contra- ceptors in thousands``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { contra- } \\ & \text { ceptors } \end{aligned}$ | Method of contraception |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female } \\ & \text { sterili- } \\ & \text { zation } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Male } \\ & \text { sterili- } \\ & \text { zation } \end{aligned}$ | Pi11 | IUD | Diaphragm | Condom | Foam | Rhythrn | Withdrawal | Douche | Other |
| ALL RACES |  | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years-- | 18,543 | 100.0 | 12.3 | 11.2 | 36.1 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 13.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 1.9 |
| 15-29 years--..------ | 8,451 | 100.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5.9 \\ 17.7 \end{array}$ | 5.316.1 | $\begin{aligned} & 53.6 \\ & 21.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 12.0 \\ 7.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \\ & 4.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.0 \\ & 16.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.1 \\ & 4.9 \end{aligned}$ | 2.0 | 2.7 | *0.4 | 1.6 |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.7 |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years---- | 17,102 | 100.0 | 11.6 | 11.9 | 35.5 | 9.4 | 3.6 | 14.1 | 5.0 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 0.7 | 1.9 |
| 15-29 years---------- | 7,756 9,346 | 100.0 100.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 5.7 \\ 16.5 \end{array}$ | 17.1 | 52.921.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 11.9 \\ 7.4 \end{array}$ | 2.64.4 | 17.1 | 5.34.7 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.0 \\ & 5.9 \end{aligned}$ | 2.8 | $* 0.3$1.0 | $\frac{1.7}{2.1}$ |
| NEGRO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years---- | 1,249 | 100.0 | 22.7 | \%1.7 | 43.8 | 12.7 | 2.0 | 5.3 | 5.0 | *1.3 | *0.7 | 3.0 | *1.6 |
| 15-29 years-------- | $\begin{aligned} & 614 \\ & 635 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 100.0 |  | $\% 0.7$ $\% 2.7$ |  | 12.4 | $\div 2.8$ | 7.5 | $\begin{array}{r} \approx 3.5 \\ 6.6 \end{array}$ | $\times 0.9$ | *0.9 | *2.1 | $\times 2.5$ |
| 30-44 years------w- |  | 100.0 | 35.2 | *2.7 | 24.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 |  |

and other) ${ }^{6}$ accounted for the remaining 30.7 percent of contraceptive use. Of these methods, the condom was most popular. It was used by 13.5 percent of currently married contraceptors, about 2.5 million couples. The diaphragm, foam, rhythm, withdrawal, douche, and other methods each accounted for 5 percent or less of contraceptive use.

Contracepting wives under age 30 ( 76.8 percent of contracepting wives aged $15-29$ years) were more likely than older wives ( 62.8 percent of contracepting wives aged $30-44$ years) to be using one of the more modern methods (table B). Among these younger wives, the pill, used by 53.6 percent of contraceptors, was the most popular method. The IUD was used by 12.0 percent of contraceptors; female sterilization, by 5.9 percent; and male sterilization, by 5.3 percent of contraceptors. In this age group, 23.1 percent were using the more traditional methods: the condom was employed by 10.0 percent of contraceptors; foam, by 5.1 percent; the diaphragm, by 2.5 percent; rhythm, by 2.0 percent; and withdrawal was used by 1.5 percent of contraceptors.

Among older wives ( $30-44$ years of age), sterilization was the most popular method including 17.7 percent who had been sterilized themselves and 16.1 percent whose husbands had been sterilized. The percents of older wives using the pill ( 21.4 percent) or the IUD (7.6 percent) were less than the percents using these methods among wives under 30 years of age ( 53.6 percent and 12.0 percent, respectively). The more traditional methods encompassed 37.2 percent of practice among older women. The condom was used by 16.4 percent; rhythm, by 5.7 percent; foam, by 4.9 percent; and the diaphragm, by 4.2 percent. Withdrawal accounted for 2.7 percent; douche, for 1.2 percent; and other methods accounted for 2.1 percent of these traditional contraceptive methods.

Although Negro women were less likely to use any contraception, those who did were more likely than white women to be using the more modern methods of pill, IUD, and sterilization. These methods were used by 80.9 percent of Negro contraceptors compared with 68.4 percent of white contraceptors. As a consequence, the difference in the proportion of all Negro and white currently married women 15-44 years of age using the modern methods of family plan-

ning was not statistically significant (48.6 percent of Negro wives and 48.2 percent of white wives, figure 3).

The percent of contraceptors selecting sterilization as their method did not differ significantly between white and Negro couples ( 23.5 percent and 24.4 percent, respectively). However, while male sterilization accounted for half of all contraceptive sterilizations among white couples, fewer than 1 in 10 sterilizations among Negro couples were performed on the husband.

The pattern of contraceptive practice among currently married women of Spanish origin (tables 5 and 6) is between that for white and Negro women. Contracepting couples account for 65.5 percent of all couples in which the wife is of Spanish origin compared with 70.5 percent of white couples and 60.0 percent of Negro couples. The percent of contraceptors using modern methods among wives of Spanish origin was about 4 percent greater than that among all white wives but nearly 9 percent lower than that among all Negro wives. Overall, the proportion of wives of Spanish origin who were protected

by the modern methods was not significantly different than in either of the other groups. About one in three contraceptive sterilizations was performed on the husband among couples with wives of Spanish origin, which is substantially more frequent than among Negro couples but well below the frequency among white couples.

Among the four major regions of the United States, differences in the percent of couples using contraception were not statistically significant, ranging from 67.6 percent in the South to 71.4 percent in the West (tables 7 and 8). Among those using contraception, the percent using the more modern methods was greatest in the West ( 79.8 percent) and smallest in the Northeast (56.9 percent).

The contraceptive practice of couples differs with total family income. In tables 9 and 10 family income is shown as a ratio of total family income to poverty level income, as defined by the Bureau of the Census. The proportion using contraception was lowest among wives with incomes below the poverty level, and this is seen among both younger and older wives. While modern methods of contraception were used by the large majority of contraceptors at all income levels, contracepting wives $30-44$ years of age with income twice the poverty level or more were less likely to be using these methods. The use of male sterilization, however, was highest among this group.

In tables 11 and 12 contraceptive status and the methods used by contraceptors are shown in relation to the parity of women (the number of live births they have had). The proportion of currently married women using contraception was higher for women with two or more children, but it was lower for those with five and more live births compared to those with two to four live births. Among those not using contraception, more women were pregnant, trying to become pregnant, or postpartum in the lower than in the higher parities. The proportion of noncontraceptors who were sterile was highest among women with five or more live births. In all parities, the modern methods were used by the majority of contraceptors, but the pill was most popular among the low parity women, many of whom wanted to have additional children, while sterilization was the most popular method among higher parity women, many of whom had all the children they wanted.

There was not a statistically significant difference in the percent of contraceptors between women in the labor force ( 70.5 percent) and those not in the labor force ( 68.9 percent, tables 13 and 14). A greater proportion of women not in the labor force are not using contraception for reasons associated with pregnancy, many of whom might otherwise be in the labor force. Women in the labor force have a higher proportion of noncontraceptors as a result of sterility and "other" reasons.

Table 1. Number of currently married women $15-44$ years of age by contraceptive status, race, and age: United States, 1973


Table 2. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by cortraceptive status, according to race and age: United States, 1973

| Race and age | ```Number of women in thousands``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { A11 } \\ \text { women } \end{gathered}$ | Contraceptors | Noncontraceptors |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Pregnant, postpartum, or seeking pregnancy | Sterile | Other nonusers |
| ALL RACES |  | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years---- | 26,646 | 100.0 | 69.6 | 30.4 | 14.3 | 7.5 | 8.6 |
| 15-19 years---------- | 1,028 | 100.0 | 57.0 | 43.0 | 35.8 | *0.4 | 6.8 |
| 20-24 years---------- | 4,949 | 100.0 | 71.2 | 28.8 | 22.9 | *0.3 | 5.6 |
| 25-29 years---------- | 6,063 | 100.0 | 71.6 | 28.4 | 21.0 | 2.2 | 5.2 |
| 30-34 years----------- | 5,248 | 100.0 | 74.3 | 25.7 | 12.0 | 6.3 | 7.5 |
| 35-39 years---------- | 4,632 | 100.0 | 70.0 | 30.0 | 6.2 | 11.9 | 11.8 |
| 40-44 years---------- | 4,726 | 100.0 | 62.4 | 37.6 | 2.6 | 20.3 | 14.7 |
| WHITE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years------ | 24,249 | 100.0 | 70.5 | 29.5 | 14.2 | 7.4 | 7.8 |
| 15-24 years---------- | 5,384 | 100.0 | 69.1 | 30.9 | 25.2 | \%0.3 | 5.4 |
| 25-34 years---------- | 10,347 | 100.0 | 73.7 | 26.3 | 16.6 | 4.1 | 5.6 |
| 35-44 years----------- | 8,518 | 100.0 | 67.6 | 32.4 | 4.4 | 16.0 | 12.0 |
| 15-44 years------ | 2,081 | 100.0 | 60.0 | 40.0 | 14.0 | 8.1 | 17.9 |
| 15-24 years---------- | 547 | 100.0 | 66.1 | 33.9 | 23.8 | \%0.6 | 9.5 |
| 25-34 years---------- | 819 | 100.0 | 63.1 | 36.9 | 17.0 | 4.6 | 15.3 |
| 35-44 years---------- | 715 | 100.0 | 51.8 | 48.2 | *3.0 | 17.8 | 27.5 |

Table 3. Number and percent distribution of currently married women $15-44$ years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to race and age: United States, 1973

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Race and age} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Number of contraceptors in thous ands} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{All contraceptors} \& \multicolumn{11}{|c|}{Method of contraception} <br>
\hline \& \& \& $$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Female } \\
\text { sterili- } \\
\text { zation }
\end{gathered}
$$ \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Male } \\
& \text { sterili- } \\
& \text { zation }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& Pi11 \& IUD \& Diaphragm \& Condom \& Foam \& Rhythm \& Withdrawal \& Douche \& other <br>
\hline ALL RACES \& \& \multicolumn{12}{|c|}{Percent distribution} <br>
\hline 15-44 years-- \& 18,543 \& 100.0 \& 12.3 \& 11.2 \& 36.1 \& 9.6 \& 3.4 \& 13.5 \& 5.0 \& 4.0 \& 2.1 \& 0.8 \& 1.9 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{15-19 years--------
$20-24$ years} \& 586 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{100.0
100.0} \& $* 0.1$ \& *0.7 \& 77.0 \& *5.3 \& \#1. 3 \& *7.9 \& $* 2.8$ \& *1.4 \& *1.4 \& $* 0^{\circ} .1$ \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$* 1.8$
$* 1.4$} <br>
\hline \& 3,524 \& \& 4.2 \& 2.5 \& 63.3 \& 11.3 \& *1.6 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
8.3
$$} \& 4.1 \& 2.0 \& *1.0 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
+0.3
$$} \& <br>
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{30-34 years--------} \& 4,342 \& 100.0 \& 8.1 \& 8.3 \& 42.6 \& 13.5 \& 3.4 \& \& 6.4 \& 2.1 \& 1.8 \& \& $* 1.4$

1.8 <br>
\hline \& 3,900 \& 100.0 \& 14.9 \& 14.4 \& 27.2 \& 11.3 \& 2.9 \& 15.2 \& 5.7 \& 4.4 \& 1.8 \& *0.6 \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1.8
+1.3
2.2} <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{35-39
$40-44$ years--------------} \& 3,241 \& 100.0 \& 17.6 \& 18.6 \& 20.2 \& 7.5 \& 4.7 \& 15.0 \& 4.5 \& 5.7 \& 3.2 \& *0.9 \& <br>
\hline \& 2,951 \& 100.0 \& 21.6 \& 15.7 \& 15.0 \& 2.8 \& 5.4 \& 19.6 \& 4.2 \& 7.4 \& 3.3 \& *2.0 \& 3.0 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{14}{|l|}{WHITE} <br>
\hline 15-44 years---- \& 17,102 \& 100.0 \& 11.6 \& 11.9 \& 35.5 \& 9.4 \& 3.6 \& 14.1 \& 5.0 \& 4.1 \& 2.2 \& 0.7 \& 1.9 <br>
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} \& 3,719 \& 100.0 \& \& 2.4 \& 64.4 \& \& *1.7 \& \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& 7,625 \\
& 5,758
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 100.0 \\
& 100.0
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 11.0 \\
& 17.6
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 11.7 \\
& 18.2
\end{aligned}
$$
\]} \& 35.0 \& 12.1 \& 3.2 \& 13.8 \& 6.1 \& 3.1 \& 1.8 \& *0. 6 \& 1.6 <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& \& 17.6 \& 5.2 \& 5.2 \& 17.9 \& 4.2 \& 6.9 \& 3.4 \& *1.2 \& 2.5 <br>
\hline \multicolumn{14}{|l|}{NEGRO} <br>
\hline 15-44 years---- \& 1,249 \& 100.0 \& 22.7 \& *1.7 \& 43.8 \& 12.7 \& 2.0 \& 5.3 \& 5.0 \& *1.3 \& $* 0.7$ \& 3.0 \& *1.6 <br>

\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& 15-24 \text { years--------- } \\
& 25-34 \text { years------- } \\
& 35-44 \text { years---- }
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 362 \\
& 517 \\
& 370
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 100.0 \\
& 100.0 \\
& 100.0
\end{aligned}
$$
\]} \& $* 6.4$ \& $* 0.1$ \& 73.6 \& 11.9 \& $\therefore 0.1$ \& $\div 2.1$ \& *2.5 \& *1. 5 \& *0.3 \& *1.5 \& <br>

\hline \& \& \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& 17.0 \\
& 46.6
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
* 2.8 \\
* 1.6
\end{array}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 42.9 \\
& 15.9
\end{aligned}
$$
\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{17.0

7.7} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{$$
\begin{aligned}
& * 2.9 \\
& * 2.7
\end{aligned}
$$} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.9 \\
& 9.1
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \[

6.6

\] \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

\pm 1.1

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& * 0.3 \\
& * 1.6
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& * 3.1 \\
& * 4.4
\end{aligned}
$$

\]} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& * 1 . \overline{2} \\
& * 3.8
\end{aligned}
$$
\]} <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& \& $$
* 5.3
$$ \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 4. Number of currently married women $15-44$ years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, race, and age: United States, 1973


Table 5. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to Spanish origin and age: United States, 1973

| Spanish origin and age | ```Number of women in thousands``` | A11 women | Contraceptors | Noncontraceptors |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Pregnant postpartum, or seeking pregnancy | Sterile | Other nonusers |
| TOTAL |  | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years---- | 26,646 | 100.0 | 69.6 | 30.4 | 14.3 | 7.5 | 8.6 |
| 15-44 years------ | 1,676 | 100.0 | 65.5 | 34.5 | 19.0 | 5.9 | 9.7 |
| 15-29 years <br>  | 770 906 | 100.0 100.0 | 67.6 63.7 | 32.4 36.3 | 26.2 12.8 | 10.9 | $* 6.2$ 12.6 |
| 15-44 years------ | 24,970 | 100.0 | 69.9 | 30.1 | 14.0 | 7.6 | 8.6 |
| 15-29 years---------- | 11,270 | 100.0 | 70.4 | 29.6 | 22.8 | 1.4 | 5.5 |
| 30-44 years----------- | 13,700 | 100.0 | 69.4 | 30.6 | 6.7 | 12.7 | 11.1 |

Table 6. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to Spanish origin and age: United States, 1973

| Spanish origin and age | ```Number Of contra- ceptors in thousands``` | A11 contraceptors | Method of contraception |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female } \\ & \text { sterili- } \\ & \text { zation } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Male } \\ & \text { sterili- } \\ & \text { zation } \end{aligned}$ | Pill | IUD | Diaphragm | Condom | Foam | Rhythm | Withdrawal | Douche | Other |
| TOTAL |  | Pexcent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years-- | 18,543 | 100.0 | 12.3 | 11.2 | 36.1 | 9.6 | 3.4 | 13.5 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 2.1 | 0.8 | 1.9 |
| 15-44 years---- | 1,098 | 100.0 | 16.4 | 7.6 | 35.0 | 13.3 | *2.7 | 10.7 | *2.8 | *3.2 | *3.4 | *0.9 | *4.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \text { years-------- } \\ & 30-34 \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 520 578 | 100.0 100.0 | *10.5 | $* 5.3$ $* 9.7$ | 48.8 22.6 | 15.9 10.8 | *1.9 | $* 7.3$ 13.7 | $* 1.8$ $* 3.6$ | $* 7.6$ $* 4.6$ | $* 3.9$ $* 2.9$ | $* 1.0$ $* 0.9$ | $* 2.0$ $* 5.9$ |
| 15-44 years---- | 17,445 | 100.0 | 12.1 | 11.4 | 36.1 | 9.4 | 3.5 | 13.7 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 1.7 |
| 15-29 years-------- | 7,931 | 100.0 | 5.6 | 5.3 | 53.9 | 11.8 | 2.5 | 10.1 | 5.4 | 2.0 | 1.3 | *0.4 | 1.6 |
| 30-44 years-n-n--m- | 9,514 | 100.0 | 17.5 | 16.5 | 21.3 | 7.4 | 4.3 | 16.6 | 5.0 | 5.8 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 1.9 |

Table 7. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to region, race, and age: United States, 1973


Table 7. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to region, race, and age: United States, 1973-Con.


Table 8. Number and percent distribution of currently married women $15-44$ years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to region, race, and age; United States, 1973


Table 9. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to ratio of total family income to poverty level income, race, and age: United States, 1973


Table 9. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to ratio of total family income to poverty level income, race, and age: United States, 1973-Con.


Table 10. Number and percent distribution of currently married women $15-44$ years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to ratio of total family income to poverty level income, race, and age: United States, 1973

| Income level, race, and age | Number of contraceptors in thousands | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { All } \\ \text { contra- } \\ \text { ceptors } \end{array}$ | Method of contraception |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Female } \\ & \text { sterili- } \\ & \text { zation } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Male } \\ \text { sterili- } \\ \text { zation } \end{gathered}$ | Pill | IUD | Diaphragm | Condom | Foam | Rhythm | Withdrawal | Douche | Other |
| BELOW POVERTY INCOME |  | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Races <br> 15-44 years-- | 1,235 | 100.0 | 19.7 8.0 |  | 40.01 | 9.4 | *3.1 | 8.3 | *4.3 | *1.8 | *2. 3 | *1.4 | *2.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \text { years-------- } \\ & 30-44 \text { years-- } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 615 \\ & 620 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 9.5 \\ & 29.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 4.5 \\ & 11.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.9 \\ & 21.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} * 7.6 \\ 11.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 4.1 \\ & * 2.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} * 6.4 \\ * 10.1 \end{array}$ | $\pm 2.1$ | $* 1.6$ $* 2.0$ | *2.1 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.6 \\ & * 1.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.6 \\ & * 3.5 \end{aligned}$ |
| White <br> 15-44 years-.-- | 1,034 | 100.0 | 18.9 | 9.1 | 39.8 | 9.2 | *3.3 | 8.7 | \%4.8 | *1.8 | *1.6 | *0.4 | *2.7 |
| $15-29$ $30-44$ years--.....- | $\begin{aligned} & 527 \\ & 508 \end{aligned}$ | 100.0 100.0 | $\begin{aligned} & * 8.3 \\ & 29.9 \end{aligned}$ | 13.1 | 59.6 19.2 | *7.7 | $\begin{aligned} & * 4.1 \\ & * 2.5 \end{aligned}$ | $* 5.8$ $* 11.6$ | $* 2.5$ $* 7.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.9 \\ & * 1.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2.4 \\ & * 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | *0.8 | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.8 \\ & * 3.6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 15-44 years---- | 182 | 100.0 | 26.6 | *0.3 | 43.1 | *11.6 | *2.4 | *4.1 | *2.1 | - | - | *7.4 | *2.4 |
| 15-29 years---------- | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \\ & 99 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} * 18.1 \\ 33.8 \end{array}$ | \%0.5 | 30.4 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{r} * 7.6 \\ * 14.9 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 4.7 \\ & * 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 4.2 \\ & * 4.0 \end{aligned}$ | $* 3 . \overline{9}$ |  | - | $* 8.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.7 \\ & * 3.8 \end{aligned}$ |
| 100-149 PERCENT POVERTY INCOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Races 15-44 years-- | 1,527 | 100.0 | 19.7 | 8.1 | 37.0 | 10.5 | *1.3 | 9.7 | *4.6 | *4.8 | *1.6 | \%0.9 | *1.8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \text { years--......- } \\ & 30-44 \text { years-- } \end{aligned}$ | 777 750 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.5 \\ & 27.1 \end{aligned}$ | $11.5$ | 51.6 21.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 11.2 \\ 9.7 \end{array}$ | $* 1.2$ | 9.5 | $\stackrel{* 2.3}{* 7.0}$ | $\begin{array}{r} * 0.6 \\ 9.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2.4 \\ & * 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.8 \\ & * 0.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\times 2.5$ |
| White <br> 15-44 years---- | 1,275 | 100.0 | 19.0 | 8.9 | 36.1 | 9.6 | *1.5 | 10.3 | *5.1 | *4.9 | *1.8 | \%0.7 | *2.1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 15-29 years-.-. } \\ & 30-44 \text { years. } \end{aligned}$ | 652 623 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 13.2 25.0 | $\begin{aligned} & * 5.0 \\ & 13.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.3 \\ & 22.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.2 \\ & * 7.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.4 \\ & * 1.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 10.6 \\ * 9.9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2.7 \\ & * 7.6 \end{aligned}$ | *10.7 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2.9 \\ & * 0.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.8 \\ & * 0.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} * 2.9 \\ * 1.3 \end{array}$ |
| Negro <br> 15-44 years- | 224 | 100.0 | 25.9 | *1.1 | 46.8 | 14.9 | *0.2 | *5.3 | *2.4 | \%0.4 | \%0.5 | *1.9 | $\% 0.5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \text { years------- } \\ & 30-44 \text { years-- } \end{aligned}$ | 105 119 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} * 10.3 \\ 39.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.4 \\ & * 1.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.0 \\ & 21.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 8.7 \\ & 20.3 \end{aligned}$ | $* 0.5$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 2.1 \\ & * 8.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.4 \\ & * 4.2 \end{aligned}$ | $: 0 . \overline{8}$ | $* 0.9$ | $* 1.1$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.6 \\ & * 0.4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 150-199 PERCENT POVERTY INCOME <br> All Races 15-44 years-- | 2,227 | 100.0 | 14.4 | 8.7 | 37.4 | 11.9 | *1.9 | 11.3 | 4.5 | 4.8 | *1.7 | *2.1 | \%1.3 |
| 15-29 years---------- | 1,106 1,121 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7.1 \\ 21.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \star 5.6 \\ & 11.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53.6 \\ & 21.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \\ & 10.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.4 \\ & * 3.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 9.0 \\ 13.7 \end{array}$ | $\div 4.6$ | $* 2.4$ | *1.9 | $* 0.8$ $* 3.4$ | \%0.9 |
| White <br> 15-44 years---- | 2,031 | 100.0 | 13.1 | 9.3 | 36.5 | 11.9 | *2.1 | 12.1 | *4.7 | *5.2 | *1.8 | *2.0 | *1.3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \\ & 30-44 \\ & \text { years--------- } \end{aligned}$ | 1,024 1,007 | 100.0 100.0 | 6.9 19.4 | *6.1 | 51.9 20.9 | 13.8 10.0 | *0.4 | 9.5 14.6 | $* 4.8$ | $* 2.6$ 7.9 | +2.0 | *0.9 | *1.0 |
| Negro <br> 15-44 years | 163 | 100.0 | 24.0 | *3.4 | 47.2 | \%10.9 | $\approx 0.3$ | *4.6 | *3.2 | *0.4 | $\% 0.6$ | *4.1 | *1.4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \text { years---....-- } \\ & 30-44 \text { years--- } \end{aligned}$ | 64 100 | 100.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 12.1 \\ 31.6 \end{array}$ | $\therefore 5.6$ | 75.2 29.3 | $* 6.3$ $* 13.8$ | *0.8 | *2.5 | $\begin{aligned} & * 2.3 \\ & * 3.7 \end{aligned}$ | *0. $\overline{6}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 0.8 \\ & * 0.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\approx 6.8$ | *2. 2 |
| 200 PERCENT OR MORE POVERTY INCOME |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Races <br> 1.5-44 years-- | 13,553 | 100.0 | 10.5 | 12.2 | 35.4 | 9.2 | 4.0 | 14.7 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 2.3 | 0.6 | 1.9 |
| $15-29$ $30-44$ yearss-------- | 5,954 7,599 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 4.5 15.3 | 5.4 17.6 | 53.3 21.4 | 12.3 6.7 | 2.9 4.8 | 10.5 | 5.9 4.6 | 2.2 5.5 | $* 1.2$ 3.2 | *0.2 | 1.6 2.1 |
| White 15-44 years---- | 12,762 | 100.0 | 10.0 | 12.8 | 35.0 | 9.0 | 4.0 | 15.2 | 5.1 | 4.0 | 2.4 | *0.5 | 1.9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 15-29 \\ & 30-44 \\ & \text { years } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,554 \\ & 7,208 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 4.3 14.4 | 5.7 18.3 | 52.8 21.3 | $\begin{array}{r} 12.0 \\ 6.7 \end{array}$ | 3.0 4.8 | 18.4 | 6.0 4.3 | 2.1 5.5 | $* 1.2$ 3.3 | *0.1 | 1.7 2.1 |
| Negro <br> 15-44 years | 680 | 100.0 | 20.3 | *1.9 | 42.2 | 12.8 | *2.9 | 5.9 | 7.1 | *2.1 | *1.0 | *2.0 | *1.9 |
| 15-29 years-------- | 362 | 100.0 | 7.3 | *1.1 | 59.8 | 16.9 | *0.8 | *3.2 | *5.3 | \%2.8 | \%0.6 | *1.7 | \%0.6 |
| 30-44 years-.------ | 318 | 100.0 | 35.1 | \%2.8 | 22.1 | 8.2 | *5.4 | 8.9 | 9.2 | *1.3 | *1.4 | *2.3 | *3.3 |

Table 11. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to parity, race, and age: United States, 1973


Table 12. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to parity, race, and age: United States, 1973


Table 13. Number and percent distribution of currently married women 15-44 years of age by contraceptive status, according to labor force status, race, and age: United States, 1973

| Labor force status, race, and age | ```Number ``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { women } \end{aligned}$ | Contraceptors | Noncontraceptors |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Pregnant, postpartum, or seeking pregnancy | Sterile | Other nonusers |
| IN LABOR FORCE |  | Percent distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| A11 Races |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years---- | 11,084 | 100.0 | 70.5 | 29.5 | 11.3 | 8.2 | 9.9 |
|  <br> 30-44 years <br> White <br> $15-44$ years | $\begin{aligned} & 4,950 \\ & 6,134 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73.6 \\ & 68.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.4 \\ & 32.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 18.5 \\ 5.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.3 \\ & 13.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6.7 \\ 12.6 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9,829 | 100.0 | 71.9 | 28.1 | 11.2 | 8.1 | 8.8 |
| $15-29$ $30-44$ years----------- | 4,4435,387 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | 74.270.0 | 25.830.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 18.5 \\ 5.3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * 1.3 \\ & 13.7 \end{aligned}$ | 6.111.1 |
| Negro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years------ | 1,128 | 100.0 | 61.4 | 38.6 | 10.8 | 9.2 | 18.7 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 482 \\ & 646 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69.7 \\ & 55.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.3 \\ & 44.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17.8 \\ 5.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \therefore 0.9 \\ & 15.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.6 \\ & 24.0 \end{aligned}$ |
| NOT IN LABOR FORCE All Races |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years---- | 15,562 | 100.0 | 68.9 | 31.1 | 16.4 | 7.0 | 7.7 |
| $15-29$ $30-44$ years--------------- | $\begin{aligned} & 7,089 \\ & 8,472 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67.8 \\ & 69.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.2 \\ & 30.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.2 \\ 8.2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.3 \\ 11.7 \end{array}$ | 4.710.2 |
| White |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years------ | 14,419 | 100.0 | 69.6 | 30.4 | 16.3 | 7.0 | 7.1 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 6,520 \\ & 7,899 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68.4 \\ & 70.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.6 \\ & 29.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 26.1 \\ 8.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1.2 \\ 11.8 \end{array}$ | 4.39.5 |
| Negro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15-44 years------ | 953 | 100.0 | 58.4 | 41.6 | 17.8 | 6.8 | 17.0 |
| 15-29 years---------- | $\begin{array}{r} 482 \\ 471 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100.0 \\ & 100.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57.6 \\ & 59.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.4 \\ & 40.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 27.8 \\ 7.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \div 2.2 \\ & \text { I1. } 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \\ & 21.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 30-44 years---------- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 14. Number and percent distribution of currently married women $15-44$ years of age using contraceptives by method of contraception used, according to labor force status, race, and age: United States, 1973

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Labor force status, race and age} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{```
Nuruber
of
contra-
ceptors
in
thousands
```} \& \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Al1 } \\
\& \text { contra- } \\
\& \text { ceptors }
\end{aligned}
\]} \& \multicolumn{11}{|c|}{Method of contraception} \\
\hline \& \& \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Female } \\
\& \text { sterili- }
\end{aligned}
\]
zation \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Male } \\
\& \text { sterili- } \\
\& \text { zation }
\end{aligned}
\] \& Pill \& IUD \& Diaphragm \& Condom \& Foam \& Rhythm \& Withdrawal \& Douche \& Other \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
IN LABOR FORCE \\
All races \\
15-44 years--
\end{tabular} \& 7,816 \& 100.0 \& 12.0 \& 10.0 \& 40.6 \& Perce

9.3 \& dist
3.5 \& bution
11.3 \& 4.7 \& 3.4 \& 2.2 \& *0.7 \& 2.2 <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& 15-29 \text { years-------- } \\
& 30-44 \text { years }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3,642 \\
& 4,174
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& 100.0

100.0 \& 3.5

19.4 \& $$
\begin{array}{r}
3.5 \\
15.7
\end{array}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 62.2 \\
& 21.7
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& 10.9

8.0 \& 2.6
4.3 \& 8.4
13.9 \& 4.9
4.6 \& $* 1.3$
5.3 \& *1.2 \& *0.2 \& $* 1.5$
2.9 <br>
\hline White 15-44 years \& 7,063 \& 100.0 \& 10.9 \& 10.8 \& 40.5 \& 9.0 \& 3.7 \& 12.0 \& 4.5 \& 3.4 \& - 2.3 \& *0.5 \& 2.3 <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& 15-29 \text { years--------- } \\
& 30-44 \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3,295 \\
& 3,769
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& 100.0

100.0 \& 3.0
17.8 \& 3.8
17.0 \& 62.0
21.6 \& 10.5
7.7 \& 2.7
4.5 \& 9.1

14.6 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4.9 \\
& 4.2
\end{aligned}
$$ \& *1.1 \& $* 1.3$

3.2 \& $\pm 1.0$ \& $* 1.6$
3.0 <br>

\hline | Negro |
| :--- |
| 15-44 years | \& 692 \& 100.0 \& 22.9 \& *1.5 \& 42.7 \& 13.1 \& *2.1 \& 4.8 \& 5.9 \& *1.8 \& *0.9 \& *2.6 \& *1.6 <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 15-29 years-2 } \\
& 30-44 \text { years }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 336

356 \& 100.0
100.0 \& 7.9

37.1 \& *2.9 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 64.7 \\
& 22.0
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 14.1

12.1 \& $\cdots 1.8$ \& \[
$$
\begin{array}{r}
* 1.9 \\
7.5
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
4.2 \\
7.6
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& * 2.5 \\
& * 1.1
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& \%0.5 \& $* 1.8$

$* 3.3$ \& $* 0.5$
$* 2.7$ <br>

\hline | NOT IN LABOR FORCE |
| :--- |
| All races 15-44 years-- | \& 10,727 \& 100.0 \& 12.6 \& 12.1 \& 32.8 \& 9.8 \& 3.4 \& 15.1 \& 5.2 \& 4.5 \& 2.1 \& 0.9 \& 1.6 <br>

\hline $$
\begin{aligned}
& 15-29 \text { years--------- } \\
& 30-44 \text { years--- }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 4,809

5,918 \& 100.0
100.0 \& 7.8
16.5 \& 6.7
16.4 \& 47.1
21.2 \& 12.8
7.3 \& 2.4
4.2 \& 11.2

18.2 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.4 \\
& 5.1
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 2.6

6.0 \& 1.7
2.4 \& $* 0.6$
1.2 \& 1.8
1.5 <br>
\hline 15-44 years---- \& 10,039 \& 100.0 \& 12.1 \& 12.6 \& 32.1 \& 9.7 \& 3.5 \& 15.5 \& 5.3 \& 4.6 \& 2.1 \& 0.8 \& 1.6 <br>

\hline 15-29 years--------- \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 4,462 \\
& 5,577
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 100.0 \\
& 100.0
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
7.6 \\
15.6
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
7.0 \\
17.2
\end{array}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 46.1 \\
& 20.8
\end{aligned}
$$

\] \& \[

$$
\begin{array}{r}
12.9 \\
7.1
\end{array}
$$
\] \& 2.5

4.2 \& 11.5

18.8 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 5.6 \\
& 5.1
\end{aligned}
$$ \& 2.6

6.1 \& $\frac{7}{2.5}$ \& $* 0.5$
$* 1.0$ \& 1.9 <br>
\hline 15-44 years---- \& 556 \& 100.0 \& 22.4 \& *2.0 \& 45.1 \& 12.3 \& *1.9 \& 6.1 \& *3.9 \& *0.6 \& \%0.4 \& *3.6 \& \%1.6 <br>
\hline 15-29 years-------- \& 278

279 \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& 100.0 \\
& 100.0
\end{aligned}
$$ \& \[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 12.0 \\
& 32.8
\end{aligned}
$$
\] \& $* 1.5$

$* 2.4$ \& 62.9
27.3 \& 11.9
12.7 \& \%0.6 \& $* 4.5$
$* 7.6$ \& $* 2.6$
$* 5.3$ \& $* 0.6$
$* 0.6$ \& $* 0.4$
+0.4 \& $* 2.4$
$* 4.8$ \& $* 0.6$
$* 2.7$ <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| SYMBOLS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data not available...-7.-.......-.-. |  |
|  | $\ldots$ |
|  |  |
| Quantity more than 0 but less than 0.05....- | 0.0 |
| Figure does not meet standards of reliability or precision- | * |

## TECHNICAL NOTES

DESIGN OF THE SURVEY: The National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG), initiated in 1971, is designed to provide data on fertility, family planning, and related aspects of maternal and child health. Field work for Cycle I was carried out by the National Opinion Research Center in 1973 and early 1974 with September 13,1973 , as the midpoint of the interviewing.

A multistage probability sample of women in the noninstitutional population of the conterminous United States was used. Approximately 33,000 households were screened to identify the sample of women who would be eligible for the NSFG, i.e., women between the ages of 15 to 44 years, inclusive, who were currently married or previously married or who were never married but had natural children presently living in the household. In households with more than one eligible woman, a random procedure was used to select only one to be interviewed. Since the interviews were always conducted with the sample person, the term "respondent" is used throughout this report as synonymous with sample person. Interviews were completed for 3,856 Negro women and for 5,941 women of other races. A detailed description of the sample design will be presented in a forthcoming report "Sample Design, Estimation Procedures, and Variance Estimation for a National Survey of Family Growth."

The interview was highly focused on the respondents' marital and pregnancy histories, on their use of contraception and the planning status of each pregnancy, on the respondents' intentions regarding the number and spacing of future births, on maternity and family planning services, and on a broad range of social and ecomonic characteristics. While the interviews varied greatly in the time required for their completion, they averaged about 70 minutes. Quality control procedures were applied at all stages of the survey. This included a verification of listing completeness with unlisted dwelling units being brought into the sample, a preliminary field review of completed questionnaires for possible missing data or inaccurate administration, a 10 -percent sample recheck of all households to be screened in the survey, observation of interviews in the field, and an independent recoding of a 5-percent subsample of completed interviews.

RELIABILITY OF ESTIMATES: Since the statistics presented in this report are based on a sample, they may differ somewhat from the figures that would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken, using the same questionnaires, instructions, interviewing personnel, and field procedures. This chance difference between sample results and a complete count is referred to as sampling error. In addition, the results are also subject to nonsampling error due to respondent misreporting, data processing mistakes, and nonresponse. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain accurate measures of nonsampling errors. These types of error were kept to a minimum by the quality control procedures and other methods incorporated into the survey design and administration.

Sampling error, or the extent to which samples may differ by chance from a complete count, is measured by a statistic called the standard error of estimate. Approximate standard errors for estimated numbers and percentages from this survey are shown in tables I and II for the total and white populations and in tables III and IV for the Negro population.

The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample would differ from a complete census by less than the standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the differences between the sample estimate and a complete count would be Iess than twice the standard error. The relative standard error is the ratio of the standard error to the statistic being estimated. In this report, numbers and percentages which have a standard error that is more

Table 1. Approximate standard errors for estimated numbers for white and total women: 1973 National Survey of Family Growth

| Size of Estimate | Relative standard error | Standard error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50,000 | 30.0 | 15,000 |
| 100,000 | 21.2 | 21,000 |
| 200,000 | 15.0 | 30,000 |
| 500,000 | 9.5 | 47,000 |
| 1,000,000 | 6.7 | 67,000 |
| 2,000,000 | 4.8 | 95,000 |
| 5,000,000 | 3.0 | 151,000 |
| 10,000,000 | 2.2 | 216,000 |
| 20,000,000 | 1.5 | 311,000 |

Table 1I. Approximate standard errors for estimated percentages expressed in percentage points for white and total women: 1973 National Survey of Family Growth

| Base of percentage | Estimated percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { or } \\ 98 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { or } \\ 95 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \text { or } \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \text { or } \\ 80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \text { or } \\ 70 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \text { or } \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ | 50 |
| 100,000 | 3.0 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 8.5 | 9.7 | 10.4 | 10.6 |
| 500,000 | 1.3 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.7 |
| 1,000,000 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 |
| 3,000,000 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| 5,000,000 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 7,000,000 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 |
| 10,000,000 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 |

Table III. Approximate standard errors for estimated numbers for Negro women: 1973 National Survey of Family Growth

| Size of Estimate | Relative standard error | Standard error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25,000 | 25.3 | 6,000 |
| 50,000 | 17.9 | 9,000 |
| 100,000 | 12.7 | 13,000 |
| 150,000 | 10.3 | 16,000 |
| 250,000 | 8.0 | 20,000 |
| 350,000 | 6.8 | 24,000 |
| 500,000 | 5.7 | 28,000 |
| 750,000 | 4.7 | 35,000 |
| 1,000,000 | 4.0 | 40,000 |

than 25 percent of the estimate itself are considered "unreliable." They are marked with an asterisk to caution the user but may be combined to make other types of comparisons of greater precision.

In this report, terms such as "similar" and "the same" mean that any observed difference between two estimates being compared is not
statistically significant. Similarly, terms such as "greater," "less," "larger," "smaller," etc., indicate that the observed differences are statistically significant. The normal deviate test with a .05 level of significance was used to test all comparisons which are discussed in the text. A statistically significant difference is one large enough that in repeated samples of the same size and type as this one, such a large difference would be expected to be found in less than 5 percent of the samples. Lack of comment in the text between any two statistics does not mean the difference was tested and found not to be significant.

## DEFINITION OF TERMS:

Contraceptive status.-The classification by contraceptive status is derived from several topics covered in the questionnaire including pregnancy status, fecundity, current use or nonuse of contraception, and specific contraceptive methods being used. A first broad division is

Table IV. Approximate standard errors for estimated percentages expressed in percentage points for Negro women: 1973 National Survey of Family Growth

| Base of percentage | Estimated percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { or } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \text { or } \\ 95 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10 \text { or } \\ 90 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \text { or } \\ 80 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \text { or } \\ 70 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40 \text { or } \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ | 50 |
| 5,000 | 7.9 | 12.3 | 17.0 | 22.6 | 25.9 | 27.7 | 28.3 |
| 10,000 | 5.6 | 8.7 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 18.3 | 19.6 | 20.0 |
| 50,000 | 2.5 | 3.9 | 5.4 | 7.1 | 8.2 | 8.8 | 8.9 |
| 100,000 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 6.3 |
| 300,000 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 |
| 500,000 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.8 |
| 700,000 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| 1,000,000 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.0 |

made between noncontraceptors and contraceptors, each of which is further subclassified.

Noncontraceptive status is classified as:

1. Pregnant.-A women (or couple) was classed as pregnant if she replied affirmatively to the question "Are you pregnant now?" or for those in doubt, "Do you think you probably are pregnant or not?" A woman who reported that the onset of her last menstrual period was within the last 30 days prior to the interview was automatically considered not pregnant.
2. Seeking pregnancy.-A woman (or couple) was classified as seeking pregnancy if she reported she was not using a method at the time of interview because she wanted to become pregnant.
3. Postpartum.-A woman (or couple) was classified as postpartum if she reported she was not currently using a method, was not seeking a pregnancy, and her last pregnancy had terminated within 2 months before the date she was interviewed.
4. Sterile.-A woman (or couple) was classified as noncontraceptively sterile if she reported that it was impossible for her to have another baby for any of the following reasons: menopause, sterility due to accident, illness, or congenital causes, or a sterilizing operation performed on the wife or the husband entirely for reasons other than preventing future children.
5. Other nonusers.-Women (or couples) who reported they were currently using no contraceptive method and could not be classified in any of the preceding categories of noncontraceptors were classified here. Among these are women who were indifferent to the chances of pregnancy, had a very low risk of pregnancy due to some fecundity impairment, or objected to contraceptive methods for personal or religious reasons. Women who used the douche following intercourse, but who did not report this as a method of contraception, were also classified here although such douching practice is known to have a very modest contraceptive effect when done very soon after intercourse.

Contraceptive status is classified as:

1. Sterile.-A woman (or couple) was classified as contraceptively sterile if she or her husband had had a sterilizing operation that was done "at least partly so that (they) would not have any more children." Surgical sterilizations for contraceptive reasons are further classified according to female and male operations.
2. Method users.-A woman (or coüple) who reported use of a contraceptive

- method at the date of interview was classified according to the specific method used. Methods used by extremely small proportions of the population such as jelly, cream suppositories, or abstinence, not in combination with any other methods, were grouped in the category "Other." Where more than one method was reported in current use, the method generally considered the most effective was used for classification purposes. The contraceptive pill, the intrauterine device (IUD), and contraceptive sterilization were developed, or achieved prominence, since 1960 and are referred to as the modern methods, while those prominent before 1960 are referred to as traditional methods.
Age.-In this report, age is classified by the age of the respondent at her last birthday before the date of interview.

Race.-Classification by race, based on interviewer observation, was reported as Negro, white, or other. Race refers to the race of the woman interviewed.

Spanish orgin.-A respondent was classified as being of Spanish origin if she reported her origin or descent as Mexicano, Chicano, Mexican American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish.

Labor Force Status.-A woman is categorized as being in the labor force if she was working full time or part time, had a job but was not at work because of temporary illness, vacation, or a strike, or if she was unemployed, laid off, or looking for work.

Poverty level.-The poverty index ratio was calculated by dividing the total family income by the weighted average threshold income of nonfarm residence, head under 65, based on the poverty levels shown in the U.S. Bureau of the

Census，Current Population Reports，Series P－60， No．98，＂Characteristics of the Low－Income Population，1973，＂table A－3．This definition takes into account the sex of the family head and the number of persons in the family．Total family income includes income from all sources for all members of the respondent＇s family．

Region．－Region refers to the part of the country where the respondent was living at the time of the survey according to the definition of the U．S．Bureau of the Census．

Parity．－Parity refers to the number of live births the respondent has had．

Marital Status．－Persons are classified by marital status as married，widowed，divorced， separated，or never married．Married persons in－ clude those who report themselves as married or as informally married，such as living with a part－ ner or common－law spouse．Persons who are temporarily separated for reasons other than marital discord，such as vacation，illness，or Armed Forces，are classified as married．Di－ vorced persons are those whose most recent mar－ riage was legally dissolved and who are free to remarry．The annulled，while having the legal status of never having been married，are classi－ fied together with the divorced．The category ＂separated＂includes those who are legally or informally separated from their most recent spouse due to marital discord．The＂never mar－ ried＂include those who have never had a formal marriage and do not consider themselves in any of the preceding categories．However，in the NSFG，single women with children of their own in the household were included and are sepa－ rately classified．All tables in this report are based upon currently married women or those whose marital status at the time of the interview was＂married．＂
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Prepared by Kathleen Ford, Ph.D., Division of Vital Statistics.
    ${ }^{2}$ This survey, the second Growth of American Families Study (GAF-II), is reported in Fertility and Family Planning in the United States, by Whelpton, P. K., Campbell, A. A., and Patterson, J. E., Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1966. This figure was computed from the computer tape for this survey obtained from the Data and Program Library Service at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.
    ${ }^{3}$ These surveys, the first and second National Fertility Studies (NFS-I and NFS-II), are reported, respectively, in Reproduction in the United States, 1965, by Ryder, N. B., and Westoff, C. F., Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1971, and in "The Modernization of U.S. Contraceptive Practice,' by Westoff, C. F., in Fam. Plann. Perspect. 4(3), 9-12, July 1972.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ Ryder, N. B., Contraceptive failure in the United States, Fam. Plann. Perspect. 5(3): 133-142, Summer 1973.
    ${ }^{5}$ Ryder, N. B., and Westoff, C. F.: Reproduction in the United States, 1965. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1971. pp. 331-335.

    6"Other" methods include primarily jelly, cream, suppositories, and abstinence.

