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Abstract

Decisions about whether to have or rear children, as well as perceptions of people who choose not to parent are linked to a variety of social processes and identities. We review literature from a variety of disciplines that focuses on voluntarily childless adults. Early research in this area, emerging in the 1970s, focused almost exclusively on heterosexual women and utilized a childless rather than a childfree framework. Later work saw a shift to a “childless-by-choice” or “childfree” framework, emphasizing that for some, not being parents is an active choice rather than an accident. While more recent research includes lesbian women and gay and heterosexual men, greater diversity within studies of adults without children is one suggested focus for future work in this area.

Introduction

Increasingly, fewer women and men in the United States opt to have or rear children than in the past. In 2002, 18 percent of women in the United States ages 40–44 had never had a child (Osborne 2003). By 2006, that number had risen to 20 percent (Dye 2008). These rates show a clear increase from the 10 percent of women ages 40–44 who had never had a child in 1976 (Dye 2008; Osborne 2003). As for men, 23 percent in the same age group were childless in 2002 (Biddlecom and Martin 2006). Rates of childlessness have also increased among younger cohorts. In 1998, 28 percent of women aged 25–29 had not borne children; this number was just 16 percent in 1976. Finally, 20 percent of 30- to 34-year old women were childless in 1998 while only 11 percent were so in 1976 (Paul 2001). While national data do not distinguish chosen childlessness from that which is not chosen, nor do childbearing rates account for adoptions, these trends are at least suggestive of the conclusion that increasing numbers of women and men are choosing not to become parents.

In this paper, we review studies of adults without children with particular emphasis on voluntary childlessness. Throughout, we use two terms to refer to adults who have chosen not to rear or bear children: voluntarily childless and childfree. Because some studies of adults without children do not explicitly attempt to disentangle voluntary childlessness from that which is involuntary, we do not limit our review exclusively to literature on the childfree. We do, however, pay particular attention to childfree studies, bringing in sources that focus more broadly on “childlessness” when those findings are relevant to the voluntarily childless and in the case of research that is fundamental to this area of study.

To begin, we outline the development of scholarship in this area and examine how and why terminology has shifted over time. We then consider pathways to becoming...
voluntarily childless and describe predominant explanations offered by researchers in the area. Next we describe work focused on issues of deviance and stigma management among voluntarily childless adults. Reflecting recent developments in the literature, we then briefly describe findings on how the voluntarily childless fare as they age. We conclude by offering several suggestions for future research in this area.

The study of voluntary childlessness over time

The 1970s saw an emergence of research focused on voluntary childlessness. These studies appeared in the scholarly journals of a variety of disciplines, from sociology (Ritchey and Stokes 1974; Veevers 1973a,b) to psychology (Houseknecht 1979b; Russo 1979), from biology (Barnett and MacDonald 1976; Gustavus and Henley 1971) to economics (Marciano 1978), and in interdisciplinary journals as well (Houseknecht 1977, 1979a; Ory 1978; Silka and Kiesler 1977; Veevers 1979). By and large, early studies tended to frame voluntary childlessness as a form of deviance. These studies focused on the unique attributes of individuals who had chosen not to have children, such as their social class and educational backgrounds. This body of work largely asked why adults, and in particular adult heterosexual women, would choose not to have children. Early research also considered the economic and demographic consequences of increasing rates of voluntary childlessness (Bloom and Pebley 1982).

Moving into the 1980s, scholarship’s focus on the unique attributes and demographics of the voluntarily childless continued (Bartlett 1996; Baum and Cope 1980; Boyd 1989; Bram 1984; Callan 1986; Kiernan 1989; Ramu and Tavuchis 1986). This decade also saw increased attention paid to voluntarily childless heterosexual couples (Baber and Dreyer 1986; Burgwyn 1983; Callan 1984). In addition, an emerging scholarship on older people without children developed around this time (Houser et al. 1984; Johnson and Catalano 1981). Moving into the 1990s, scholars also began to consider the role of religiosity in the decision not to have children (Heaton et al. 1992; Krishnan 1990).

By the 2000’s, the aging population of adults without children become an increasingly popular point of focus for researchers (Abma and Martinez 2006; Albertini and Kohli 2009; DeOllos and Kapinus 2002; Dykstra and Keizer 2009; Kohli and Albertini 2009; Umberson et al. 2010; Wenger et al. 2000; Wenger 2009). While research on how childfree lives challenge gender norms appeared prior to the 2000s (Baber and Dreyer 1986; Bram 1984; Morell 1994), the past decade has also seen increasing attention to the gendered nature of voluntary childlessness (Gillespie 2003; Hird 2003; Hird and Abshoff 2000; Maher and Saugeres 2007). Further, recent studies have examined the impact of family-friendly workplace policies and cultures on people whose family forms do not match the traditional vision called up by the term “family-friendly” (Casper et al. 2007; Wood and Newton 2006).

In addition to the shifting points of focus outlined above, the terminology used to describe adults who choose not to have children has also changed over time. Early studies used the term “childless” to refer to adults without children (see, e.g., Houseknecht 1977, 1979a,b; Mosher and Bachrach 1982). This however left no way to distinguish adults who did not have children but wished to from those who had made an intentional choice not to have them. Studies published in the 1980s show increasing use of the terms “voluntarily” and “intentionally” associated chosen childlessness (Baum and Cope 1980; Barnett and MacDonald 1986; Bloom and Pebley 1982; Bram 1984; Calhoun 1980; Callan 1982, 1983, 1986; Den Bandt 1980; Feldman 1981; Ramu 1985).

Over time, as more individuals began making the choice to remain non-parents (Bachu and O’Connell 1998), some scholars began using the term “childfree” as a more accurate...
expression of the choice it describes (Bartlett 1996; Defago 2005; Gillespie 2003). Today, the terms “childless-by-choice” and childfree are more commonly seen than “childless” when referring to individuals who have made the explicit and intentional choice not to have or rear children. Because a predominance of the literature we review here uses the term voluntarily childless, and because we also wish to acknowledge more recent terminological developments, we use the terms voluntarily childless and childfree throughout the paper to describe the individuals upon whom we focus.

Pathways to being childfree

There are a variety of pathways adults may take to making the decision to remain childfree. In this section we examine both how adults come to identify as childfree and explanations for why some choose to do so. In terms of the question of how, some adults choose early not to have or rear children and stick with this decision throughout the life course. Others may postpone childbearing decisions for such a period of time that eventually biological reproduction is no longer an option. Still others may intend to bear or rear children but never actually do so. Those in the latter two categories may eventually come to identify as childfree, along with those who knew early on that they would not have children.

In their study of childbearing patterns among a nationally representative sample, Heaton et al. (1999) found that while some adults indeed remained “consistently childless” over time, others who initially intended to have children later changed their minds and decided against doing so. Most quantitative investigations in this area do not distinguish between the voluntarily and involuntarily childless and this is sometimes intentional (Keizer et al. 2008); yet these studies are nevertheless instructive for researchers interested in those who explicitly identify as childfree. One pattern found in pathways to “childlessness,” be it chosen or not, is that this process may differ by gender (Keizer et al. 2008). Quantitative investigations have also found that differences in transitions to adulthood may play a role in pathways to parenthood and non-parenthood. Focusing broadly on “childlessness” rather than specifically on voluntary childlessness, Hagestad and Call (2007) found that two transitions in particular – leaving one’s parents’ home and marrying – played a role in whether or not one would become a parent.

Quantitative findings, while generally focused broadly on both the childfree and involuntarily childless, suggest that childfree adults do not universally reach the decision to remain so at the same stage of life or in the same way. Though qualitative studies are well suited to examining processes such as how individuals come to identify as childfree, fewer qualitative investigations focus specifically on pathways to the childfree identity. Such studies have the potential to illuminate the quantitative patterns described in the aforementioned studies.

A large portion of the literature examines not how adults come to identify as childfree but why they do so (Agrillo and Nelini 2008; Clausen 2002; Gillespie 2003; Houseknecht 1982; Letherby 2002). When examining why some adults remain voluntarily childless, explanations range from the impact of macro-social forces such as women’s increasing labor force participation to micro-level motivations such as autonomy and freedom. Predominantly, explanations for increasing rates of voluntary childlessness focus on key social changes such as the feminist movement of the 1970s, increased reproductive choice, and women’s increasing labor force participation (Gillespie 2003; see also Bartlett 1996; Campbell 1985; Ireland 1993; McAllister 1998).

Some of the literature in this area has shifted focus from the macro-level social changes described above to more micro-level processes that explain individuals’ motives for and
consequences of remaining childfree (e.g., Gillespie 2003; Houseknecht 1987; Letherby 2002; Park 2005). For example, Houseknecht (1987) found that the most commonly cited reason for not having children was “freedom from childcare responsibility and greater opportunity for self-fulfillment and spontaneous mobility” (350). In Gillespie’s (2003) research, themes that emerged in relation to the choice not to have children included personal freedom and the ability to develop relationships with other adults. In one qualitative study, Carmichael and Whittaker (2007) found that those had “chosen childlessness” cited the following reasons for not wanting children: an aversion to the lifestyle changes that come with parenthood, an explicit rejection of the maternal role, selfishness, and either feeling unsuited or proficient but unwilling to take on the role of parent.

In sum, both macro- and micro-level processes have been explored as potential explanations for how and why some adults come to identify as childfree. Triangulating findings from quantitative investigations of pathways to voluntary childlessness with qualitative examinations of the reasons childfree individuals themselves cite for their decision could lead to even greater understanding of the how and the why behind childfree people’s status as childfree. In addition to studies which focus on the choices and life course of childfree people themselves, the literature in this area also includes studies of others’ responses to and perceptions of the childfree.

Deviance and stigma management

One line research in the childfree literature examines cultural perceptions of childfree adults (Copur and Koropeckyj-Cox 2010; Koropeckyj-Cox and Pendell 2007; Koropeckyj-Cox et al. 2007; Lisle 1999; McAllister 1998; Vinson et al. 2010). From its beginnings, much of the scholarly literature on the childfree has considered whether, or the extent to which, the choice not to have children qualifies as a deviant act. As early as 1973, Veevers (1973b) noted that perceptions of the voluntarily childless as emotionally unstable and maladjusted, while common among social scientists and the public more generally, were unfounded. In that same decade, Houseknecht (1977) found that although women who proclaimed a desire to remain childfree were aware of negative social sanctions associated with their choice, they were significantly less concerned with those sanctions than were women who desired to have children. Since these and other early studies that examine perceptions of the childfree (e.g., Callan 1985; Polit 1978; Rainwater 1960), researchers have continued to investigate issues of deviance and stigma management as they arise for childfree adults.

More recent research on perceptions of childfree adults shows that parents are perceived as warmer than non-parents (Copur and Koropeckyj-Cox 2010), that women have more positive attitudes about “childlessness” (be it chosen or not) than men (Koropeckyj-Cox and Pendell 2007), and that couples who are viewed as unlikely to have children are regarded more negatively than those who are seen as likely to become parents (Koropeckyj-Cox et al. 2007). Race also plays a role in perceptions of childfree women; African American mothers are viewed more favorably than childfree African American women whereas perceptions of white women vary less based on parental status (Vinson et al. 2010). Interestingly, much of the aforementioned perceptions data come from samples of college students rather than parents or adults who themselves identify as voluntarily childfree.

Other perception studies focus on the stigma associated with remaining childfree (Mollen 2006; Mueller and Yoder 1999; Park 2002) and attitudes about childlessness (Caron...
and Wynn 1992; Koropeckyj-Cox and Pendell 2007; Koropeckyj-Cox et al. 2007). Those who report feeling stigma as a result of being childfree note experiencing pity and criticism (Mollen 2006), being criticized for being too involved with work activities (Mueller and Yoder 1999), and being perceived as selfish, cold, and materialistic (Park 2002; see also Kelly 2009).

Beyond defining the childfree status as deviant, several studies consider how childfree individuals manage the stigma of their “deviant” status. Veevers was among the first to do so in her 1975 examination of the “moral careers of voluntarily childless wives” (see also Veevers 1980). Veevers (1975) noted that voluntarily childless heterosexual wives employed one of two strategies when subjected to negative social sanctions associated with their status as childfree: either they engaged in symbolic gestures that suggested conformity such as noting adoption plans or they proclaimed moral views that were explicitly at odds with motherhood. Years later, Park (2002) identified several other strategies that voluntarily childless women and men employ to manage the stigma associated with the childfree status. Noting that our cultural context of pronatalism leads to negative evaluations of the childfree, Park (2002) found that the techniques childfree women and men use to manage stigma range from defensive or reactive (such as “identity substitution”) to proactive (such as redefining “childlessness” in a positive way).

An additional strategy employed by some childfree adults to manage the stigma associated with their status is to surround oneself with supportive others. Houseknecht (1977) noted early on the importance of forming a supportive reference group as one strategy for managing the stigma associated with the childfree status. The “emerging childfree movement” (Park 2002, 39) demonstrates that childfree adults recognize their status as stigmatized and challenge the characterization of their choice as a deviant one. Increasingly, the internet and social networking sites have facilitated efforts of the childfree to connect with like others (Basten 2009). Of course, the extent to which members of childfree groups share enough in common to support a continued movement remains to be seen. While research indicates that these groups have the capacity to draw wide appeal and that they have formed internationally (Basten 2009), it is possible that the heterogeneity of childfree organizations may make sustaining a larger movement challenging (see Basten 2009’s discussion of Ramu 1985). In any case, this organized response to constructions of voluntary childlessness as deviant is certainly notable and is likely to gain increasing attention in the literature.

Childfree into older age

As increasing numbers of individuals choose to remain childfree, attention to the lives of elderly people without children increases. As mentioned previously, the 1990s saw an emergence of literature focused on older people who are childfree. This line of research continued into the 2000’s (Abma and Martinez 2006; Albertini and Kohli 2009; DeOllos and Kapinus 2002; Dykstra and Keizer 2009; Kohli and Albertini 2009; Umberson et al. 2010; Wenger 2009; Wenger et al. 2000). These studies largely focus on the later-in-life consequences of not having reared children such as quality of life, wellbeing, and support of and by family. In general, research on older childfree adults finds few if any negative consequences for these individuals.

Dykstra and Keizer (2009) found that fatherhood makes a difference in some realms of older men’s well-being but it does not matter to the same extent across all life domains. In particular, while fathers had higher incomes on average than men without children, fatherhood was not found to have an effect on older men’s life satisfaction and mental
health. In her study of childfree older adults in Wales, Wenger (2009) found that aging individuals without children adapted their lives to accommodate their needs in ways other than the mechanisms used by aging parents. Wenger’s (2009) study participants were found to fill “voids” that might be presumed to exist by relying on other family members or on engagement in community endeavors. Similarly, Albertini and Kohli (2009) found that the support networks of “childless” older people were more diverse than those of parents, and included stronger links with a broader range of relatives as well as friends and other non-relatives. Older adults without children in Albertini and Kohli’s (2009) study also tended to be more actively engaged in charity work than their counterparts who had children, thus contributing to their communities in unique and important ways.

In sum, research on how childfree adults fare later in life shows that few regret their decision not to have or rear children and that many find alternative ways to connect with others and engage in their communities.

Suggestions for future research: diversity, process, and consequences

Notably, prior work on childfree adults focuses almost exclusively on women and does not consider men’s decisions (Mollen 2006; Mueller and Yoder 1999; Park 2005; but see Lunneborg 1999). By and large, prior research focuses not just on women only but more specifically on heterosexual women (but see Berkowitz 2007; Berkowitz and Marsiglio 2007). Future researchers should therefore aim to include a more diverse selection of participants in their studies of childfree adults. Though several recent studies of how race may influence choices or perceptions exist (Koropeckyj-Cox et al. 2007; Umberson et al. 2010; Vinson et al. 2010), greater racial and ethnic diversity within study samples should also be a goal of future research in this area.

While literature from a variety of disciplines has examined trends in rates of and motivations for voluntary childlessness, questions of how, rather than why, such decisions are made remains. In particular, qualitative research on pathways to voluntary childlessness would complement the extant quantitative research on these processes. Further, few researchers have considered the extent to which decisions to not become parents may be linked to gender, sexuality, and perceptions of family more generally. Work framed within the study of families in particular could make important contributions toward our understanding of how individuals construct and perceive notions of what counts as “family.” Prior research on gay and lesbian families could provide a useful starting point for studies of childfree family formations.

Future work might also move from finding explanations for voluntary childlessness to more deliberately examining its consequences, not just for those who choose not to have children but for their communities, for the lives of other children, and, as mentioned, for families more generally. The consequences of deciding to remain childfree specifically for the lives of children have not yet been considered. What role do childfree people play in the lives of children and how do those relationships differ from parent-child relationships? What does it mean for our cultural understanding of “family” if increasing numbers of families do not include children?

Though the 2000’s saw some research on how family-friendly policies impact (or do not impact) the lives of childfree people, future research might continue this line of work by further investigating childfree people’s perceptions of family friendly policies and considering alternatives to such policies that might benefit childfree people and adults with children equally. Family-friendly workplace policies are just one area of policies relevant to voluntary childlessness. Early on, Veevers (1974) called attention to several of
the social policy implications of voluntary childlessness but this line of investigation remains in need of further study.

In sum, the literature on childfree, or voluntarily childless, adults is rich, representing a diverse array of disciplinary perspectives and methodological approaches. Though further questions remain about voluntary childlessness, researchers in this area will find much insight and many interesting questions raised within the existing literature on adults who make the choice not to become parents.
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