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Abstract

Background: In many countries around the world we are currently witnessing a large decrease in the fertility rate. This phenomenon brings several social sustaining problems. Large families (families with three or more children) seem therefore essential on contradicting this tendency. The aim of this study is to explore attitudes towards conception in large (LFM) and non-large families mothers (NLFM).

Methods: We used a quantitative approach (N=210 LFM; 170 NLFM) and we analyzed how the family type relates to variables such as satisfaction with life, religiosity, attitudes towards contraception, and attitudes towards abortion. These variables were accessed in each participant through an online survey.

Results: We found evidence supporting the hypothesis that LFM have higher levels of satisfaction with life and religiosity; they have more negative attitudes towards contraception and abortion. We have also tested the hypotheses of the relationship between family type and attitudes towards contraception and abortion being moderated by the strength of different types of religiosity, finding some supportive data, at least for the attitudes towards contraception.

Conclusion: Although we conclude that additional research on large families and reproductive behavior is needed, this study emphasizes some of the factors that differentiate the specific population that contributes to an increase the fertility rate.
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Introduction

Since the phenomenon known as the Baby Boom after World War II, there have been numerous efforts to control and reduce birth rates [1]. This efforts, though, have evolved into an excessive drop in birth rates. When comparing today’s Portuguese total fertility rate with the reality of a few generations ago, we find a drastic reduction in this population indicator. In fact, in 2010 Portugal had a total fertility rate of only 1.37 children per woman [2]. This is an economically unsustainable rate, considering that we need a total fertility rate of 2.1 children per woman to allow the replacement of generations [3]. Portugal is experiencing a serious demographic crisis.

Having the mean number of children in each family decreased, and families where there is still a high fecundity rate—three or more children—are an exception. Given the socio-economic importance of this exception, the present study focus on this type of family—the large families. If large families are an exception to current reproductive behaviors, it is important to understand why. Our analysis focus on the mothers of large families, specifically on the attitudes related to their reproductive behavior.

It is necessary to identify mechanisms and attitudes that are relevant when it comes to fertility decisions involving the beginning of a Large Family, as suggested by Eggen and Rupp cited by Rupp, Beier, Dechant & Haag [4]. The identification of these variables, however, is not intended to promote programs that force birth [5] but only to recognize the demographic value of a large family in a country where there is a shortage of births.

In the literature review we conducted, we have identified as relevant variables for this study “satisfaction with life”, “religiosity”, “attitudes towards contraception”, and “attitudes towards abortion”. Considering the current paradigm in Portugal, at least at a medium-high socio-economic level, we can advance the possibility of a negative correlation between the type of family and attitudes towards contraception [6], but perhaps more due to moral or religious issues than lack/presence of information; the same applies to the attitudes towards abortion [7]. Regarding the influence of religiosity on fertility, having in mind in particular the assumptions of theology and interaction reviewed by Zhang [8], and the doctrinal guidelines concerning reproductive behavior of the Catholic religion, which is the most frequent in Portugal, we decided to explore the role of Religiosity in the three dimensions identified by Koenig and Bussing [9]—Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Organizational. Furthermore, not intending to build an attitudinal explanatory model of reproductive behavior, we also aim to explore whether attitudes towards contraception and abortion weighed to reach a large fecundity rate, and if this fecundity rate represents greater satisfaction with life, as previously suggested by Angeles [10]. Contradicting Angeles [10] findings, it is more common to find data supporting opposite conclusions, like Beute-II and Wittig-Berman [11], who find that the number of children is negatively correlated with family satisfaction. We also find evidence [12] that shows the number of children at home is positively correlated with the inter-role conflict the woman experiences, in couples where the man is strongly work-oriented. However, these two references are older and therefore reflect a family reality more different from the present one, and it is thereby important to explore the relationship between satisfaction with life of a given mother and the number of children she has.

We have four main working hypotheses, which focused on the themes of satisfaction with life, religion, attitudes towards contraception and attitudes towards abortion, being implemented as follows:

Hypothesis 1. Mothers of Large Families present a higher mean level of satisfaction with life than Mothers of Non Large Families.

The second hypothesis will verify relationships between family type and the different types of religiosity:

Hypothesis 2.1. Mothers of Large Families present a higher mean level of organizational religiosity than Mothers of Non Large Families.

Hypothesis 2.2. Mothers of Large Families present a higher mean level of non-organizational religiosity than Mothers of Non Large Families.

Hypothesis 2.3. Mothers of Large Families present a higher mean level of intrinsic religiosity than Mothers of Non Large Families.

In hypothesis 3 we will check how family type relates to attitudes towards contraception and religiosity:

Hypothesis 3.1. Mothers of Large Families have more negative attitudes regarding contraception than Mothers of Non Large Families.

Hypothesis 3.2. The relationship between family type and attitudes towards contraception is moderated by organizational religiosity.

Hypothesis 3.3. The relationship between family type and attitudes towards contraception is moderated by non-organizational religiosity.

Hypothesis 3.4. The relationship between family type and attitudes towards contraception is moderated by intrinsic religiosity.

Finally, the fourth hypothesis will analyze how family type relates to attitudes towards abortion and religiosity:

Hypothesis 4.1. Mothers of Large Families have more negative attitudes in relation to abortion than Mothers of Non Large Families.

Hypothesis 4.2. The relationship between family type and attitudes towards abortion is moderated by organizational religiosity.

Hypothesis 4.3. The relationship between family type and attitudes towards abortion is moderated by non-organizational religiosity.
Hypothesis 4.4. The relationship between family type and attitudes towards abortion is moderated by intrinsic religiosity.

Methods

Sample
To isolate the possible influence of the variables "area of residence" and "marital status", we established that the questionnaire would be made only to mothers resident within the district of Lisbon and married. We anticipate this marital status as the most frequent in women who are mothers and according to Angeles [10], the effect of children on the satisfaction with life is greater if the couple is married. We also established that the questionnaire would be made only to mothers of biological children, since there are variables in study that directly related to conception (such as attitudes towards contraception and attitudes towards abortion).

The sample consists of 380 women with a mean age of 41.07 years old (SD = 7.560), being the youngest mother 25 years old and the oldest mother 71 years old. These participants were in average mothers for the first time at 27.40 years (SD = 3.959), being the participant who was first mother had her first child at 17 years old, and the latest mother had her first child at age 40.

In this study, 210 participants (55.3%) were Mothers of Large Families and 170 participants (44.7%) were Mothers of Non Large Families. Among Mothers of Large Families, 63.3% had three children, 21.9% had four children, 9% had five children, 2.9% had six children, 1.4% had seven children, and 1.5% had more than seven children (the maximum being 11). Regarding Mothers of Non Large Families, 31.2% had a single child, and 68.8% had two children.

Regarding the country of origin of these participants, the vast majority (98.7%) was Portuguese, two were (0.5%) Brazilian, one was (0.3%) Swedish, one was Guinean and one was Angolan. Regarding religion, 82.6% reported being Catholic, 6.3% from other religions, 7.4% reported having no religion, and 3.7% did not know or did not answer.

When asked about having or not a paying job, 83.4% responded "yes", 12.6% responded "no", and 3.9% responded "part-time". Regarding education, 6.1% had a maximum of 9th grade; 14.8% had completed 12th grade, 64.4% had a bachelor (3 years university) or "licenciatura" (5 years university), 12.1% had a master degree, and 2.6% had a PhD. Considering the household income, 5.9% lived with a maximum of 1000 Euros per month, 22.1% had an income between 1000 and 2000 Euros per month, 30.7% between 2000 and 3000 Euros per month, 22.6% between 3000 to 4000 Euros per month, and finally 18.6% lived with more than 4000 Euros per month. In Table 1 we present a summary of these variables for each family type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Non Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Non Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time mother</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without religion</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know/answer</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying job</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3-5 years university</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 1000</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income in €</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-2000</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000-3000</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 1 we present a summary of these variables for each family type.
Perspectives of mothers from large and non-large families

Instrument
Besides the type of family we studied four other variables. In this section we describe how each of them was operationalized, explaining the selection criteria of each instrument as well as the necessary adaptations for this study.

Satisfaction with Life Scale
The Satisfaction with Life Scale was chosen because it is a small, simple, and widely used scale. It was originally developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin [13] and has five items, each one with seven response options. It was found in full-size in a study of Seco, Casimiro, Pereira, Dias, and Custódio [14]. According to these authors, this scale was first adapted for the Portuguese population in 1990 by Neto, Barros, and Barros, with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.78. Later in 1992 there was still a second adjustment to the Portuguese population by Simões [14], where items have been given only five response options ranging from 1 - Strongly Disagree to 5 - Strongly Agree. This latest version had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.77. So, being this the version we used, it was not necessary to do any changes to the scale in this study.

Religiosity Scale
To operationalize the variable religiosity, we chose the Religiosity Scale of Moreira-Almeida, Peres, Aloe, Neto, and Koenig [15]. This choice was also based on the criterion of simplicity, being composed of only five items, and having the first two five response options, and the last three six response options. The scale focuses on three different conceptual dimensions: organizational Religiosity (first item); non organizational religiosity (second item), and intrinsic religiosity (last three items). This version [15] is an adaptation to the Brazilian population of the original scale of Koenig, Meador, and Parkerson [16]. According to Koenig, and Bussing [9], in different studies the original version of the scale has a Cronbach’s alpha ranging between 0.78 and 0.91. In the present study, this scale was adapted into Portuguese of Portugal through a process of translation and retranslation. The retranslation was made by three Brazilian Psychologists. The comparison between the translation and back translation was conducted by our research team. No significant differences emerged [17].

Attitudes towards Contraception Scale
In order to measure attitudes towards contraception, we consulted the Handbook of Sexuality Related Measures [18]. The Scale to Assess University Women’s Attitudes about Contraceptive Acquisition and Use of Fisher [19] was chosen as it also focuses on moral beliefs on the subject, which is a relevant aspect considering the variables under analysis, namely religiosity. As it was originally developed for the university context, the last three items were eliminated because they are only applicable to that context (e.g. “Going to the student health service in order to obtain birth control would be embarrassing”). This leaves 13 items in a Likert scale of seven values each. However, the meanings of the response extreme vary from item to item (e.g. “good / bad”, “wrong / right”). In its original version, it was found a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.83 for this scale, which is a good indicator of internal consistency [18]. As the scale was in English, it was translated into Portuguese, and retranslated back into English by an independent person with training in psychology. The items where disagreement arose were analyzed within our research team, to reach inter-judges agreement [17].

Scale of Attitudes towards Abortion
To make attitudes towards abortion measurable, we also consulted the Handbook of Sexuality Related Measures [18]. We chose the Scale of Attitudes towards Abortion of Finlay [20] because it is a simple scale, easy to apply, and with few items. In its original version it contains only one question (“Which of the following circumstances, in your opinion, justify a woman’s desire to have an abortion?”), with eight response options of one point each, and a final option of zero points which states “No circumstances ever justify abortion.” By completing this scale, participants may select as many answer options as they wish. This version of the scale has a coefficient of reproducibility of 0.9320. Regarding the adaptation of the scale for the Portuguese language, the process was identical to the previous scale. Three changes were necessary: 1) instead of the question asking “what are the circumstances which in your opinion justify the desire of a woman to abort” we ask ”what are the circumstances which in your opinion justify the choice of a woman to abort.” This because, being this practice currently legal in Portugal until ten weeks of pregnancy, it was considered that it would make sense to ask the question under a behavioral point of view; 2) one of the answer choices referred to problems caused by German measles (“the woman had German measles, and she fears the baby may have been harmed”). However, this was a more common problem in the past (remember that the scale was developed in the 80s). Since this is now a disease that is preventable by vaccine nationally, the response option has been replaced by ”the woman suspected that the baby has a disability,” as this motive was one of the exceptions in the Portuguese law of 1984 on the subject (line c Article 140 of the Criminal Code, according to the law 6/84 of May 11’); 3) the item ”the woman simply does not want another baby now” was removed for three reasons. First, because we felt that this item corresponds to an agreement with any circumstance, i.e. it would act as the other end of the null item. This item corresponds to the acceptance of any circumstance, then tick this option could result in data redundancy. Second, because by reducing the scale to seven accountable options, and by building an index, the minimum and maximum values (one to seven) become homogenized to the scale of Attitudes towards Contraception, thus facilitating the comparison of the two attitudes scales. Finally, we decided to
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Concerning the release of study, this was done initially
with the support of the Portuguese Association of Large
Families (APFN). APFN is independent of the Portuguese
State and political parties and brings together people of
various philosophical conceptions. A letter was written
to APFN members providing a link to the questionnaire
and the inclusion criteria. This letter was sent by APFN
to all mothers resident within the district of Lisbon. To
get participants of Non Large Families, the questionnaire
also circulated through research groups, a scout group, and
personal contacts.

At the end, all the data collected in Qualtrics could be
directly saved in a SPSS database. All analyzes were per
formed using the SPSS version 18 (PASW). We analyzed
the Cronbach’s alpha for the scales of Satisfaction with Life,
Attitudes towards Contraception (having been reversed
items 1, 7, and 12), and the dimension Intrinsic Religiosity
of the Religiosity scale. Subsequently index variables were
built on these scales. The scale on Attitudes towards Abort
sisted of only one question with several possible
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able, then analyzing the Cronbach’s alpha (PASW calcula
for this analysis with dichotomous variables is equivalent
to the coefficient of Kuder-Richardson [20]). After
these checks to the consistency of each scale and previous
recodes, hypotheses 1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, and 4.1, were ana
lyzed using a Student’s t test for independent samples, and
the groups defined by family type (Large or Non Large).
Regarding hypotheses 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4, these
were analyzed through moderation via regression. All
variables used in these regressions were previously cen
tered, in order to avoid problems of multicollinearity.

Results

Satisfaction with Life
In Table 2 we present the mean value and standard de
viation of each item of the scale used [23]. Analyzing
the Cronbach’s alpha, we obtained a value of 0.856 (which
would not increase with the exclusion of any item). As
the scale achieved a good result in the measure of internal
consistency analyzed, an index was constructed. This index
had an average of 4.06 (SD = 0.84), and this average could
vary between the values 1 and 5, corresponding 5 to high
est satisfaction.

Religiosity
According to the authors of the scale of Religiosity [15],
this should not be analyzed by calculating the total score,
but analyzing each dimension separately. In order to stan
dardize this scale with the other scales, all items in each
dimension were reversed, thus a higher value corresponds
to a higher degree of the construct in question (Religiosi
ity). As the first two items defined two different dimens
ions (Organizational Religiosity and Non Organizational
Religiosity), we present in Table 3, the mean and standard
deviceation for the first two dimensions.

These two items varied between 1 and 6 (the closer
to the value 6, the higher the level of religiosity). In Ta
ble 4 we can observe mean values for each item in the
third dimension (Intrinsic Religiosity). This scale has a
Cronbach’s alpha of 0.916. If the first item was elimi
nated, this value would rise to 0.923. However, as 0.916
is already a very good alpha value, we chose not to do
so, thus keeping all of the information collected. It was
then constructed an index of Intrinsic Religiosity, which
scored a mean of 3.72 (SD = 1.18), where 1 corresponds
to no religiosity and 5 representing the highest level.

**Scale of Attitudes towards Contraception**

After inversion of the items indicated by Fisher [19], we analyzed the average results of each item, which are presented in Table 5. This scale has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.907, which again indicates a fairly good consistency. This value was slightly higher eliminating the items 7 (0.913) 8 10 (0.908) and 12 (0.914). However, we chose not to do so again, keeping all the information available in the analysis.

These 13 items were then grouped into an index, obtaining an average of 5.68 (SD = 1.34). This value could vary from 1 to 7, representing the value 7 a more pro-contraception attitude.

**Scale on Attitudes towards Abortion**

In Table 6 we present the number of participants who reported each dichotomized variable from Finlay’s scale [20]. These variables had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.815; this value does not rise with the exclusion of any item. The eighth item (”no circumstance justifies an abortion”) was not accounted for in this calculation, because according to the author this option should be zero, serving only to ensure that all options were read by participants [20]. It was then constructed an index from the first seven variables. This does not constitute an average of several items, but rather the sum of responses to various items, ranging this result between 0 (no circumstance was pointed) and 7 (seven circumstances were pointed). On average, these participants indicated that they consider 2.57 circumstances justify the choice of a woman to abort (SD = 2.01).

### Table 2. Satisfaction with Life - Mean values for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SWL1</th>
<th>SWL2</th>
<th>SWL3</th>
<th>SWL4</th>
<th>SWL5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard-Deviation</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1.137</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SWL = Satisfaction with Life

### Hypothesis 1

**Hypothesis 1. The Mothers of Large Families present a higher mean level of Satisfaction with Life than Mothers of Non Large Families**

We found that all the assumptions of the Student’s $t$ test for two independent samples were respected. Thus continuing with the analysis, we obtained the following results: $t (378) = -2.008$, $p = 0.045$. As $p < 0.05$, we rejected the null hypothesis, concluding that there is a significant difference between the mean Satisfaction with Life in the two groups: the Mothers of Large Families ($N = 210$, $M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.83$) are more satisfied with the life than the Mothers of Non Large Families ($N = 170$, $M = 3.97$, $SD = 0.85$). Thus corroborating this hypothesis we measured the degree of association by the coefficient Eta, obtaining a value of 0.103, which according to Bryman and Cramer [24] corresponds to a very weak intensity. The proportion of the variation in Satisfaction with Life explained by the type of family is only 1.1%.

### Hypothesis 2

We wanted to test in this section the relationship between family type and Religiosity.

**Hypothesis 2.1. Mothers of Large Families have a greater Organizational Religiosity than Mothers of Non Large Families**

Respecting the assumptions of the Student’s $t$ test for independent samples, we found that $t (377) = -4.037$, $p < 0.001$. We rejected the null hypothesis then, corroborating the difference between the average of Organizational Religiosity in both types of mothers, featuring the Mothers

### Table 4. Intrinsic Religiosity – Mean values for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IR1</th>
<th>IR2</th>
<th>IR3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard-Deviation</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>1.294</td>
<td>1.349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IR = Intrinsic Religiosity

OR = Organizational Religiosity; NOR = Non Organizational Religiosity
of Large Families (N = 210, M = 4.16, SD = 1.57) higher average value in this type of religiosity, than the Mothers of Non Large Families (N = 169, M = 3.50, SD = 1.60). Regarding the association between these two variables, we obtained a 0.204 Eta, which shows a weak intensity of this relationship [24]. The family type explains a proportion of variation in Organizational Religiosity of only 4.1%.

Hypothesis 2.2. Mothers of Large Families have greater Non Organizational Religiosity than Mothers of Non Large Families. Verified the assumptions of the Student’s t test for independent samples, we found that t (378) = -3.168, p = 0.002. Assuming then a significant difference in mean of Non Organizational Religiosity for these two samples, we note again that Mothers of Large Families (N = 210, M = 3.78, SD = 1.92) are more religious than Mothers of Non Large Families (N = 170, M = 3.15, SD = 1.89). We found for this relationship a value of Eta 0.161, which again represents a very weak intensity relation [24], explaining the type of family a proportion of variation in Non-Organizational Religiosity only of 2.6%.

Hypothesis 2.3. Mothers of Large Families have greater intrinsic religiosity than Mothers of Non Large Families. Using the same test again, we found a t (328,102) = -3.908, p < 0.001, not assuming homogeneity of variance (p < 0.001 for the Levene test). We found then that Mothers of Large Families (N = 270, M = 3.93, SD = 1.06) are more religious than Mothers of Non Large Families (N = 170, M = 3.46, SD = 1.27). The measure of association between family type and Intrinsic Religiosity corresponds to a 0.201 Eta, which is a weak value, which shows that 4% of the proportion of variation of Intrinsic Religiosity is explained by family type.

Hypothesis 3

We explored the relationship between family type, Attitudes towards Contraception and Religiosity.

Hypothesis 3.1. Mothers of Large Families have more negative attitudes with respect to contraception than Mothers of Non Large Families. We found in this analysis a value of t (376,680) = 3.203, p = 0.001 when performing the Student’s t test for independent samples (assuming it is not assumed homogeneity of variances, since p = 0.006 for the Levene test). We found then that Mothers of Large Families (N = 210, M = 5.49, SD = 1.41) are on average more negative in relation to contraception than Mothers of Non Large Families (N = 170, M = 5.92, SD = 1.21), and this difference attained statistical significance. We found a very weak value of Eta (0.160) for the association between these two variables, explaining the type of family 2.6% of the proportion of variation of Attitudes towards Contraception.

Hypothesis 3.2. The relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Contraception is moderated by Organizational Religiosity. Regressing the interaction effect between family type and Organizational Religiosity on Attitudes towards Contraception, this proved to be significant, with an intensity of 0.85% (p = 0.027, B = - 0.147, SE = 0.066, Beta = - 0.092 t = -2215; R² Semiparcial = 0.0085). This interaction has a good tolerance (0.997), reflecting the absence of multicollinearity. Note also that the random residual variables

### Table 5A. Attitudes towards Contraception - Mean values for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATC</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC1</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC2</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC3</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC4</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>2.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC5</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC6</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC7</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATC** = Attitudes towards Contraception
had an expected value of zero. However, the distribution of residuals indicates some lack of normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variances, even after removing outliers (because of problems in the distribution of the dependent variable "attitudes towards contraception", the cases which residues had a value less than or equal to -2.5 were removed in all moderations with this variable as dependent), therefore we cannot consider that in this regression model assumptions are fully respected. We considered that it was still relevant to analyze graphically how these variables behave [25]. We saw that when family type is Large (high), the Attitudes towards Contraception tend to have lower values. This was very clear when Organizational Religiosity is high, and remains, although less sharply when the Organizational Religiosity is moderate. But when the Organizational Religiosity is low, this relationship is reversed, larger families show slightly higher values in Attitudes towards Contraception.

Hypothesis 3.3. The relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Contraception is moderated by Non Organizational Religiosity

Testing the existence of an interaction effect between family type and Non Organizational Religiosity in Attitudes towards Contraception, we faced a significant effect, with an intensity of 1.54% (p = 0.005, B = -0.163, SE = 0.058, beta = -0.124, t = -2.825; Semiparcial R2 = 0.0154). We emphasize that this model does not present problems of multicollinearity (tolerance = 0.997), with residual random variables with expected value zero. However, like the previous model, the distribution of residuals indicates some lack of normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variances, even after removing outliers. Thus, we should bear in mind that there are assumptions that could not be fully respected.

We also decided to graphically analyze the interaction of these variables [25]. We can verify that Attitudes towards Contraception are more positive in Non-Large Families. This relationship is not the same depending on the degree of Non Organizational Religiosity: the higher, the more negative these attitudes. Unlike the previous analysis on the Organizational Religiosity, at low levels of Non Organizational Religiosity this effect is not reversed, although it loses almost its entire expression.

Hypothesis 3.4. The relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Contraception is moderated by Intrinsic Religiosity

In checking the effect of interaction between family type and Intrinsic Religiosity on Attitudes towards Contraception, we found a significant effect, with an intensity of 1.49% (p = 0.009, B = -0.258, SE = 0.099, Beta = -0.124 t = -2.610; Semiparcial R2 = 0.0149). We checked the assumptions of no multicollinearity (tolerance = 0.967) and residual random variables having zero expected value. However, even after the removal of outliers, normal and linear distributions were not observed, with homogeneity of variance, in the residual random variables. We could see how, as in previous moderations, Intrinsic Religiosity influences the relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Contraception: when Religiosity is low, there is practically no difference in the level of Attitudes regarding contraception among family types, and these attitudes are more favorable; when Religiosity presents average values, the favorability regarding contraception falls, especially in Large Families; and finally, when Religiosity is high, the favorability regarding contraception falls further, reaching its minimum in more religious Large Families.

Hypothesis 4

Finally, we analyzed the relationship between family type, the Attitudes towards Abortion and Religiosity.

Hypothesis 4.1. Mothers of Large Families have more negative attitudes towards abortion than Mothers of Non Large Families.

When performing the Student’s t test for two independent samples, respecting all assumptions, we conclude that t (374) = 3809, p < 0.001, so this is a significant difference: Mothers of Large Families (N = 208; M = 2.23, SD = 1.92) are more negative towards abortion than Mothers of Non Large Families (N = 168, M = 3.01, SD = 2.03). Again, the value of Eta concerning the association between these two variables proved to be very weak (0.193), family type explains 3.7% of the variation in Attitudes towards Abortion.

Hypothesis 4.2. The relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Abortion is moderated by Organizational Religiosity

Testing for an effect of Organizational Religiosity in the relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Abortion, we found that there is no significant effect (p = 0.743, B = -0.032, SE = 0.098; Beta = -0.013 t = -0.328; Semiparcial R2 = 0.0002). This model does not reveal problems of multicollinearity (tolerance = 0.997), and the random residual variables have an expected null value. The distribution of residuals, however, indicates a lack of normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variances. We therefore consider that we have a regression model that does not meet some of the assumptions. Although this hypothesis does not translate into a significant confirmation, we analyzed the relationship between these variables [25]. The most numerous type of family had lower results in Attitudes towards Abortion, as well as the level of Organizational Religiosity. The group that was more favorable group towards abortion is constituted of women with few children and reduced Organizational Religiosity, and the less favorable group towards abortion is constituted of women with more children and more religious. Although here we do not find a significant effect in accordance with expectations, there is a trend for the influence of Religiosity and family type in these attitudes.
Hypothesis 4.4. The relationship between family type and Attitudes towards Abortion is moderated by Non-Organizational Religiosity

Finally, in the latter case, there was likewise no significant effect of moderation ($p = 0.371, B = -0.130, \text{SE} = 0.146$, beta = -0.038, t = -0.895; R2 Semiparcial = 0.0014). There were no multicollinearity problems (tolerance = 0.967) nor with the expected value of the residual random variables. Residual analysis reveals yet again, some deviations from normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variances were not met. Again, this is a model where it is not possible to admit some of the assumptions.

We analyzed however the relationship between the family type, Non Organizational Religiosity and Attitudes towards Abortion [25]. When family type is the most numerous, and/or when Non Organizational Religiosity is higher, we found more negative Attitudes towards Abortion, and the converse also applies: in non-large families and/or lower degrees of Non Organizational Religiosity, these attitudes are more favorable. We observed again a tendency as expected, although not significant.

Summary of Results

Here we aim to synthesize the information presented in the analysis of each hypothesis. We divide this synthesis according to the type of analysis performed, so outlining the analyzes using Student’s $t$ test for independent samples in Table 7, and the analyzes of moderation effect on different assumptions in Table 8. All significant relationships in both tables are highlighted.

Discussion

As expected, we found that Mothers of Large Families showed greater Satisfaction with Life [10]. We may admit that Mothers of Large Families are now living closer to the desired fertility, a concept studied by Dey and Wasoff [26] and Liefbroer [27], which may be one of several explanations for this difference in Satisfaction with Life. These mothers also showed higher Religiosity [8, 28, 29] in the three studied dimensions (Organizational, Non Organizational, and Intrinsic) according to Koenig & Bussing [9], and more negative attitudes towards Contraception [6] and Abortion [7, 30, 31]. It should be noted however, that although significant results were found, none of the relationships showed a strong intensity.

We found that religiosity can still be a factor that influences the strength of the relationship between family type and these attitudes, as suggested by Lehrer [32], Munshi & Myaux [33], and Davidson & Jaccard [34], being a moderator with significant effect in Attitudes towards Contraception, despite some limitations of the models. Note that the topic Natural Family Planning arose spontaneously in some comments left by some mothers ("I think that when you refer to contraceptives in your study you are not referring to natural methods of pregnancy regulation"); "You should consider in your study the use or no use of contraception or even of the so-called natural methods").

However, we have to consider that the study is limited to married mothers with biological children living in the district of Lisbon, Portugal. It would be therefore interesting to replicate the study of the relationships between

Table 7. Summary of Student’s $t$ tests for independent samples.

| Hypothesis | $M$ (LFM) | $M$ (NLFM) | $p$-value | $\text{Eta}^2 \times 100$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.1. (FT and SWL)</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.1. (FT and OR)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.2. (FT and NOR)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2.3. (FT and IR)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3.1. (FT and ATC)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.4.1.(FT and ATA)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{ATA} = \text{Attitudes towards abortion}; \text{ATC} = \text{Attitudes towards contraception}; \text{FT} = \text{Family Type}; \text{IR} = \text{Intrinsic religiosity}; \text{LFM} = \text{Large families mothers}; \text{OR} = \text{Organizational religiosity}; \text{NLFM} = \text{Non-large families mothers}; \text{NOR} = \text{Non-Organizational religiosity}; \text{SWL} = \text{Satisfaction with Life} \]
these variables in other populations. Due to these inclusion criteria, 71 questionnaires from a total of 451 could not be considered valid, so that only 84.26% (380) were considered for statistical analysis.

It is also important to remember that this is a non-random sample and a correlational study, so with these results we cannot draw generalizable conclusions to the population, neither causal relationships. These results must also be considered keeping in mind that the sample has a very wide range of ages (46 years apart), which includes different generational realities and contextual experiences, due to different historical, socio-economic, and political periods. On the other hand, a correlational study does not allow us to see the direction of a relationship, which may be bidirectional. For example, the fact that a mother had three or more children may constitute in itself a source of Satisfaction with Life, but it can also be the case that the decision to have a third child is the result of an already existing greater Satisfaction with Life. Another limitation that should be mentioned is the fact that the measuring instruments of Religiosity, Attitudes towards Contraception and Attitudes towards Abortion are not tested and standardized for representative samples of the Portuguese population, despite the adaptation process conducted. It is also necessary to note that online data collection implies a lack of control over the conditions on which such collection is done. Thus, if this collection had been made in person it would be possible to have a greater level of control of variables that can affect the course of the study.

Despite these limitations or specificities, we believe that these results are an important step in clarifying and building a theoretical framework for the study of Large Families. In conducting this study we sought to provide a basis for exploratory research on a very specific and understudied type of population—Mothers of Large Families. On the one hand, we focused on how these mothers perceive reality through the study of their Satisfaction with Life and noticing them more satisfied than the sample of Mothers of Non Large Families. On the other hand, we also studied attitudes closely related to conception, as the Attitudes towards Contraception and Abortion. We may intuit that a mother who accepts to accommodate three or more babies, can be—not knowing whether as cause or consequence—more predisposed to appreciate or revere conception, and therefore being more negative regarding Contraception and Abortion a consequence of being more positive regarding conception. This may be a possible explanation of our results that indicate this difference in attitudes. We also analyzed how different types of religiosity may be an influence on these attitudes, being Mothers of Large Families the most religious.

**Conclusion**

Although there might be some lack of control on some of the variables, we hope that this work has contributed to the study of the factors that differentiate the specific population that contributes to the increased rate of Birth, specifically through the study of Mothers of Large Families. It would be interesting to continue to identify other variables that may be relevant for such mothers, as the attitudes toward methods of Natural Family Planning, or the effects of this type of planning in married life [35], and in the Satisfaction with Life. It would be even further enriching this type of research focusing also both parents. Another interesting aspect would be to explore the role that this type of family plays in the communities where they are located, such as schools or associations.

Finally, we emphasize that more research in this area is also important on the politically point-of-view, especially in identifying measures that enable the reduction of the discrepancy between the desired number of children and the real number of children [36]. We know that the costs of having a child, employment or career, the household income, the perception of social uncertainty, and social policies are factors that weigh in reproductive behavior [37], and as such should also be taken into account at government level if we do not want to aggravate the fertility crisis happening in Portugal. On the other hand, there are sometimes parents with a higher socioeconomic status expecting to have fewer children [26], so we consider that, according to David [5], it continues to be a need for in-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Effect</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard-error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>R2 Semi-partial</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(H.3.2.) FT*OR - ATC</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>-2.215</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H.3.3.) FT*NOR – ATC</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>-2.825</td>
<td>0.0154</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H.3.4.) FT*IR - ATC</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>-2.610</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H.4.2.) FT*OR – ATA</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.328</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H.4.3.) FT*NOR – ATA</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.966</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>0.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H.4.4.) FT*IR – ATA</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td>0.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATA = Attitudes towards Abortion; ATC = Attitudes towards contraception; FT = Family Type; LFM = Large families mothers; OR = Organizational Religiosity; NLFM = Non-large families mothers; NOR = Non-Organizational Religiosity
terdisciplinary research dedicated to what influences social changes in reproductive behavior.
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