

**Views of the Interrelationships of the Dimensions of Developmental Idealism  
and Family Life: Evidence from Nepal**

Arland Thornton

Linda Young-DeMarco

Dirgha Ghimire

*University of Michigan*

Population Studies Center Research Report 12-778  
October 2012

## **ABSTRACT**

We examine how people understand and conceptualize developmental idealism – a cultural schema that links ideas about societal and familial development. For centuries, scholars and policy makers have written that the world is dynamic, changing from traditional to modern, that modern families are causes of modern societies, that modern societies are causes of modern families, and that modern societies and families are better than traditional ones. These ideas have spread widely around the world, with the capacity for fostering change. The question motivating our research concerns the extent to which people link together the various aspects of developmental idealism as a package. Do individuals who endorse one aspect of developmental idealism endorse other aspects, or is there little relationship between how individuals evaluate the various aspects? We investigate these issues using 2008 data collected in Nepal. Our data indicate that Nepalis link some aspects of developmental idealism together but not others.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This paper examines the ways in which people in Nepal understand and conceptualize developmental idealism, a set of beliefs and values that scholars and policy makers have created from the ideas of modernization and development. Developmental idealism is a cultural schema that contains ideas linking certain aspects of societal and familial development. For centuries, scholars and policy makers have written that the world is dynamic, with changes moving from traditional to modern, that modern families are causes of modern societies, and that modern societies are causes of modern families. They have also written that modern societies and families are better than traditional ones. These views have been disseminated widely around the world where they are known among ordinary people and influence a range of behaviors, including family ones. Our goal in this paper is to investigate the extent to which ordinary people in Nepal understand and conceptualize the various aspects of developmental idealism as a package versus understanding the various aspects as separate entities.

Developmental idealism is an outgrowth from the ideas of modernization/development that have dominated much academic and public policy discourse for centuries (Nisbet 1969; Sanderson 1990). The ideas of development have been so powerful that today most governments and international organizations endorse development and programs to encourage it. A central part of the developmental model for centuries has been the idea that countries have been distributed along a continuum of development, with northwest Europe and its diasporas having high development and with other countries scattered at various lower levels of development.

Although there are within-country and within-region differences, scholars have emphasized for at least two hundred years that family systems have varied greatly across countries, particularly emphasizing the differences between families in northwest Europe and elsewhere (Westermarck 1894/1891; Hajnal 1965; Laslett 1977; Le Play 1855-1881; Malthus 1803; Reher 1998; Thornton 2005). In contrast with northwest Europe, societies in many regions of the world were seen as generally organized around families, having extensive family solidarity, having large complex households, having little gender equality, having arranged marriages, contracting marriages at young ages, and having unplanned and high fertility. Since these family attributes were often found in places labeled as less developed, the attributes themselves were frequently labeled as less developed or traditional. In comparison with many of these societies, northwest Europe was often viewed to have more individualism,

smaller and simpler households, greater gender equality, more freedom and affection in mate selection, older ages at marriages, and planned and low fertility. Since such family types were seen as being located in modern or developed places, they were themselves seen as modern.

As Thornton (2001, 2005) has documented, this developmental model and the perceived associations of development with certain family systems created developmental idealism—a schema of beliefs and values concerning many aspects of family life and how they are related to well-being. Developmental idealism is a set of cultural ideas indicating that modern societies and families are good, that modern societies produce modern families, that modern families bring prosperity, and that equality and freedom are essential human rights. This means that developmental idealism is associated with extensive technology, high levels of education, a high standard of living, individualism, gender equality, youthful autonomy, small families, mature marriage, and fertility control. Coming from the developmental model, developmental idealism also posits a world where social change is both expected and valued, with that change seen as moving from the traditional to the modern.

Developmental idealism is one of several cultural ideas that originated in the West and has been disseminated internationally among academic, economic, and political elites. This Western culture, which has sometimes been portrayed as a universal or world culture, has been powerful in the dissemination of support for individualism and a rational worldview, expanded school enrollments, greater human rights and gender equality, and the expansion of family planning and low fertility (Meyer, Boli, Thomas & Ramirez 1997; Krücken and Drori 2009; Benavot et al 1991; Baker and Letendre 2005; Tsutsui and Wotipka 2004; Cole 2005; Bromley, Meyer & Ramirez 2009; Berkovitch 1999; Barrett and Frank 1999). The bulk of the documentation for the spread of Western culture has focused on government doctrines and programs, laws, school programs and textbooks, and nongovernmental organizations.

Research is accumulating to show that many of the ideas of modernization have spread widely and been incorporated into many cultures around the world. Important here is ethnographic research conducted in Subsaharan Africa, New Guinea, the Middle East, China, Nepal, and India (Caldwell, Reddy & Caldwell 1988; Dahl and Rabo 1992; Deeb 2006; Ferguson 1999; Osella and Osella 2006; Pigg 1992; Wang 1999; Ahearn 2001; Abu-Lughod 1998; Yount, Thornton, Mehanna, Patel & Moaddel 2010). Such knowledge has also been documented in focus group research among high school students in Argentina (Binstock and Thornton 2007).

Although survey research on developmental idealism is very new, recent surveys have documented knowledge of some elements of developmental idealism among ordinary people in several places. Research in Nepal shows that many ordinary people believe that certain family attributes are associated with development, education, wealth, and the good life (Mitchell 2009; Thornton, Binstock & Ghimire 2008, Thornton, Ghimire, & Mitchell, forthcoming). Also, survey research in Iran and Malawi demonstrates that several aspects of developmental idealism, including the association of certain family aspects with development, are widely recognized in these two countries (Abbasi-Shavazi, Nodoushan & Thornton 2012; Thornton et al 2012a). Also, ordinary people in Argentina, China, Egypt, Iran, Nepal, and the United States have been shown to have knowledge of several aspects of developmental idealism about fertility and family planning (Thornton et al 2012b).

It is important to note that many of the ideas of developmental idealism directly contradict many of the cultural ideas that the people of the world have had for hundreds of years. Consequently, the introduction of developmental idealism into a population is often met with rejection as it conflicts with the existing culture of that population. Developmental idealism, however, can gain considerable legitimacy over time and become increasingly accepted by a population. Of course, individuals can reject certain elements of developmental idealism while accepting others. In addition, individuals can hold multiple reinforcing and conflicting ideas at the same time, adapting and integrating together developmental idealism and local cultures in various ways (Thornton 2001, 2005).

This spread of developmental idealism is important because social scientists have increasingly recognized the importance of ideational or cultural factors in their explanations of family and demographic behavior (Basu 2005; Caldwell 1982; Coale and Watkins 1986; Cleland and Wilson 1987; Cherlin 1992; van de Kaa 1996; Lesthaeghe 2010; Johnson-Hanks et al 2011). Thornton (2001, 2005, 2010) has argued that the spread of developmental idealism has played an important role in the family and demographic behavior of individuals in many parts of the world. He has argued that developmental idealism has changed individual decisionmaking and behavior in many places concerning cohabitation, marriage, divorce, intergenerational relations, women's roles, contraceptive use, and family size. Furthermore, as developmental idealism has been disseminated, it has produced in many places societal changes in these important dimensions of life (Cammack and Heaton 2011; Kavas and Thornton 2012; Thornton and Philipov 2009; Yount and Rashad 2008).

Despite the importance of developmental idealism for understanding individual behavior and societal trends and the growing documentation of its spread, there are many important unanswered questions concerning it. So far, the research has focused primarily on aggregate distributions of developmental idealism, asking questions about how widespread developmental idealism is. There has been little attention paid to how individuals themselves conceptualize developmental idealism. The purpose of this paper is to address the ways that individuals interrelate various aspects of developmental idealism.

Our general question concerns the extent to which individuals accept or reject the various aspects of developmental idealism as a package. That is, do individuals who endorse one aspect of developmental idealism also endorse the other aspects of developmental idealism? Or is there little or no relationship between the ways in which individuals evaluate the various aspects of developmental idealism? Or, is there some middle ground where individuals interrelate some aspects of developmental idealism but not others?

We conceptualize the various aspects of developmental idealism along two cross-cutting axes. One axis, which we refer to as elements of developmental idealism, focuses on the various family elements involved, such as age at marriage, fertility, spouse choice, and non-marital cohabitation. The second axis, which we refer to as the dimensions of developmental idealism, concerns whether the issue is one of perception of causation, expectation of change, or value placed on family elements. More specifically, the dimensions include: beliefs about modern societies causing modern families; beliefs about modern families causing modern societies; beliefs about future change; evaluations of future change; and values concerning various family configurations.

Concerning the family elements of developmental idealism, we are interested in whether individuals who see one family element to be connected to development also see other family elements to be connected to development. We ask, for example, do people who say that development will cause fertility to decrease also say that development will cause age at marriage, self-choice of spouse, and non-marital cohabitation to increase? Also, do people who say that non-marital cohabitation will increase in the future also say that age at marriage and self-choice of spouse will increase in the future and that fertility will decline? And, are people who believe that low fertility is better than high fertility more likely to say that an older age at marriage, self-choice spouse, and societies where non-marital cohabitation is acceptable are better?

The interrelationships among the various family elements of developmental idealism can vary from all the family elements being very closely interrelated to none of them being interrelated. In the closely-interrelated case, individuals who endorsed developmental idealism in regard to one family element would endorse developmental idealism in regard to the other family elements. In the weakly-interrelated case, individuals who endorse one family element of developmental idealism would not be more likely than other individuals to endorse other family elements of developmental idealism. Of course, there is the intermediate possibility that endorsement of one family element would be related to endorsement of some other family elements but not to others. There may also be clusters of family elements that interrelate with each other and not with other clusters.

Turning now to our second axis of developmental idealism that focuses on the dimensions of beliefs about causation, beliefs about future change, or value placed on family attributes, we ask, for example, do people who say that development will produce an increase in self-choice spouse also say that an increase in self-choice spouse will foster development, that self-choice spouse will increase in the future, that an increase in self-choice spouse is a good thing, and that self-choice spouse is generally better than parental spouse choice. Similarly, we ask whether people who say that development will increase age at marriage also say that an increase in age at marriage will foster development, that age at marriage will increase in the future, that an increase in age at marriage is a good thing, and that an older age at marriage is generally better than a younger age at marriage. Similar questions can be asked about beliefs in causation, beliefs about future change, and values concerning the other family elements.

Just as we suggested that the linkages among the various family elements of developmental idealism might vary, so may the linkages among the various dimensions of developmental idealism. These dimensions of developmental idealism could range from being closely interrelated to having no interrelationships. In the closely-related case, people who endorsed developmental idealism as it related to development causing more self-choice in spouse selection would also say that an increase in self-choice would help produce development, that self-choice would increase in the future, evaluate an increase in self-choice positively, and generally value self-choice over a parentally arranged marriage. In the weakly-interrelated case, there would be no relationship between the answers that individuals gave on these dimensions of developmental idealism as it relates to spouse choice. In addition, there may be clusters of these dimensions of developmental idealism that are interrelated, but not interrelated with the other dimensions of developmental idealism.

Our primary goal in this paper is to address these questions using 2008-2009 survey data from Nepal. We have several batteries of questions asking Nepalis whether they believe that development will change certain family elements, whether changes in certain family elements will foster development, beliefs about future family change, evaluations of future family changes, and values about family elements. For each dimension of developmental idealism, we asked about several family elements. In this paper we examine how the family elements of developmental idealism are interrelated in the minds of individuals and how the dimensions of developmental idealism are interrelated for individuals.

One of our central findings is that certain family elements of developmental idealism interrelate or cluster together quite highly while others do not. That is, for some clusters, individuals who endorse one family element of developmental idealism are substantially more likely than other individuals to endorse other family elements of developmental idealism. Another central finding is that individuals who endorse one dimension of developmental idealism are substantially more likely than other people to endorse certain other dimensions of developmental idealism. These findings allow us to address the measurement reliability of the developmental idealism questions in our survey. By assuming that certain measures are so interrelated that they are measuring essentially the same basic thing, we can obtain estimates of measurement reliability. This provides insight into the reliability of developmental idealism measures for people in Nepal.

In addition to answering the questions motivating this research, our answers will provide an important foundation for additional research. By providing evaluations of how particular elements of developmental idealism fit together, our research provides the foundation for data reduction and the creation of scales for future research investigating the factors influencing developmental idealism and the ways in which developmental idealism influences decisionmaking and behavior concerning a wide range of behaviors, including marriage, childbearing, marital dissolution, and gender roles. In addition, our research provides insights concerning whether measurement reliability is sufficiently high that researchers can use the measures confidently in analyses of the causes and consequences of the acceptance of developmental idealism.

Note that our research is not motivated by any endorsement of either the general modernization model or of developmental idealism. We recognize that the modernization model

has in recent decades been strongly challenged by social scientists and we do not advocate it as a useful model for understanding social change (Hodgen 1964; Nisbet 1969, 1980; Szreter 1993). We also take no position concerning whether the various elements of developmental idealism are bad or good, false or true. We are interested in developmental idealism because we believe that it is a powerful force on individuals and societies, and it is important to understand how people evaluate it, what influences it, and how it influences other important aspects of life.

## **STUDY SITE**

Our research site is in the Western Chitwan Valley in south central Nepal. Nepal is a mountainous country located between China and India. Although the majority of Nepalis are Hindu, there is a substantial Buddhist minority, and a few people of other religions. Important attributes of Nepal include a rural population involved in agriculture, low levels of education and income, limited health services, and limited transportation and communication facilities. The country has historically had several family attributes that developmental idealism has identified as traditional, including early marriage, arranged marriage, extended households, parental control over children, and unplanned and high fertility. Nepal has historically prescribed same-caste marriage and proscribed widow remarriage, premarital sex, and non-marital cohabitation.

Although there were historically contacts between Nepal and the outside world, before the 1950s Nepal was kept in relative isolation (Adhikari 1998). From the 1950s onward, the country became increasingly open and integrated with the rest of the world, with development becoming a major goal of the government and other elites (Bista 1991; Panday 1999). Many governmental and nongovernmental organizations and programs have promulgated developmental idealism messages. Also important has been the expansion of schools and educational attainments, health services, nonfamily employment, and the mass media (Axinn and Yabiku 2001; Beutel and Axinn 2002; Barber and Axinn 2004; Yabiku and Schlabach 2009). International tourism has also been important in Nepal for decades.

The Chitwan Valley was covered with dense forest before 1955 when the government in cooperation with an international aid project opened the valley for settlement. Many migrants moved to Chitwan from all around the country. The Valley was connected to the rest of Nepal by all-weather roads in the late 1970s and experienced similar changes that occurred in other parts of the country (Shrestha 1989; Gunaratne 1994; Barber et al 1997; Axinn and Yabiku 2001).

## DATA AND METHODS

### Sample Design

Our data come from the 2008 interviews in the Chitwan Valley Family Study. The sample comes from 151 neighborhoods scattered throughout Western Chitwan Valley. A neighborhood was defined as a geographic cluster of five to fifteen households. The neighborhoods were chosen to be an equal probability, systematic sample of neighborhoods in Western Chitwan. The characteristics of the neighborhoods sampled closely resemble the characteristics of the Chitwan Valley (Barber et al 1997).

The main universe of the study included all residents of the sampled neighborhoods aged 15-59. In addition to this main sample, we interviewed parents of unmarried people 15-34 and spouses of people 15-34 as long as the parents and spouses were living in Nepal. The response rate was 97.1 percent, with our sample size being just over 5000 people. Because our sample comes from one valley, our results cannot be extrapolated to all of Nepal. Table 1 provides information concerning the attributes of the sample. Study participants were interviewed in the Nepali language in face-to-face interviews.

### Conceptual and Measurement Issues

When this research began, there were no existing measures of developmental idealism. Several diverse approaches were used to create the needed measures (Thornton et al 2010). The first task was gaining an understanding of how development, change, and family matters are discussed in Nepal. We both used the ethnographic work by others (Fricke 1988, 1997; Bista 1991; Pigg 1992, Guneratne 1998, 2001; Ahearn 2001) and our own ethnographic work to understand how development, *bikas* in Nepali, is conceptualized. We conducted informal discussions, in-depth interviews, and focus groups with individuals from multiple ethnic groups, genders, and ages to explicate Nepali thinking on development and family matters.

We then designed and pretested questions that asked people in survey settings about several dimensions of developmental idealism. We fielded these in a pilot study in 2003 that showed that people understood our questions and were able to answer them (Thornton et al forthcoming). With this experience, we modified our questions and interview protocols somewhat, pretested them further, and then fielded them in the 2008 interviews of the Chitwan Valley Family Study.

We use data designed to ascertain five different dimensions of developmental idealism. Within each dimension of developmental idealism, respondents were asked about several family elements. These family elements included many that have long been associated with developmental idealism's traditional-modern continuum: age of marriage; arranged marriage; individual needs compared to family needs; intergenerational coresidence; timing of childbearing; and respect for authority. The family elements asked about also include two dimensions of historical Nepali culture that are often considered traditional: prescriptions for inter-caste marriage and proscriptions against widow remarriage. Finally, we included questions on family attributes that have recently become common in the West and are frequently associated with modernity: marital dissolution; premarital sex; and non-marital cohabitation. Details about the introductions to the questions and exact question wording are provided in Appendix A.

For the first two dimensions of developmental idealism, we asked respondents about causal relationships between family change and development. The first of these two sets asked respondents if development would increase or decrease the prevalence of certain family elements, while the second set asked if certain family changes would make Nepal richer or poorer. The interviewer did not define development but let respondents use their own perspective to answer the questions. For the third dimension of developmental idealism, we asked respondents to give us their beliefs about whether certain family elements would increase or decrease in the future, while for the fourth dimension, we asked respondents whether they thought family changes in the direction of developmental idealism would be good, bad, or it didn't matter. Finally, for our fifth set, we asked respondents to compare different family elements and evaluate which element was better. Respondents who initially gave a response of "other" or "don't know" to any question were encouraged in a follow-up question to choose one of the options.

The univariate distributions for these questions are provided in Table 2 as dichotomies showing the percentage who gave the answer endorsed by developmental idealism. The very few respondents who insisted that they did not know or provided another answer were coded in Table 2 as not giving a developmental idealism answer. Also, for Table 2, the trichotomy for the evaluations of future trends was dichotomized; respondents saying that a future family change in the modern direction was good were coded as endorsing developmental idealism, while all others were coded as not endorsing it. However, for the correlations and factor analyses described below, we used the full ordered-trichotomy of support from thinking that developmental idealism in the future would be bad, to indifferent, to good.

## **Analysis Strategy**

Since our basic research question concerns the extent to which the answers people give on developmental idealism questions are interrelated or correlated, we began our analysis by calculating polychoric or tetrachoric correlations among all of the family elements within each of the dimensions of developmental idealism. That is, we calculated a matrix of correlations among family elements for the development causing family change dimension, a matrix among family elements for the family causing development dimension, a matrix among family elements for the future expectation dimension, a matrix among family elements for the evaluation of future change dimension, and a matrix among family elements for the evaluation of which family attributes are better dimension (see Appendix B).

To summarize the data, we conducted exploratory factor analysis of each of the five sets of questions. For each set, we estimated one and two factor models, with correlations between factors estimated in the two-factor models. In the one-factor model, the assumption is that there is one underlying construct or factor that explains each of the observed variables. The factor analysis estimates the effects (or loadings) of the underlying construct or factor on each observed variable. Uniformly high loadings indicate that each of the observed measures are closely related to the underlying construct and to each other. The two-factor model assumes that there are two underlying factors explaining the observed measures. Observed variables with high loadings on one factor are highly interrelated with each other while observed variables with high loadings on the second factor are highly interrelated with each other. The factor loadings from these models are reported in Table 3.

We also calculated a set of correlation matrices between the dimensions of developmental idealism within categories of the family elements. That is, for each family element such as arranged marriage, we calculated a matrix of correlations among the answers respondents gave about development changing the prevalence of arranged marriage, about changing prevalence of arranged marriage affecting development, about the future of arranged marriage, about the evaluations of future changes in arranged marriage, and about evaluations of arranged versus self-choice marriage. Similar five-variable correlation matrices were calculated for each of the other family elements (see Appendix C). We also estimated one-factor models for each of these sets of variables, with the factor loadings listed in Table 4.

We did not estimate two-factor models for these five variable sets because there was too little information to identify the parameters. This led us to focus our attention on the patterns of correlations among the five variables in order to investigate further linkages among them.

Although the primary motivation of our paper is on the ways that Nepalis conceptualize and inter-connect the various elements of family life and the various dimensions of developmental idealism, our data also provide insights into the measurement reliabilities of the items. We define reliability as the ratio of the variance of the factor (underlying latent variable) to the variance of the observed variable. By making assumptions that two of our developmental idealism items measure the same underlying construct, measure only that underlying construct, and have equal reliabilities (and equal factor loadings), we estimate the factor score as the square root of the correlation between the two measures and the reliability as the correlation itself. However, to the extent that the assumptions of the two items measuring the same thing and only that thing are violated, our estimates of loadings will be biased downward through this estimation procedure.

## **RESULTS**

### **Aggregate Distributions**

We first discuss the univariate distributions of each of the dichotomous developmental idealism variables, which are displayed in Table 2. Our first observation is that the percentage endorsing the developmental idealism answer is greatest for two of the five developmental idealism dimensions: development causing family change; and expectations of developmental idealism in the future. For eight of the eleven items dealing with development causing family change, the majority of respondents indicated that development would change the family element in the developmental idealism direction, with many of the percentages being substantially above fifty percent. Similarly, for ten of the twelve items dealing with expectations about the future, the majority, often a great majority, indicated that the family element would move in the developmental idealism direction in the next twenty years. The exceptions to this generalization are age at marriage and divorce for the development causing family change questions, respect for authority for the future questions, and women never marrying for both sets of questions. Even for these exceptions, forty percent or more endorsed the developmental idealism answer.

For the other three dimensions of developmental idealism—family change causing development, evaluation of developmental change in the future, and preferences for developmental idealism—the pattern is just the opposite. For most of the questions, only a minority endorsed the developmental idealism answer, and in several cases the minority is very small. The only family elements where a majority endorsed the developmental idealism answer consistently were age at first marriage and time from marriage to first birth. These exceptions are important because both of these variables deal with age at family formation, and both have been the subject of extensive indoctrination by government and nongovernmental organizations in Nepal. In addition, for both marriages arranged by parents and widow remarriage, respondents endorsed the developmental idealism response for two of the three items.

It is, of course, difficult to interpret differences in distributions across questionnaire items because of differences in question emphasis and meaning. Nevertheless, Table 2 suggests that there is more belief in the two cognitive dimensions of development causing family change and beliefs about the future than in evaluations of developmental idealism (either present or future). People seem to endorse the model in the two former instances, but not in the evaluations of the patterns involved. Interestingly, the distribution of answers concerning the cognitive element of family change bringing development tends to line up more with the two evaluation variables than with the other two cognitive variables, an observation that we will return to later.

### **Interrelations among Family Elements within Dimensions of Developmental Idealism**

We now turn to Table 3 and the factor loadings from the exploratory factor analyses of the family elements observed within dimensions of developmental idealism. The factor loadings equal the standardized effect of the underlying construct or factor on the observed variable. The factor loadings in the one-factor models are not uniformly high across the various family elements within dimensions of developmental idealism. This means that there is no uniform pattern for individuals who endorse the developmental idealism response on one family element to endorse it for the other family elements. That is, developmental idealism does not appear to come as a single simple package. The people who endorse one family element being related to development are not necessarily the same individuals who endorse the other items.

At the same time, there are very few loadings in Table 3 that are close to zero or negative. This means that there is at least some tendency for individuals who endorse one family element being related to development to also endorse other family elements being related to development. Thus, there is some tendency towards individuals to be either general endorsers of developmental idealism within a developmental idealism dimension or to be general rejecters of developmental idealism.

The data suggest that the dimension of developmental idealism where the interconnections among answers given by respondents are the highest is for the family causing development items. The smallest loadings for these sets of items are .38, the highest loading reaches .78, and the average loading is .55. The second highest set of interconnections is for values concerning developmental idealism in the future; the smallest loading is .25, the highest is .77, and the mean is .44. For development causing family change, the loadings range from -.16 to .88, with an average of .42. Although there are very high loadings for some of the family elements in the questions focused on expectations of developmental idealism in the future and current values about developmental idealism, overall these loadings tend to be smaller than for the other three dimensions, with average loadings ranging from .29 to .39.

We now turn to the two-factor models and ask whether the family elements within dimensions of developmental idealism tend to interrelate together in two groupings. Here, the general answer is yes. Among the numerous variables analyzed in Table 3, there were only four that did not have positive factor loadings of .3 or higher on one of the two factors. Three of these concerned values for certain family elements. All the family elements in development causing family, family causing development, and values for the future had loadings on one of the factors that were positive and .3 or higher. Furthermore, only one family element in the future expectations set failed to load as high as .3 on one of the two factors. There is clearly a tendency for some individuals to accept a group of developmental idealism items while other individuals tend to reject those same items.

Burrowing a little deeper, we can see that some of the family elements cluster together quite tightly within a dimension of developmental idealism. For example, the loadings on divorce, non-marital cohabitation, and premarital sex in Factor B of development causing family change range from .58 to .87. In addition, these three variables load on Factor A in family change causing development from .65 to .89, on Factor A in expectations of the future from .57 to .82, and evaluations of developmental idealism in the future from .63 to .80. The non-marital cohabitation and premarital sex elements also load on Factor A in the developmental values dimension, but the divorce element does not. Clearly, people in Nepal perceive the relationships between development and cohabitation and premarital sex similarly. This is very likely the result of these two family elements being very similar in content. With the exception of the developmental idealism values dimension, the divorce item generally loads with cohabitation and premarital sex, indicating that people who see divorce as part of development also often see cohabitation and premarital sex as part of development.

Interestingly, the element of putting individual needs before family needs tends to load with divorce, cohabitation, and premarital sex, although the loadings for putting individual needs above the family are consistently smaller than for the other three family elements. This suggests that there may be an individualism/familism element in the ways that people link divorce, cohabitation, and premarital sex with development.

Two other family elements that load together consistently are inter-caste marriage and widow remarriage. They have loadings of .57 and .51 on the development causing family change items, .76 and .64 on the family change causing development items, .58 and .49 on the expectations for the future, .50 and .61 on the evaluations of future family change, and .42 and .76 for values about developmental idealism. People who see development connected to inter-caste-marriage also see it connected to widow remarriage, and rejection of one is associated with rejection of the other. Interestingly, for some developmental idealism dimensions, inter-caste marriage and widow remarriage also load with divorce, cohabitation, and premarital sex.

Two additional family elements that generally load together are marriages arranged by parents and married children living with parents. This is especially the case for development causing family change and for expecting future change in the developmental idealism direction. These two variables share the common property that both involve intergenerational relations around marriage--about how the marriage is arranged or living arrangements after marriage.

There are also a small handful of family elements that have only modest loadings with all the other family elements across all the question types. These include age at marriage where all the loadings are lower than .4 and never marrying, where only one loading reaches as high as .41. This means that these two family elements do not generally interrelate highly with the other items.

Looking now at the correlations between factors in the two-factor models (bottom row of Table 3), we see that, with one exception, the correlations between the two factors are positive. In addition, two of the inter-factor correlations are quite substantial: .46 for the family change causing development set and .31 for future expectations of developmental idealism. The exception to this pattern is the set of questions dealing with values for developmental idealism, as there is virtually no correlation between the two factors on this dimension, just as the one-factor loadings for this set were smaller than for the other sets.

### **Interrelations among Dimensions of Developmental Idealism within Family Elements**

We now shift our focus from examining how respondents group together various family elements within dimensions of developmental idealism to considering how they group dimensions of developmental idealism within family elements. In Table 4, we list the one-factor loadings for each dimension of developmental idealism within each family element. We see that with seven of the eight family elements, the factor loadings are all positive and in many instances are quite substantial. This indicates that individuals who perceive a particular family element as related to developmental idealism in one dimension also see that same family element to be related to other dimensions of developmental idealism. Furthermore, the high loadings indicate substantial interrelationships among some of the dimensions of developmental idealism.

Although the factor loadings are generally positive, they are also uneven, sometimes substantially so. This suggests that some of the dimensions of developmental idealism are quite closely interconnected while others are loosely interconnected.

As we noted earlier, we did not have sufficient information to estimate two-factor models with five variables. This led us to rely on the patterns of intercorrelations among the five variables within the eight sets of family elements (Appendix C). These investigations revealed a general pattern of interrelationships among the developmental idealism dimensions across the eight family elements: two developmental idealism dimensions were generally interrelated with each other, and the other three developmental idealism dimensions were generally interrelated with each other.

The two interrelated developmental idealism dimensions include the dimension of development causing family change and expectations for the future. The correlations between these two developmental idealism dimensions ranged from .35 to .74 across the eight family elements, with the mean correlation equaling .52. Furthermore, for each of the eight family elements, the correlation between the developmental idealism dimension of development causing family change and expectations for the future were higher than all correlations between these two dimensions and the other three developmental idealism dimensions, with most of the latter correlations being rather small. These correlations provide evidence that the two dimensions of development causing family change and expectations for the future are quite closely interrelated in people's minds, but are generally fairly unrelated to the other three dimensions of developmental idealism.

We took this insight about the interconnections between the dimension of development causing family change and the future expectations dimension further by estimating factor loadings for these two dimensions for each of the eight family elements on the assumption that the two dimensions of developmental idealism were measuring the same thing. Estimation of these factor loadings also required that we assume that the factor loadings for the two dimensions were equal. With these assumptions, the factor loadings for these two dimensions are equal to the square root of the correlation between the two variables. We show the estimated factor loadings for these two dimensions for each of the eight family elements in the second column of Table 4.

Table 4 reveals consistently high factor loadings for these two dimensions across each of the eight family elements. They range from .59 to .86, with the average of the eight loadings being .72. This indicates a high degree of interconnectedness in the ways that individual Nepalis perceive the future and the influence of development on family change.

The other three dimensions of developmental idealism—family change causing development, evaluations of future increases in developmental idealism, and values for developmental idealism—also tend to be interconnected with each other. Although the correlations among these three dimensions of developmental idealism tend to be smaller than the correlations between the two previously discussed dimensions, for six of the eight family elements the correlations are quite substantial, with many exceeding .3 (Appendix C). Individuals who give the developmental idealism answer on one of these dimensions tend to give the developmental idealism answers on the others. The two exceptions are for putting individual needs above family needs and for divorce, where some correlations are close to zero or negative.

For the six family elements with substantial intercorrelations among the dimensions of family change causing development, evaluations of future family change, and values for developmental idealism, we used exploratory factor analysis to estimate factor loadings for a one-factor model for the three dimensions. Estimation of a one-factor model with three variables is just identified and no goodness of fit parameters are estimated. The factor loadings are provided in the columns labeled “B” of Table 4.

All of these variables load together with modest-to-high loadings. The loadings range from .35 to .87, with all but one loading at .4 or above and several loadings above .6. The average loading is .60. These loadings suggest substantial inter-connectedness of views about the evaluations of developmental idealism, evaluations of future developmental idealism change, and

believing that family change causes development. However, as already mentioned, two family elements, divorce and putting individual needs before family needs, do not fit this pattern, suggesting that these interconnections may not be universal across all family elements.

### **Reliability of Measures**

As we discussed earlier, if we assume that two developmental idealism measures are measuring the same underlying construct, are only measuring that underlying construct, and have equal reliabilities (and equal factor loadings), we can estimate the reliability of the two measures. We estimate such reliabilities for the family elements of non-marital cohabitation and premarital sex because they are very similar conceptually and each loads highly and similarly on a factor for four of the five dimensions of developmental idealism. This suggests that these two family elements come close to approximating the required assumptions for the estimation of factor loadings and reliabilities. The estimated correlations (see Appendix B) between these two variables for the four dimensions of developmental idealism are: .71 for the development causing family change dimension, .71 for family change causing development dimension, .54 for the expectations for future change dimension, and .59 for the evaluations of the future change dimension. Under the assumptions noted above, these correlations translate into the following factor loadings (and reliabilities): .84 (.71); .84 (.71); .73 (.54); and .77 (.59), suggesting very high degrees of reliability for these two variables.

We also calculated factor loadings and reliabilities for the two family elements of intercaste marriage and widow remarriage because the factor loadings for these two elements in the exploratory factor analyses are consistently large and fairly uniform. The factor loadings for these two family elements across the five dimensions range from .55 to .74. However, we expect that even these two family elements are sufficiently different that the two elements are probably not measuring exactly the same thing and the loading estimates are probably underestimates.

Earlier, we estimated the factor loadings for the two developmental idealism dimensions of development causing family change and for believing family change would increase towards developmental idealism in the future by assuming that the factor loadings equaled the square root of the correlations between the two variables (Table 4). The square of these loadings equals the reliabilities. As we noted earlier, several of these loadings are quite high—for example, .81 in the case of marriages arranged by parents and .86 in the case of premarital sex. Such high loadings imply reliabilities in the range of .66 to .74.

Of course, most of the other estimated correlations among the observed variables are much lower than those just discussed. Such low correlations could occur because the items are measured unreliably, the items are measuring different things, or both things are happening. We expect that with very high measurement reliabilities for some observed measures, variables with low correlations with each other are probably tapping different aspects in people's minds.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

This paper was motivated by a desire to understand how ordinary people in Nepal conceptualize and understand the interrelationships between development and family life. We were interested in the extent to which individuals accept or reject the various aspects of developmental idealism as a package. That is, do individuals who endorse one aspect of developmental idealism also endorse the other aspects, or is there little relationship between the ways in which individuals evaluate various aspects of developmental idealism?

Our research provides evidence that is incompatible with the idea that there is zero linkage between the various aspects of developmental idealism. Even with one-factor models, most of the factor loadings were positive and substantial. With two-factor models, very few variables failed to have substantial loadings on one of the factors. So, individuals tend to interconnect the various aspects of developmental idealism in important ways. At the same time, most of the factor loadings, even in the two-factor models, were substantially below one, indicating either a lack of linkage or low measurement reliabilities.

At the same time, it is clear that some variables relate to certain variables more than others, indicating a clustering of ideas about certain aspects of development. Perhaps the clearest interrelating of family elements occurs among the developmental idealism items dealing with premarital sex and cohabitation, where the factor loadings are very high. Interestingly, for several developmental idealism dimensions, the items dealing with divorce also relate with those dealing with premarital sex and cohabitation. Developmental idealism items dealing with widow remarriage also seem to be interrelated with items dealing with inter-caste marriage.

Our expectation is that the items dealing with premarital sex interrelate with those dealing with cohabitation because these two family elements are conceptually very similar. Both premarital sex and cohabitation violate the historical Nepali proscription against sex outside of marriage. At the same time, divorce interrelates moderately closely with each of these two aspects, and divorce is quite conceptually distinct from them. In a similar way, widow remarriage and inter-caste marriage items are also frequently interrelated, even though they indicate quite different elements of marriage. It is possible that even though these various items

may seem quite different conceptually, either Nepalis have historically interconnected them or the mechanisms disseminating developmental idealism within Nepal are linking them in important ways. More research is needed to investigate why Nepalis see some family elements and not others to be related to development.

We also found strong evidence for the intermixing of certain dimensions of developmental idealism and not others. The data indicate that individuals who perceive development as a cause of a particular family change also expect that particular family element to change in the future, and this is a fairly tight interconnection. It is also a very important substantive linkage providing insight into the ways Nepalis perceive development and the future.

We believe that the key to understanding this linkage is Nepali views about the future of development in Nepal. In the same survey that we are examining here, fully 99 percent of all respondents said that they expected emphasis on technology to increase in the next twenty years, and 98 percent said that they thought this would be a good thing (data not shown in tables). Since technology is often thought of as a central feature of development, this viewpoint indicates a very positive expectation for future development. Given that most Nepalis expect development in the future, it is not surprising that those Nepalis who perceive development causing a particular family change will expect that family element to change in that direction.

Interestingly, as we mentioned in our discussion of the univariate distributions, it was the dimension of development causing family change and the dimension of expecting family change that were the most endorsed by Nepalis. Most Nepalis perceived that development caused changes in many elements of family life and also expected that families would change in the developmental idealism direction in the future. We expect that most Nepalis believe that the country will become more developed economically in the future and believe that development causes family change, and that it is this conjunction of beliefs that lead them to expect family changes in the future.

We also found fairly close interconnections between the other three dimensions of developmental idealism. People who valued a developmental idealism family element also tended to value a developmental idealism future change and tended to say that family change caused development. The fact that people who evaluated developmental idealism positively also tended to evaluate future developmental idealism change positively is not surprising. These two dimensions are similar in that one provides a general evaluation of a family element and the other provides a specific evaluation of changes in that element in the future.

Our interpretation of this relationship comes from our experience living in Nepal and our focus groups and in-depth interviews where Nepalis generally define development in economic

and technological terms and almost universally endorse increases in economic well-being and growing technological sophistication. We expect that it is very difficult for Nepalis who say that a particular family element is bad or say that a future change in it is bad would have an expectation that increases in such a bad thing could produce the development that many so enthusiastically endorse.

Interestingly, it is these three dimensions of developmental idealism that are generally the least endorsed by people in Nepal. This suggests that while Nepalis believe that development brings family change and that families will be changing in the future, they are not entirely pleased with changes in the developmental idealism direction. In fact, large fractions prefer non-developmental idealism family forms and believe that future changes in the direction of developmental idealism are bad. Apparently, for many, there is an intellectual understanding of certain dimensions of developmental idealism, but a normative rejection of them.

We believe that our interpretations of the ways in which Nepalis link the dimensions of developmental idealism are plausible, even likely. Yet, we advocate additional research using in-depth interviews and focus groups to test our interpretations and to further illuminate the reasons why people link together the elements of developmental idealism as they do.

Although our research was primarily motivated by a desire to understand how people interconnect various aspects of developmental idealism, our results also have implications for the reliability of measurement. As we indicated above, the high loadings of some of the items, either in the general factor analyses or in simple correlational analyses, indicate that there is a high degree of measurement reliability and a high degree of interconnectedness of some of the developmental idealism items. We expect that the low factor loadings for some items are more the result of their low conceptual connections with the other items than the result of them having low measurement reliabilities. To the extent that this is true, it provides important reassurance for researchers desirous of using measures of developmental idealism in studies of its causes and consequences. Of course, other research designs and empirical data will be required to test this reassurance.

We end this paper with the obvious caveat that our research was conducted within one area of Nepal, and we cannot generalize our findings to other areas of Nepal or to the world more generally. This leads us to call for additional research to investigate whether individuals elsewhere in Nepal and elsewhere in the world connect the various aspects of developmental idealism together in the same way as people in our study do.

**Table 1.** Percent Distribution of Respondent Characteristics

	<b>Percent</b>
<i>Gender</i>	
Female	58
<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Brahmin/Chhetri	45
Dalit	11
Newar	6
Hill Indigenous	17
Terai Indigenous	21
<i>Education</i>	
None	24
1-5 years	9
6-10 years	22
11-14 years	27
15+ years	18
<i>Marital status</i>	
Ever married	76
<i>Number of Children</i>	
0	29
1-2	30
3-4	26
5+	15
<i>Age in years in 2008</i>	
15-24	30
25-34	25
35-44	20
45+	25

**Table 2.** Percentage of Respondents Giving Developmental Idealism Answer by Developmental Idealism Dimension and Family Element

	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future	Prefer DI
Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marriage for Women	45.9	55.0	74.9	67.3	
Marriages Arranged by Parents	86.2	50.5	87.6	38.0	70.8
Divorce	48.3	7.5	63.1	12.5	57.0
Non-Marital Cohabitation	74.9	16.3	82.7	16.3	12.9
Premarital Sex	80.6	6.6	88.0	6.6	1.7
Individual Needs Before Family	77.0	30.6	76.6	39.6	13.0
Married Children Living with Parents	65.7	37.4	70.5	17.4	12.5
Women Never Marrying	39.8	41.4	43.2	26.6	8.4 <sup>a</sup>
Inter-caste Marriage	87.3	41.2	92.4	36.2	13.5
Widow Remarriage	80.0	46.7	79.3	59.1	77.8
Time from Marriage to 1 <sup>st</sup> Birth	72.3	76.0	71.9	71.5	
Respect for Authority			40.2	17.0	
N	5172	5172	5172	5172	5172

<sup>a</sup> Question wording read “Most People” instead of “Women”

**Table 3.** Factor Loadings for Various Models of Family Elements within Developmental Idealism Dimensions

	Dev → Fam			Fam → Dev			Expect DI in Future			Prefer DI in Future			Prefer DI		
	(1)	(A)	(B)	(1)	(A)	(B)	(1)	(A)	(B)	(1)	(A)	(B)	(1)	(A)	(B)
Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marriage for Women	-.16	.32	-.24	.38	.06	.39	-.04	.14	-.36	.30	.15	.30			
Marriages Arranged by Parents	.16	.79	.00	.57	.16	.50	.35	.02	.65	.42	.27	.35	.44	.28	.39
Divorce	.54	-.15	.58	.59	.65	.01	.55	.58	-.03	.63	.64	.04	.47	.04	.47
Non-Marital Cohabitation	.76	-.02	.77	.66	.75	.01	.51	.57	-.09	.59	.63	-.03	.07	.48	-.07
Premarital Sex	.88	.03	.87	.78	.89	-.02	.82	.82	.03	.77	.80	.00	.24	.81	.00
Individual Needs Before Family	.42	-.12	.45	.44	.54	-.01	.19	.31	-.22	.31	.48	-.26	.30	.19	.26
Married Children Living with Parents	.17	.52	.07	.54	.50	.14	.33	.00	.73	.40	.44	-.03	.21	.15	.17
Women Never Marrying	.29	-.18	.33	.52	.26	.36	.19	.35	-.28	.46 <sup>a</sup>	.41 <sup>a</sup>	.16 <sup>a</sup>	-.29 <sup>a</sup>	.20 <sup>a</sup>	-.35 <sup>a</sup>
Inter-caste Marriage	.63	.34	.57	.64	.01	.76	.66	.58	.17	.46	.25	.50	.49	.42	.42
Widow Remarriage	.55	.18	.51	.53	.00	.64	.50	.49	.03	.25	-.05	.61	.68	-.02	.76
Time from Marriage to 1 <sup>st</sup> Birth	.33	.00	.33	.38	-.07	.51	.28	.39	-.18	.26	.00	.50			
Respect for Authority							.31	.10	.44	.41	.42	.02			
Average Dimension Loading	.42			.55			.39			.44			.29		
N	5172			5172			5172			5172			5172		
X <sup>2</sup>	1158.7		327.7	1313.2		536.7	1372.7		251.4	1736.2		496.7	316.7		104.12
DF	44		34	44		34	54		43	54		43	27		19
P- value	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.0	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00
RMSEA	.07		.04	.08		.05	.07		.03	.08		.04	.05		.03
CFI	.82		.95	.84		.94	.66		.95	.75		.93	.75		.93
Correlation between Factor A & Factor B			.139			.455			.310			.183			-.038

<sup>a</sup> Question wording read “Most People” instead of “Women”

**Table 4.** Factor Loadings for Dimensions of Developmental Idealism within Family Element

	One Factor (a-e) (1)	One Factor (a,c) (A)	One Factor (b,d,e) (B)		One Factor (a-e) (1)	One Factor (a,c) (A)	One Factor (b,d,e) (B)
<b>Marriages Arranged by Parents</b>				<b>Divorce</b>			
Dev → Fam (a)	.69	.81		Dev → Fam (a)	.39	.61	
Fam → Dev (b)	.27		.40	Fam → Dev (b)	.08		
Expect DI in Future (c)	.70	.81		Expect DI in Future (c)	.95	.61	
Prefer DI in Future (d)	.43		.72	Prefer DI in Future (d)	.10		
Prefer DI(e)	.54		.56	Prefer DI(e)	.21		
X <sup>2</sup>	544.09			X <sup>2</sup>	183.57		
DF	5			DF	5		
P- value	0.00			P- value	0.00		
RMSEA	.14			RMSEA	.08		
CFI	.71			CFI	.70		
<b>Non-Marital Cohabitation</b>				<b>Premarital Sex</b>			
Dev → Fam (a)	.05	.64		Dev → Fam (a)	.82	.86	
Fam → Dev (b)	.59		.59	Fam → Dev (b)	.34		.59
Expect DI in Future (c)	.04	.64		Expect DI in Future (c)	.87	.86	
Prefer DI in Future (d)	.68		.68	Prefer DI in Future (d)	.27		.87
Prefer DI(e)	.57		.58	Prefer DI(e)	.54		.59
X <sup>2</sup>	348.20			X <sup>2</sup>	444.43		
DF	5			DF	5		
P- value	0.00			P- value	0.00		
RMSEA	.12			RMSEA	.13		
CFI	.64			CFI	.81		
<b>Individual Needs Before Family</b>				<b>Married Children Living with Parents</b>			
Dev → Fam (a)	.12	.59		Dev → Fam (a)	.54	.69	
Fam → Dev (b)	.59		.	Fam → Dev (b)	-.19		.35
Expect DI in Future (c)	.13	.59		Expect DI in Future (c)	.87	.69	
Prefer DI in Future (d)	.66			Prefer DI in Future (d)	-.11		.57
Prefer DI(e)	.14		.	Prefer DI(e)	.06		.55
X <sup>2</sup>	269.44			X <sup>2</sup>	324.98		
DF	5			DF	5		
P- value	0.00			P- value	0.00		
RMSEA	.10			RMSEA	.11		
CFI	.61			CFI	.66		
<b>Inter-caste Marriage</b>				<b>Widow Remarriage</b>			
Dev → Fam (a)	.58	.79		Dev → Fam (a)	.64	.76	
Fam → Dev (b)	.52		.48	Fam → Dev (b)	.40		.41
Expect DI in Future (c)	.63	.79		Expect DI in Future (c)	.68	.76	
Prefer DI in Future (d)	.63		.80	Prefer DI in Future (d)	.76		.86
Prefer DI(e)	.72		.70	Prefer DI(e)	.56		.60
X <sup>2</sup>	294.53			X <sup>2</sup>	198.10		
DF	5			DF	5		
P- value	0.00			P- value	0.00		
RMSEA	.11			RMSEA	.09		
CFI	.86			CFI	.94		

## Appendix A. Nepal Developmental Idealism Survey Question Wording

---

### Development Causes Family Change

---

Some people think that Nepal will become richer in the future. Let's talk about what things that would increase and what things would decrease if Nepal became richer.

- How about females marrying before the age of 18? If Nepal becomes richer, over time would that increase or decrease females marrying before the age of 18?
- Parents choosing who their children marry - If Nepal becomes richer, over time would that increase or decrease parents choosing who their children marry?
- Marriages ending in divorce?
- Unmarried men and women living together like married couples?
- Premarital sex?
- People putting individual needs before family needs?
- Married children living with their parents or in-laws?
- Women who never marry?
- People marrying a person of a different caste?
- Young widows getting remarried?
- The length of time between getting married and having a child?

---

### Family Change Causes Development

---

We have been talking about what might happen to families if Nepal became richer. Now we are going to talk about something different - what might happen to Nepal if some things about the Nepali family changed. For each of the following things, please tell me whether you think it would help make Nepal richer or help make Nepal poorer.

- What if fewer females married before the age of 18? Would that help make Nepal richer or help make Nepal poorer?
- What if fewer parents chose who their children married – would that help make Nepal richer or help make Nepal poorer?
- If there were more marriages ending in divorce?
- If more unmarried men and women lived together like married couples?
- If there was more premarital sex?
- If more people put individual needs before family needs?
- If fewer married children lived with their parents or in-laws?
- If more women never married?
- If more people married a person of a different caste?
- If more young widows got remarried?
- If the length of time between getting married and having a child increased?

---

### Expectations and Evaluations of Future Change

---

Now please think about the next twenty years in Nepal.

- Do you think unmarried men and women living together like married couples will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose unmarried men and women living together like married couples increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think the average age for a woman to get married will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose the average age for a woman to get married increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think marriages ending in divorce will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose marriages ending in divorce increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think married couples who live with their parents or in-laws will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose married couples who live with their parents or in-laws decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think the respect for authority will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose the respect for authority decreases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think people putting individual needs before family needs will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose people putting individual needs before family needs increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think premarital sex will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose premarital sex increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?

- Do you think parents choosing who their children marry will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose parents choosing who their children marry decreases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think people marrying someone from a different caste will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose people marrying someone from a different caste increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think women never getting married will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose women never getting married increases in Nepal during the next twenty years? Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think young widows getting remarried will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose young widows getting remarried increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?
- Do you think the length of time between getting married and having a child will increase or decrease in Nepal during the next twenty years?
- Suppose the length of time between getting married and having a child increases in Nepal during the next twenty years. Overall, will that be a good thing, bad thing or won't it matter?

---

### **Which Family Attributes are Better**

---

Now I would like you to compare different family situations. For each of the following comparisons, please tell me which situation would be better for most people in Nepal today.

- First overall, which do you think is better for most people in Nepal today – married children living with their parents or in-laws, or married children living separately?
  - Overall, which do you think is better for most people in Nepal today – young people choosing their own spouses, or parents choosing their spouses for them?
  - A society in which it is acceptable for an unmarried man and woman to live together like a married couple or a society where it is not acceptable for an unmarried man and woman to live together like a married couple?
  - Waiting until marriage to have sex or having sex before marriage?
  - Overall, which do you think is better for most people in Nepal today – a divorce or an unhappy marriage?
  - Overall, which do think is better for most people in Nepal today – to put individual needs first or to put family needs first?
  - Overall, which do think is better for most people in Nepal today – marrying within one's own caste or marrying someone of another caste?
  - Overall, which do you think is better for most young widows in Nepal today – to remarry or not to remarry?
  - Overall, which do you think is better for most people in Nepal today – to get married or not to get married?
  - What do you think is better for most people - youth choosing their marriage partners or parents choosing on their behalf?
-

**Appendix B. Tetrachoric or Polychoric Correlation Matrices of Family Elements within Developmental Idealism Dimension**

<b>Development Causes Family Change</b>										
	Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr	Arranged Marr	Divorce	Cohabitation	Premarital Sex	Individual Needs	Co-residence	Never Marry	Inter-caste Marr	Widow Remarr
Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr										
Arranged Marr	.261									
Divorce	-.186	-.039								
Cohabitation	-.115	.065	.451							
Premarital Sex	-.219	.140	.462	.710						
Indiv Needs	-.110	-.004	.249	.325	.395					
Co-residence	.137	.430	.034	.144	.200	-.030				
Never Marry	-.053	-.104	.221	.213	.227	.156	-.116			
Inter-caste Marr	-.037	.300	.248	.397	.512	.179	.236	.179		
Widow Remarr	-.057	.181	.265	.317	.386	.224	.090	.142	.542	
1 <sup>st</sup> Birth Timing	.040	-.004	.185	.218	.222	.179	-.017	.159	.253	.295

<b>Family Change Causes Development</b>										
	Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr	Arranged Marr	Divorce	Cohabitation	Premarital Sex	Individual Needs	Co-residence	Never Marry	Inter-caste Marr	Widow Remarr
Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr										
Arranged Marr	.433									
Divorce	.199	.339								
Cohabitation	.111	.299	.530							
Premarital Sex	.216	.323	.585	.713						
Indiv Needs	.106	.150	.328	.330	.418					
Co-residence	.167	.283	.340	.338	.395	.435				
Never Marry	.179	.246	.181	.345	.320	.215	.371			
Inter-caste Marr	.206	.428	.243	.305	.327	.144	.252	.394		
Widow Remarr	.193	.277	.211	.203	.261	.170	.188	.246	.549	
1 <sup>st</sup> Birth Timing	.238	.245	.021	.137	.066	.107	.182	.282	.301	.320

<b>Expectations of Developmental Idealism Change in the Future</b>											
	Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr	Arranged Marr	Divorce	Cohab	Premarital Sex	Indiv Needs	Co- residence	Never Marry	Inter-caste Marr	Widow Remarr	1 <sup>st</sup> Birth Time
Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr											
Arranged Marr	-.157										
Divorce	.015	.061									
Cohabitation	.033	.084	.301								
Premarital Sex	-.045	.167	.508	.536							
Indiv Needs	.070	-.074	.113	.147	.214						
Co-residence	-.227	.492	.112	.063	.189	-.083					
Never Marry	.072	-.162	.208	.177	.165	.066	-.113				
Inter-caste Marr	.006	.315	.300	.329	.503	.156	.218	.090			
Widow Remarr	.027	.148	.279	.164	.357	.122	.127	.113	.425		
1 <sup>st</sup> Birth Timing	.173	.009	.173	.102	.178	.172	-.018	.187	.199	.275	
Respect Auth	-.170	.277	.168	.030	.199	-.072	.354	-.022	.197	.138	.044

<b>Future Values for Developmental Idealism</b>											
	Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr	Arrange d Marr	Divorc e	Cohab	Premarital Sex	Indiv Needs	Co- residence	Never Marry	Inter-caste Marr	Widow Remarr	1 <sup>st</sup> Birth Time
Age 1 <sup>st</sup> Marr											
Arranged Marr	.144										
Divorce	.148	.208									
Cohabitation	.217	.123	.393								
Premarital Sex	.154	.212	.488	.589							
Indiv Needs	.064	.036	.237	.313	.351						
Coresidence	-.011	.240	.314	.190	.298	.181					
Never Marry	.139	.163	.354	.241	.324	.185	.176				
Inter-caste Marr	.186	.339	.163	.232	.299	.007	.108	.219			
Widow Remarr	.188	.184	.120	.026	.099	-.167	.004	.129	.302		
1 <sup>st</sup> Birth Timing	.247	.179	.071	.036	.053	-.017	.000	.154	.234	.318	
Respect Auth	.048	.237	.324	.175	.283	.157	.282	.165	.158	.004	.014

<b>Current Values for Developmental Idealism</b>								
	Arranged Marr	Divorce	Cohabitation	Premarital Sex	Individual Needs	Coresidence	Never Marry	Inter-caste Marr
Arranged Marr								
Divorce	.247							
Cohabitation	.094	-.084						
Premarital Sex	.117	-.038	.449					
Indiv Needs	.122	.120	.029	.181				
Coresidence	.167	.165	.052	.037	.129			
Never Marry	-.045	-.057	.090	.066	-.032	.046		
Inter-caste Marr	.281	.169	.161	.339	.196	.043	-.045	
Widow Remarr	.241	.351	-.029	.016	.184	.063	-.374	.329

**Appendix C. Tetrachoric or Polychoric Correlation Matrices of Developmental Idealism Dimensions within Each Family Element**

<b>Arranged Marriage</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.049			
Expect DI in Future	.658	.017		
Prefer DI in Future	.115	.285	.147	
Prefer DI	.239	.220	.230	.401

<b>Divorce</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.057			
Expect DI in Future	.375	.053		
Prefer DI in Future	-.034	.337	.085	
Prefer DI	.078	-.104	.195	.126

<b>Cohabitation</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.065			
Expect DI in Future	.410	-.019		
Prefer DI in Future	.003	.398	.046	
Prefer DI	-.017	.340	-.011	.390

<b>Premarital Sex</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.135			
Expect DI in Future	.745	.108		
Prefer DI in Future	.068	.513	.041	
Prefer DI	.242	.344	.246	.509

<b>Individual Needs</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.072			
Expect DI in Future	.348	.013		
Prefer DI in Future	.000	.402	.064	
Prefer DI	.088	.031	.145	.105

<b>Coreidence</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	-.101			
Expect DI in Future	.473	-.154		
Prefer DI in Future	-.023	.199	-.096	
Prefer DI	.121	.194	.106	.314

<b>Inter-Caste Marriage</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.274			
Expect DI in Future	.618	.213		
Prefer DI in Future	.213	.388	.268	
Prefer DI	.292	.337	.247	.559

<b>Widow Remarriage</b>				
	Dev → Fam	Fam → Dev	Expect DI in Future	Prefer DI in Future
Dev → Fam				
Fam → Dev	.268			
Expect DI in Future	.574	.178		
Prefer DI in Future	.387	.350	.492	
Prefer DI	.279	.243	.265	.515

## REFERENCES

- Abbasi-Shavazi, Mohammad Jalal, Askara-Nodoushan, Abbas, Thornton, Arland. 2012. Family Life and Developmental Idealism in Yazd, Iran. *Demographic Research*, 26(10), 207 - 238.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1998. *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Adhikari, Di Pi. 1998. *The History of Nepalese Nationalism*. Nayabazar Kathmandu: Jeewan Printing Support Press.
- Ahearn, Laura M. 2001. *Invitations to love: Literacy, love letters, and social change in Nepal*: University of Michigan Press.
- Axinn, William G., & Yabiku, Scott T. 2001. Social change, the social organization of families, and fertility limitation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(5), 1219-1261.
- Baker, David P., & LeTendre, Gerald K. (Eds.). 2005. *National Differences, Global Similarities: World Culture and the Future of Schooling*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Barber, Jennifer S., Shivaki, Ganesh P., Axinn, William G., & Gajurel, Kishor. 1997. Sampling strategies for rural settings: A detailed example from the Chitwan Valley Family Study. *Nepal Population Journal*, 6(5), 193-203.
- Barber, Jennifer S., & Axinn, William G. 2004. New ideas and fertility limitation: The role of mass media. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 1180-1200.
- Barrett, Deborah, & Frank, David J. 1999. Population control for national development: From world discourse to national policies. In J. Boli & G. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Constructing world culture: International nongovernmental organizations since 1875* (pp. 198-221). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Basu, Alaka 2005. Ultramodern contraception. *Asian Population Studies*, 1(3), 303-323.
- Benavot, Aaron, Cha, Yun-Kyung., Kamens, David, Meyer, John W., & Wong, Suk-Ying. 1991. Knowledge for the Masses: World Models and National Curricula, 1920-1986. *American Sociological Review*, 56(1), 85-100.
- Berkovitch, Nitza. 1999. The emergence and transformation of the international women's movement. In J. Boli & G. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Constructing world culture: International nongovernmental organizations since 1875* (pp. 100-126). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Beutel, Ann M., & Axinn, William G. 2002. Gender, social change, and educational attainment. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 51(1), 109-134.
- Binstock, Georgina, & Thornton, Arland. 2007. Knowledge and use of developmental thinking about societies and families among teenagers in Argentina. *Demografia*, 50(5), 75-104.
- Bista, Dar Badahur. 1991. *Fatalism and Development: Nepal's Struggle for Modernization: Orient Longman Ltd*. Calcutta, India: Orient Longman Limited.
- Bromley, Patricia, Meyer, John W., & Ramirez, Francisco O. 2009. *Student-centeredness in social science textbooks, 1970-2008: A cross-national study*. Unpublished paper. Department of Sociology, Stanford University. Palo Alto, CA.
- Caldwell, John C. 1982. *Theory of fertility decline*. London and New York: Academic Press.

- Caldwell, John C., Reddy, Palli H., & Caldwell, Pat. 1988. *The causes of demographic change: Experimental research in South India*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Cammack, Mark, & Heaton, Tim. 2011. Explaining the Recent Upturn in Divorce in Indonesia: Developmental Idealism and the Effect of Political Change. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 39(6), 776-796.
- Cherlin, Andrew. 1992. *Marriage, divorce, remarriage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cleland, John, & Wilson, Christopher. 1987. Demand theories of the fertility transition: An iconoclastic view. *Population Studies*, 41(1), 5-30.
- Cole, Wade M. 2005. Sovereignty Relinquished? Explaining Commitment to the International Human Rights Covenants, 1966-1999. *American Sociological Review*, 70(3), 472-495.
- Coale, Ansley J., & Watkins, Susan C. (Eds.). 1986. *The decline of fertility in Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Dahl, Gudrun, & Rabo, Annika. 1992. *Kam-ap or take-off: Local notions of development*. Stockholm: Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology.
- Deeb, Lara. (Ed.). 2006. *An Enchanted Modern: Gender and Public Piety in Shi'i Lebanon*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ferguson, James (Ed.). 1999. *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copper Belt*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fricke, Thomas E. 1988. *Himalayan households: Tamang demography and domestic processes* (Vol. 11). Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- Fricke, Thomas E. 1997. The uses of culture in demographic research: A continuing place for community studies. *Population and Development Review*, 23(4), 825-832.
- Guneratne, Arjun. 1998. Modernization, the State, and the Construction of Tharu Identity in Nepal. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 57(93), 749-773.
- Hajnal, John 1965. European marriage patterns in perspective. In D. V. Glass & D. E. C. Eversley (Eds.), *Population in History* (Vol. 57, pp. 101-143). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Hodgen, Margaret T. 1964. *Early anthropology in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Johnson-Hanks, Jennifer A., Bachrach, Christine A., Morgan, S. Phillip, & Kohler, Han-Peter. 2011. *Understanding family change and variation: toward a theory of conjunctural action* (Vol. 5): Springer Verlag.
- Kavas, Serap and Thornton, Arland. 2012. "Adjustment and Hybridity in Turkish Family Change: Perspectives from Developmental Idealism." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, San Francisco.
- Krücken, Georg, & Drori, Gili S. (Eds.). 2009. *World Society: The Writings of John W. Meyer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laslett, Peter. 1977. Characteristics of the Western Family Considered Over Time. *Journal of Family History*, 2(2), 89-114.
- Le Play, Frederic. 1982. *Frederic Le Play on Family, Work, and Social Change*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Lesthaeghe, Ron 2010. The Unfolding Story of the Second Demographic Transition. *Population and Development Review*, 36(2), 211-251.
- Malthus, Thomas R. 1986. An essay on the principle of population. In E. A. Wrigley & D. Souden (Eds.), *The works of Thomas Robert Malthus* (Vol. 2-3). London: William Pickering.
- Meyer, John W., Boli, John, Thomas, George M., & Ramirez, Francisco. O. 1997. World society and the nation-state. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 144-181.
- Mitchell, Colter M. 2009. *Three Essays on Worldviews, Autonomy and the Family in Nepal*. The University of Michigan.
- Nisbet, Robert A. 1969. *Social change and history*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Nisbet, Robert A. 1980. *History of the idea of progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Osella, Filippo, & Osella, Caroline. 2006. Once upon a time in the West: Stories of migration and modernity from Kerala, South India. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 12(3), 569-588.
- Panday, Devendra Raj. 1999. *Nepal's failed development: Reflections on the mission and the maladies*, Nepal South Asia Centre (Kathmandu).
- Pigg, Stacy L. 1992. Inventing social categories through place: Social representations and development in Nepal. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34(3), 491-513.
- Reher, David S. 1998. Family ties in Western Europe: Persistent contrasts. *Population and Development Review*, 24(2), 203-234.
- Sanderson, Stephen K. 1990. *Social evolutionism: A critical history*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Shrestha, Nanda R. 1989. Frontier settlement and landlessness among hill migrants in Nepal Tarai. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 79(3), 370-389.
- Szreter, Simon. 1993. The idea of demographic transition and the study of fertility change. *Population and Development Review*, 19(4), 659-702.
- Thornton, Arland. 2001. The developmental paradigm, reading history sideways, and family change. *Demography*, 38(4), 449-465.
- Thornton, Arland. 2005. *Reading history sideways: The fallacy and enduring impact of the developmental paradigm on family life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thornton, Arland. 2010. International family change and continuity: the past and future from the developmental idealism perspective. *Demografía*, 53(5), 21-50.
- Thornton, Arland, Achen, Alexandra, Barber, Jennifer S., Binstock, Georgina, Garrison, Wade M., Ghimire, Dirgha J., Inglehard, Ronald, Jayakody, Rukmalie, Jiang, Yang, de Jong, Julie, King, Katherine,
- Lesthaeghe, Ron J., Mehenna, Sohair, Mitchell, Colter, Moaddel, Mansoor, Ofstedal, Mary Beht, Schwarz, Norbert, Wang, Guangzhou, Xie, Yu, Yang, Li-Shou, Young-DeMarco, Linda C., Yount, Katherine. 2010. Creating questions and protocols for an international study of ideas about development and family life. In M. Braun, B. Edwards, J. Harkness, T. Johnson, L. Lyberg, P. Mohler, B.E. Pennell, and T.W. Smith (Eds.), *Survey methods in multinational, multiregional and multicultural contexts* (pp. 59-74). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Thornton, Arland, Binstock, Georgina, & Ghimire, Dirgha. 2008. International dissemination of ideas about developmental and family change. In R. Jayakody, A. Thornton & W. Axinn (Eds.), *International family change: Ideational perspectives* (pp. 19-44). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Thornton, Arland, Binstock, Georgina, Yount, Kathryn, Abbasi-Shavazi, Mohammad Jalal, Ghimire, Dirgha, and Xie, Yu. 2012a. "International fertility change: New data and insights from the developmental idealism framework." *Demography*, 49(2):677-698, PMID: PMC3328099
- Thornton, Arland, Ghimire, Dirgha J., & Mitchell, Colter. In press. The measurement and prevalence of an ideational model of family and economic development in Nepal. *Population Studies*.
- Thornton, Arland, & Philipov, Dimiter. 2009. Sweeping changes in marriage, cohabitation and childbearing in Central and Eastern Europe: New insights from the developmental idealism framework. *European Journal of Population*, 25, 123-156.
- Thornton, Arland, Pierotti, Rachael S., Young-DeMarco, Linda, & Watkins, Susan. 2012b. *Developmental Idealism and Family Life in Malawi*. Paper presented at the Population Association of America, San Francisco, California, May 2012.
- Tsutsui, Kiyoteru, & Wotipka, Christine. M. 2004. Global civil society and the international human rights movement: Citizen participation in human rights international nongovernmental organizations. *Social Forces*, 83(2), 587-620.
- van de Kaa, Dirk J. 1996. Anchored narratives: The story and findings of half a century of research into the determinants of fertility. *Population Studies*, 50(3), 389-432.
- Wang, Zheng. (Ed.). 1999. *Women in the Chinese Enlightenment: Oral and Textual Histories*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Westermarck, Edward (Ed.). 1894/1891. *The history of human marriage*. London and New York: Macmillan Company.
- Yabiku, Scott T., & Schlabach, Sarah. 2009. Social Change and the Relationships Between Education and Employment. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 28(4), 533-549.
- Yount, Kathryn M., & Rashad, Hoda. 2008. *Family in the Middle East: Ideational Change in Egypt, Iran, and Tunisia*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Yount, Kathryn M., Thornton, Arland, Mehanna, Sohair, Patel, Shilpa, & Moaddel, Mansoor. 2010. *Lay Accounts of 'Modern' and 'Traditional' Family in Greater Cairo: A Test of Developmental Models of Family Life*. Paper presented at the Symposium on the Globalization of Modernization Theory: Clashes of Modernities and Moralities, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, June 9-10, 2010.