

Contents

<i>List of Boxes</i>	ix
<i>Preface</i>	x
1 Introduction: Asking Questions	1
Who Are Family Members?	2
What Do Families Do?	6
How Are Families Connected to Other Groups?	13
Discussion	16
2 Family Complexity	18
Cultural Diversity	22
Situational Diversity	27
Individualization	32
Discussion	34
3 Family Priorities	36
The Structure of Family Relationships	37
Cultural Factors	39
Situational Factors	41
Normative Guidelines	44
Family History	47
Structural Change in Family Relationships	48
Discussion	50
4 Entries, Exits, and Voices Off-stage	52
Role Entries	54
Role Exits	60
Voices Off-stage	66
Discussion	69
5 Intimate Relationships	71
Family Ties	72
Sexual Relations: Beyond Companionship?	77
Modernizing Marriage	78
Intimate Violence and Abuse	81
Discussion	89

6	Childcare and Caregiving	91
	Social Distribution of Childcare and Caregiving	93
	Time Use	96
	Family Roles, Social Identities and Self Concepts	101
	Intensive Mothering	104
	Discussion	105
7	Money and the Family Economy	108
	Financial Practices	109
	Family Income	112
	Balancing Employment and Family Life	119
	Social Exchange	125
	Discussion	126
8	Family Environments	128
	Markets	129
	Public Discourses	135
	Welfare States	137
	Social Networks	143
	Discussion	146
9	Conclusion	148
	Sociology, Modernity and Family	149
	Discussion	152
	<i>Glossary</i>	153
	<i>References</i>	164
	<i>Index</i>	184

1

Introduction: Asking Questions

The main reason for asking sociological questions about family life is because families take many different forms. None of us can possibly have personal experience with all types of families. Sociological research is therefore needed to describe family variations, and to show us how the varieties of family living compare. Three basic questions about families are discussed in this chapter. These questions are:

- Who are family members?
- What do families do?
- And how are families connected to other groups?

CONCEPTS

family boundaries ■ kinship terminology ■
family ■ nuclear family ■ household ■ polygyny ■
polyandry ■ polygamy ■ extended family ■
secularization ■ cohabitation ■ structures ■
functions ■ roles ■ functionalism ■ nurturant
socialization ■ functional prerequisite ■ structural
prerequisite ■ patriarchy ■ ethnomethodology ■
division of labour ■ positivism ■ breadwinner/
homemaker family ■ longitudinal data ■ economic
determinism ■ family strategies ■ fertility ■
population aging

All of us can identify within ourselves feelings, interests and beliefs that were shaped by family members who were close to us when we were children. We can also observe, by comparing our own experiences with those of other people, how some families provide better opportunities than others to help individuals obtain the things they want. In these ways, family living has influenced how we grew from childhood into adulthood. It has therefore helped us to become the kind of adult that we are today.

The sociological approach to families begins in our individual understandings of how we are affected by the time we spend with other family members. It emphasizes how individuals' activities and personal characteristics are affected by the circumstances of living in interaction with other people. As sociologists, we are not interested only in our own lives but we are also interested in the family lives of other people, including people whom we have never met. We want to know how families of different kinds, in different places, produce different outcomes.

Family life is often subject to change, either in our own experiences or in the lives of the people around us. Immigration and alternative lifestyles on the one hand, and the disruption and reconstitution of families on the other hand, are giving us more encounters with unfamiliar ways of living. Over our lifetimes we can expect to be exposed to many different ideas on family life. Mental flexibility about fundamental personal relationships is, therefore, a practical requirement for successful living now. Here, the sociological viewpoint can help us adapt to the changes in our own lives, and it can help us adjust to the differences among the people we meet. Family sociology for the twenty-first century must be open to many possibilities. That means asking some very basic questions about how family life works.

At the heart of the sociology of family life there is a small set of questions, which all sociologists ask. Sociologists may answer those questions in different ways, and they often disagree with one another about which answer is correct. However, the fact that they ask the same questions does give the discipline a core subject matter.

Sociological enquiries deal with contexts of interaction, such as family groups. There are three basic questions about families as social groups. One or more of these questions is involved in all sociological investigations into family life. They are:

- Who are family members?
- What do families do?
- How are families connected to other groups?

Who Are Family Members?

If asked, we are all capable of identifying who are the members of our families. On certain special occasions, such as annual celebrations or family reunions, we

may make mental lists of the family members who should receive gifts or invitations from us. Sometimes, on occasions such as weddings, or in wills for the inheritance of property, lists of family members are formalized and written down. Such lists become public evidence of the people who are most important to us. A family list separates people who are emotionally significant to us from the rest of the population, so that we can have special kinds of interactions with them. People who are not on the list are excluded. If those people find out that they have been excluded, they may feel 'left out' of our family life.

The inclusion of some people in family events, and the exclusion of other people, is referred to by social scientists as drawing *family boundaries*. Family boundaries are barriers that separate people who are inside the family from people who are outside the family. Sometimes those barriers are very visible, such as the walls around a dwelling or a fence around a family compound. Other barriers are less visible, such as the interaction processes by which some people are selected for inclusion in family activities while others are not.

Naming people as family members is one important way of drawing family boundaries. Children are therefore usually taught from an early age who their family members are, and how to name them correctly. Learning how to name family members involves more than just giving the correct personal name to an individual. It also involves the correct use of *kinship terminology*. Words such as 'sister' or 'uncle' are used to classify different family members according to their kinship relationships.

Drawing family boundaries in appropriate ways, including the proper use of kinship terminology, are rarely seen as important issues in most of adult life. We are likely to become aware of the significance we attach to these social processes only when rules of boundary maintenance which we take for granted are broken (Boss, 1987). An unexpected breaching of family rules may cause humour or sadness, depending on how it is done and who is most affected. For example, in many western societies today, problems of ambiguity about family boundaries can be observed among elderly people suffering from Alzheimer's disease.

More people are living longer in technologically developed countries like the United States, but we have not yet found reliable ways to prevent mental deterioration and loss of memory. Confusion about social relationships sometimes results. There is a confusing sense of loss, that someone who is still physically present has somehow slipped outside the family circle (Boss, 1999). The question asked at the beginning of this section – 'who are family members?' – is not a trivial question here. Because this question of being inside or outside a family boundary is so important to most people, it is also an important topic for sociology (Wilson and Pahl, 1988).

In the discipline of sociology, questions about family membership very quickly turn into questions about defining the concept of the family. That is because how we define what a family is determines how wide we set the family

boundaries, and that in turn determines how many people are counted as being inside the boundary. The typical family that sociologists describe may appear to be a small group or a large group, according to the way in which it is defined. If we use a narrow definition of 'the family', families almost always appear as small groups. But if we use a broad definition of *family*, it will be seen that families are sometimes small groups and sometimes very large groups. In this book we will use a broad definition of family. For our purposes, a family is considered to be any group which consists of people in intimate relationships which are believed to endure over time and across generations (Cheal, 1988).

There is no single concept of the family which is true for all historical periods and in all places. Definitions of family are relative to the social and cultural environments of people who think about families and who talk about families, as they go about their daily lives (Flandrin, 1979; Trost, 1990). As social scientists, sociologists spend a lot of time thinking about families and talking about families. We draw our images of families from our cultural environments, and then we clarify those images into specific concepts used in sociological theories (Gubrium and Holstein, 1990).

In the middle decades of the twentieth century many sociologists thought about the family as a small group, or *nuclear family*, composed of a legally married couple and their children, for as long as the latter lived at home. This group of people was described as living together in a permanent arrangement (at least until the children moved out), separated from the rest of the world by the walls of the family dwelling and by societal guarantees of family privacy. The family and the *household*, or economic group, were often considered to be identical for practical purposes. The nuclear family was considered to be the basic unit of household production, such as food preparation.

The 'isolated nuclear family', as this type of family was sometimes called, was especially popular in most of Europe and North America during the period of reconstruction after the Second World War. It provided the basis for early definitions of family in the growing discipline of sociology. As well, it provided the basis for procedures that governments used to collect information about families. The isolated nuclear family became the standard social scientific model of families in the Anglo-American countries, and it continues to be an influential ideal for many people today (Smith, 1993).

Sociological images of the isolated nuclear family have reflected a particular set of cultural traditions, based in part in the Christian religion and derived mainly from regions in northern Europe. Definitions of the family as a small group created by a permanent, legal bond between one man and one woman continue to be useful, in places where those cultural traditions remain in force. However, outside those places narrow definitions of family life are not always useful starting points for sociology, because different cultural traditions may produce very different family forms.

In the Middle East, Palestinian family life was traditionally organized in ways which were quite different from the isolated nuclear family (Abdo-Zubi,

1987). To begin with, a form of marriage called *polygyny* – that is, the marriage of a man to more than one woman – has existed among the Palestinians. The opposite of polygyny is *polyandry*, that is the marriage of a woman to more than one man. Polygyny and polyandry are both forms of *polygamy*, but polygyny is by far the more common of the two.

According to Muslim tradition, a man can marry up to four wives. In practice, this form of marriage in Palestine, as elsewhere, was found mainly among the wealthier classes since few men could afford to maintain several households (see also Al Khateeb, 1996). Another important feature of traditional Palestinian family life was a form of *extended family*, called the ‘hamula’. The hamula consisted of a number of households whose male heads were linked to one another by descent from a common male ancestor. The members of the hamula lived in the same village, where the head of the hamula was the chief decision-maker. The head of the hamula was usually the oldest man in the village. He made decisions for his wives and children, as well as his younger brothers and their wives and children, and his unmarried sisters. The head of the hamula arranged the distribution of land for the production of food, and he represented the hamula in its external political relationships (historically, mainly with Turkish overlords, then the British, and then the Israelis). In addition to making major economic and political decisions, the head of the hamula also had the major say in decisions about family relationships, including the choice of marriage partners for children of the hamula, and divorce.

Family life for a member of a traditional hamula must have been very different from that of an individual in an isolated nuclear family. Family boundaries were wider and they included more people, and relationships with kin affected vital aspects of daily living. Today, most Palestinians no longer live in traditional hamulas, and more of them live in nuclear families not unlike those found in Anglo-American and European countries. Even so, modified hamula ties continue to be important for many Palestinians, especially in agricultural regions and in urban political organization of Arab communities in Israel (Al-Haj, 1995).

Clearly, thinking about ‘the family’ only as a nuclear family of husband, wife and children would be a restrictive viewpoint in crosscultural studies of family life. It is also a limited point of view from which to study the Anglo-American and European societies today. All of those societies have changed since the 1950s, and they continue to change in ways that are producing increased family diversity. Shifting patterns of migration have brought more different people from many other places into the countries of the northern hemisphere. Also, there have been major economic, social and cultural changes, including extensive secularization.

Secularization is the process by which religious institutions and religious beliefs exert less and less influence on social life over time. In places like Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, and the Province of Quebec in Canada, the decline in the influence of traditional religious beliefs has been accompanied by a

greater tolerance for unmarried lifestyles (Buunk, 1987; Kontula and Haavio-Mannila, 1995). This does not mean that family life has become entirely absent here. Rather, it means that in many cases family life has evolved into a new form, which is based on *cohabitation* instead of legal marriage (Hoem and Hoem, 1988; Palomba and Moors, 1995; Wu, 2000). Emerging forms of family life such as unmarried cohabitation have received greater attention from sociologists in recent years, because they are gaining greater social acceptance in a number of countries (Wu and Balakrishnan, 1992).

In countries like Canada and Australia, government legislation and court decisions have been extending legal definitions of family beyond the nuclear family model of heterosexual marriage and fixed, biological links between parents and children (Bala, 1994). Unmarried heterosexual cohabitation, also known as ‘common law marriage’ in Canada and ‘de facto relationship’ in Australia, has gained substantial legal recognition similar to formal marriage (Nicholson, 1993). This has happened partly in response to demands for less discrimination against alternative lifestyles. It has also been done in part so that governments can gain greater control over the new families, including more taxation powers.

A similar process of change seems to be occurring in a number of places with respect to homosexual cohabitation. There has often been a great deal of controversy over whether or not two people of the same sex who live together are ‘really’ a family or not. Jeffrey Weeks (1991) has described how in England it is sometimes argued that homosexual live-in relationships should not be recognized by public agencies, since it is claimed that they are merely ‘pretended family relationships’. However, the dominant trend seems to be one of growing, if hesitant, social recognition for same-sex couples in England as in the United States (Rosen, 1999). That is because changing values, and new lifestyles such as long term cohabitation, are leading towards broader legal definitions. Those definitions stress the extent of practical support which exists between two or more individuals rather than their biological or sexual characteristics, or their official marital status (McRae, 1993).

Changing legal definitions of social relationships today are part of a continuous process of the collective redrawing of family boundaries. That process occurs partly in reaction to, and partly it encourages, more complex family relationships. In Chapter 2 we will examine selected aspects of contemporary family complexity. We will describe some of the forms it takes, and we will see what sociologists have had to say about it.

What Do Families Do?

Greater family complexity and broader definitions of what a family is have helped to focus more attention on what families do. As Elizabeth Silva and Carol Smart note, ‘In this context of fluid and changing definitions of families,

a basic core remains which refers to the sharing of resources, caring, responsibilities and obligations. What a family is appears intrinsically related to what it does' (Silva and Smart, 1999: 7). As a result, contemporary definitions of families used by some sociologists and social policy analysts, as well as by workers in a number of service professions, have tended to place less emphasis on family *structures* and more emphasis on family *functions*, than in the past (Bala, 1994).

The structure of a family consists of a set of positions, or *roles*, within the family, and the patterned interactions between them. For example, the definition of the nuclear family which was given earlier, as a legally married couple and their children who all live together, is a description of a certain type of family structure. The description of the family structure tells us who the family members are (for example, husband and wife), and it tells us what the relationships are between them (for example, marriage). However, it does not tell us what the family members do together, nor does it tell us what consequences their activities have.

The things that family members do are easy to identify. They give and lend money, they get children ready to go to school, they prepare and share food, they have sex and express love in other ways, and so on. But what is the significance of all these activities, from a sociological point of view?

One view holds that the activities carried out by family members are family functions, that is activities which fulfill certain of the members' needs. Those activities often fulfill needs of people outside the family as well. For instance, we can see that in traditional rural families, like the Palestinian hamula, people cooperate in the production of food and in defence against enemies. These particular family functions may not be important in most urban contexts today, but even in modern nuclear families people do carry out some activities to meet their needs. Preparing meals, and caring for sick children and adults, are obvious examples. Mutual protection is also still a function performed by urban families. Parents 'streetproof' their kids about what to do in the presence of sexual predators, or in some cases what to do when they hear gunfire on their street.

Functional definitions of families focus on what people do together, and especially on what they do to support each other. One such definition states that a family is a group of people who assume responsibility for some of the following functions (Zimmerman, 1988; Vanier Institute of the Family, 1994):

1. physical maintenance and care of group members;
2. addition of new members through procreation or adoption;
3. socialization of children;
4. social control over members;
5. production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services; and,
6. maintenance of motivation and morale through love.

Defining families in terms of these functions is socially inclusive, since any group of persons who agree to support one another in these ways is counted as a family.

Functional definitions of families, which stress financial and emotional support and physical care, are sometimes preferred in the professional discourses of people in social service occupations, such as social workers and lawyers (Minow, 1998). That is because a functional definition of the family helps to get around a potentially difficult problem, namely how to avoid excluding people who want to be considered as having equivalent rights to family members. Access to children, and the right to receive services intended for families, can depend heavily on whether or not a particular individual is counted as a 'real' member of a family.

Today, there are many people who have personal relationships which do not fit into the mould of the nuclear family. Nevertheless, they often want to have their relationships publicly recognized as family relationships, in practice and – increasingly – in law (Arnup, 1997). These claims arise from situations such as when a member of a same-sex couple wanted to arrange the funeral of his long-term partner, but his efforts were overwhelmed by the stronger legal rights of the deceased man's parents (Weeks, Heaphy and Donovan, 1999). Claims made by partners in cases like this involve bending and stretching institutionalized family structures, by emphasizing voluntary choices about relationships rather than fixed social positions within a nuclear family. Flexible definitions of family life that emphasize functional relationships between individuals are often advanced by those individuals who feel excluded from the privileges of family membership.

If functional definitions of families are increasingly attractive to some people, they are also rejected by others. Those who are opposed to functional definitions of the family include people who want to hold onto traditional, and especially religious, meanings of family life. They believe that homosexual couples are morally wrong, and that they should never be considered as families in the same way as heterosexual couples.

Opponents of the functional approach to families also include some sociologists. They point out that not all families function well. Some families are dysfunctional, even though from the outside it can be hard to tell them apart from functional families.

Issues are further complicated by the fact that functional relationships can easily slip into dysfunctional relationships. When love turns to hate in moments of intense emotion, it is hard to say what is the real state of the relationship. We have to face the paradox that families are contexts of love and nurturance, and they are also contexts of violence and murder (Collier, Rosaldo and Yanagisako, 1992; Duffy and Momirov, 1997).

Standard sociological theory has emphasized the pleasant side of families. In the past, sociologists tended to look at family activities only from a functionalist point of view. *Functionalism* is a theoretical approach which stresses the positive benefits of families. (See **Box 1.1**). Families are therefore often

Box 1.1 How can we define family? Answer one: It is a structure that fulfils a function

Many definitions of 'family' have been proposed in the social sciences, but there is not complete agreement about any of them. There are challenging arguments to be made against each approach and social scientists will continue to debate how to define family.

Functionalist definitions of family were very influential during the middle decades of the twentieth century, first articulated by the anthropologists Bronislaw Malinowski (1884–1942) and George Peter Murdock (1897–1985), and later by sociologists such as Ira Reiss. These influential men claimed that 'the family' is a universal institution. They believed that 'the family' is found in every human society because it performs certain basic functions for the maintenance of social life.

Ira Reiss (1965) argued that '*nurturant socialization*' of the newborn child is a *functional prerequisite* for every human society, and he further claimed that a 'small kinship group' is a *structural prerequisite* for the fulfilment of this function. He therefore defined family as 'a small kinship structured group with the key function of nurturant socialization of the newborn.' Among the many problems with this definition are the following. How do we classify couples who do not have children? Are they to be excluded from the concept of 'family'? What exactly is a 'kinship group'? Reiss suggests that a kinship group is based on biological ties of descent, real or fictive, that give people rights over children. How, then, should we classify surrogate mothers? And who exactly provides 'nurturant socialization'? If a couple leaves their children with foster parents during the working week, and the children live with them only at the weekend, which is the family here? If a mother gives her child to her own mother (the child's grandmother) to care for throughout most of the year, but visits the child from time to time, is she a member of the child's family or not?

In addition to the conceptual difficulties that arise from attempting to apply the above definition, there are certain practical problems that can follow from using it as a basis for social policy. If parents do not provide nurturant socialization for their children, should they be denied rights over the children because they are 'not really family' to them? Who has the right to make such decisions? How are these decisions connected to power relationships? And what are the implications for different social groups?

described as adaptive systems, which respond creatively to the stresses that are caused by unmet needs. Functionalist sociologists also argue that the reason why families exist is because of the functions which they fulfill. That is to say,

family structures are thought to have evolved in the past because they helped human populations to survive. According to this point of view, families are thought to still be evolving today in order to help us cope with our changing economic and social environments. Functionalist sociologists emphasize how families continue to be essential for the maintenance of other social institutions, for example through the moral education of children who grow up to be decent, law-abiding members of society.

On the other hand, there are some sociologists who argue that the family is 'anti-social' (Barrett and McIntosh, 1991). What they mean by this is that family life, as most of us have known it, is thought to interfere with the full realization of human potential. Critical sociologists state that families are inward looking. They argue that a society which emphasizes family values tends to place a higher priority on private interests rather than public interests. When individuals are encouraged to put the interests of other family members first, they are obliged to be honest, fair and generous toward the people in their family. However, they may not feel that they have to treat people outside their own family in the same way. Public morality is likely to suffer as a result, and communities will have little capacity to cope with social problems. The isolated nuclear family may be functional for its members, but dysfunctional for society.

Feminist critics suggest that families are not always functional for all of their members, and they ask the question: functional for whom? They then proceed to point out the existence of inequalities within families. Family activities often place more restrictions on the personal liberties of wives than they do on husbands. That is mainly because women are more likely to have the primary responsibility for the care of young children, who need constant attention. It is also partly due to the predominant relations of power and influence between the sexes. (See **Box 1.2**).

Feminist sociologists have drawn attention to the power that older men have traditionally exercised over women and children. This kind of power is referred to as *patriarchy*. The traditional Palestinian hamula, for example, was organized along patriarchal lines. Decision-making power was exercised mainly by the oldest male, in his role as the head of the hamula. The patriarch of the hamula exercised power directly over his wives and children, and indirectly through his younger brothers. His brothers, in turn, exercised power over their wives and children, in their roles as heads of households.

Patriarchy was a stronger principle of social organization in Palestine in the past than it is in most western countries today. This does not mean that patriarchy is confined only to the Middle East; nor does it mean that it has existed only in the past. Patriarchy, and patriarchal images of families, still influence how many people experience family life today (Haj-Yahia, 1998). The influence of patriarchal ideas is sometimes reflected in the manner in which official reports present information about families.

During most of the post-Second World War period, governments collected statistical information about family income mainly from one family member

Box 1.2 How can we define family? Answer two: It is an arbitrary social construction

In opposition to those who claim that the family is a universal, and essential, social structure, there are social scientists who claim that 'the family' is ultimately an arbitrary social construction. The latter theorists take a quite different approach to the problem of definition in family studies.

It has been argued from a feminist perspective that 'the family' is not a natural social phenomenon at all (Collier, Rosaldo and Yanagisako, 1992). Rather, it is seen as one element in an ideology that idealizes 'nurturance' because it is thought to be lacking in an impersonal, bureaucratic, industrial society. This ideology, which we have inherited from the nineteenth-century reaction against excesses of industrialization, places a special emphasis upon nurturance by women (because of their role in reproduction). It therefore ties women to 'the family'. This ideological construction of the family is thought to be imposed upon modern societies by agencies of the state through law-making and law-enforcement. Attention is therefore drawn away from a supposedly universal definition of 'family', and toward the legal definitions of family and family relationships which are found in particular societies at particular points in time. Those definitions are believed to be open to change through political action.

Other social scientists, working mainly from the tradition of *ethnomethodology*, have arrived at similar conclusions about the way in which the public meaning of 'family' is a result of ongoing processes of the construction of meaning in social life (Gubrium, 1987; Holstein and Gubrium, 1999). These observers not only discuss social processes in legal institutions, but they also describe the subtle ways in which discourses about families create social effects in institutions such as hospitals and social service agencies. Here, they stress the ambiguity that frequently occurs in practical accounts of what 'really' counts as a family relationship, as well as the contested nature of the meanings of everyday family events.

Conflicts around the meaning of 'family', and uncertainty about what it 'really' is, have led some theorists to claim that we do not know what it is and furthermore we should not even attempt to define it (Bernardes, 1985, 1999). From this point of view, every definition of 'the family', is an ideological concept that must be understood within its political context.

In contrast to the approaches described here, some social scientists (that is, *positivists*) are likely to feel that it will be very difficult to produce a general body of theory about family life, based on testable propositions, if we do not develop a precise, and generalizable, definition of the family unit.

(usually an older male) identified as the 'head of the household'. This way of collecting information was based on the convenient assumption that in every family there was one person, usually the husband or the father, who managed most of the money for the family (Marsh and Arber, 1992). In contrast, information about children's health or children's education is usually collected from the mother, on the assumption that she is the person most knowledgeable about the child.

Social research into families often displays assumptions and practices concerning how tasks are divided within families. Traditional ideas on the *division of labour* between spouses, with husbands looking after the money and wives looking after the children, have had a considerable influence on the social organization of family activities, and on the conduct of social research.

How important the division of labour is in families today is open to debate. The roles of wives and husbands have clearly changed in certain respects in recent decades. But how much change has there been, and have the roles of men and women changed equally? What kinds of activities do women and men perform in families today?

We see here that questions about what families do very quickly turn into questions about what particular family members do, and with whom. Partly for this reason, and partly because of the criticisms of sociological functionalism mentioned earlier, the focus in family sociology has tended to shift away from the study of functions toward the study of interactions and transactions, or in other words, family practices (Morgan, 1996).

Family practices consist of all the ordinary, everyday actions that people do, insofar as they are intended to have some effect on another family member. One of the main things family members do is talk. They talk as they go about their daily routines in the household. They talk when they visit or phone distant family members who want to be informed about what is going on within the family. By communicating the meanings they give to experiences, family members construct a shared knowledge of each other's lives and their relationships with one another (Berger and Kellner, 1964). Shared knowledge of each other's needs and desires is the basis for practical exchanges of goods and services in transactions between family members.

In some instances, we can see that people who occupy different roles within the family contribute different things in their transactions with other family members. Family transactions then take the form of social exchange. One person gives one thing, and they receive a different thing in return. Exchange transactions like this are often important in marriage, especially when there is a sharp division of labour between husband and wife. An extreme example of this is a type of nuclear family known as the breadwinner/homemaker family.

The *breadwinner/homemaker family* was a very influential model for family life in the 1950s and 1960s. It is still found today, but it is no longer as prevalent as it once was. Economically, the breadwinner/homemaker type of family is based on a clear division of labour between the spouses, who therefore

have quite different experiences of marriage. The husband earns all of the family income, and the wife does all of the housework. The effect of this arrangement is to produce an informal exchange within marriage, of money for services. Neither partner can provide for themselves alone, but by exchanging their resources of money and labour they can meet most of their needs.

In exchange transactions, both partners receive something in return for what they do, and everybody benefits to some extent. However, the feminist question about who benefits the most is still relevant here. Exchange transactions are sometimes balanced, when both parties receive the same amount of benefit, and at other times they are unbalanced. If there are young children in the home, the person who provides the services may end up with less leisure time than the person who provides the income. Such inequality is neither accidental nor random. Rather, it can be argued that it reflects major differences in the value that our society attaches to unpaid work in the home, versus paid work in the market economy.

How Are Families Connected to Other Groups?

Families do not exist in isolation. They are connected to a number of groups, because they depend upon them. Families cannot meet all of their needs unaided, in any society, and they must therefore turn to other groups for support and for resources. In a market economy, where most resources are only available if you can pay for them, that means entering into economic exchanges with people outside the family.

The connections between families and other groups are related to the level of economic development. The higher the standard of living in a society, the more resources people need and the more dependent they are on their transactions with people outside the family. In the most affluent societies, a high level of consumption can only be achieved by having a high income. That is earned by a high level of participation in the labour market. Wives and husbands are therefore both usually employed for wages in the most economically advanced countries today.

The dependence of family well-being on market transactions is one obvious way in which families are connected to other social groups. Because most families are so reliant economically on labour markets and commodity markets, they are greatly affected by economic events. A striking example of this is the impact that the Great Depression of the late 1920s and 1930s had on families in many countries. The effects of the Depression on families in the United States have been well documented by Glen Elder (1974).

Elder's important study used *longitudinal data* on children who were ages eleven or twelve in Oakland, California, in the years from 1931 to 1932. These children were studied intensively from 1932 to 1939, and they were studied again as they neared age 40. Longitudinal studies such as this, which collect

information on the same individuals over long periods of time, are the most reliable way of tracing how people's family lives are affected by new situations.

The 'children of the Depression', as Elder called them, showed the effects of changes in family interactions that tended to follow from decline in the family's economic position. Average family income in the Oakland sample fell approximately 40 per cent between 1929 and 1933. Family members adapted to their financial decline by producing more goods and services themselves. The economic roles of mothers and children expanded, while the provider role of fathers shrank. These conditions weakened the father's customary role of social control, especially over sons. A high level of participation in economic activities by boys and girls strengthened their sense of autonomy, leading to early transition into adulthood. Among girls at that time, this meant early domestic responsibilities and, in deprived middle-class families, a preference for marriage over advanced education.

Studies like Glen Elder's analysis of the effects that changes in the market economy have on family patterns raise interesting questions, concerning the direction of influence between social factors. Such questions are especially important for causal theories. Is family life mainly determined by economic events, or do family events determine the nature of economic changes? Which direction of causation is most important in the long run? These questions, and the various answers to them, have been very influential in sociological accounts of family life (Seccombe, 1992, 1993).

Analyses which stress the determination of social life by economic processes are called *economic determinism*. Such accounts often seek to show how families take on distinct forms in particular economic systems such as capitalism (for example, Fine, 1992). On the other hand, there are accounts of family change, like that of Glen Elder, which suggest that family life is not completely determined by large-scale economic shifts. Rather, families are shown to create and shape their responses to change, through adaptive *family strategies*.

A family strategy is an organized attempt by the members of a family to maintain or to improve their collective situation. The most important family strategies are survival strategies. These strategies, such as how to generate an adequate income from the skills and resources of family members, are essential for the maintenance of the family as a social unit. In the industrializing society of Hong Kong in the 1970s, families with children could not survive on the low wage of an industrial worker. First-born daughters were therefore expected to find work as soon as they were physically mature, and to contribute their earnings to the family income pool (Salaff, 1995). The family could thus afford for its sons and younger daughters to stay in school longer, in order that they might earn higher wages than their older sisters when they eventually entered the labour force.

As families adapt to new situations by adopting survival strategies, they affect other groups in turn. If enough families change in the same way, then the combined impact on other groups can be considerable. For example, if a large

number of families decide to economize by making their old car last longer before buying a new one then the demand for cars will drop. This will lead to falling production by automobile factories, which in turn will result in less employment for the people who work in them. In a similar way, changing patterns of marriage can affect the demand for housing. The level of demand for new homes increases if couples start getting married at younger ages. On the other hand, housing demand falls when young adults delay leaving home and continue to live with their parents for longer. Here we see that families are not just 'dependent variables' which are determined by their economic environments. Families can also collectively cause changes in markets, such as the housing market, and family change can create demands for new government policies.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest among social scientists in the potential effects that families can have upon a variety of social institutions. In particular, government economists and public pension plan administrators are often concerned about the consequences of women having fewer children, or in other words declining *fertility*. A completed fertility rate of 2.1 births per woman is defined as the 'replacement level' of fertility, at which one generation will be fully replaced by the next generation. Today, fertility rates are below the replacement level in several western countries and in Japan. This raises a number of questions about who is going to pay for the income benefits of the elderly, and how the elderly will be cared for in future when they are in poor health (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1988). The answers that are being given to those questions will have implications for changes to income transfer programmes and health-care systems, as well as family life. It seems that in countries such as Japan, elderly spouses may have to provide each other with more in-home health care if they cannot rely upon hospitals or adult children to look after them (Ogawa and Retherford, 1997). The pace of fertility decline in Japan means that Japanese society will have to adapt very quickly to a situation in which many couples, rather than just a few, end up without a son (Mason, Tsuya and Choe, 1998). Whether that situation pushes Japanese families in the direction of the nuclear family that the West has had for several centuries, or in some other direction, is unclear.

It is important in many countries today to think about what the consequences might be of *population aging* during the first half of the twenty-first century. Throughout Europe and in North America, as well as in significant parts of Asia such as Japan, an increasing proportion of the population is being made up of people in older age groups. This major demographic change is partly due to the fact that on average people are living longer now, due to steady improvements in diet, sanitation and health care. However, the major factor in population aging is falling fertility.

We can see that in issues such as population change in Japan, family patterns are major topics of social policy now. In the past, it was sometimes suggested that family life occupied a private sphere, which was largely protected from

public intervention. That is not the case today. Government legislators, the courts, and public agencies of various kinds are all constantly trying to find new ways to manage what goes on within families. There are several reasons for this. One of the main reasons is pressure on governments to balance their budgets, without raising taxes, by lowering the social expenditures that compensate for family deficiencies (Cheal, 1996a). Families are being required to meet additional responsibilities in most Anglo-American and European countries, and there has been a revival of official interest in family functioning (Sgritta, 1989). Another reason for the penetration of public policy into private life is decreased tolerance for physical and sexual abuse within families. That development is mainly due to greater awareness of the effects of power in personal relationships, raised by the feminist movement.

At the end of the twentieth century, some of the groups which are having the biggest influence on families are social movements. These movements either want to bring about accelerated family change, or they want to resist certain kinds of family changes, by mobilizing public opinion through meetings, rallies and the mass media. The feminist movement stresses female autonomy from patriarchal control. Partly in reaction to this perceived threat of increased individualism, and also in response to growing social problems, conservative pro-family movements stress a return to family values (Cohen and Katzenstein, 1988; Abbott and Wallace, 1992). In the United States and Canada, bitter conflicts over abortion, involving the rights of mothers versus the rights of the unborn, have especially divided these two groups (Luker, 1984).

One of the consequences of the recent increase in family pluralism is that family diversity has often become a major source of controversy (Jagger and Wright, 1999). As a result, clashes of opinion over sexual and relational ethics have become popular subjects of mass entertainment. In England, the intimate relationships of members of the 'royal family' have been closely scrutinized by millions of people. Inside information, or rumours, about the personal lives of royalty has helped to sell huge numbers of newspapers, magazines and books. Today, the details of family life are often public business on a grand scale.

Discussion

Sociologists of family life participate in public discussions about families in the societies in which we live, and we are therefore often involved in debating controversial subjects. Sociologists approach these topics from the perspective of an intellectual discipline which attempts to clarify the issues involved. As we do this, family sociologists also try to apply data from research to answer basic questions. In this chapter we have seen how sociological approaches to the study of family life arise from three basic questions. Those three questions are: Who are family members? What do families do? How are families connected to other groups?

Each of the three main questions about family life raises a number of subsidiary questions. Illustrative examples of specialized questions were outlined in this introductory chapter, and some of the concepts and methods used in the sociology of family life were presented. In the remainder of this book the three basic questions will be pursued in more detail. We will see how they lead into a wide array of specific enquiries, and we will learn more about the concepts and methods by which sociologists analyze the world in which we live.

Index

A

- abortion 16
- abuse 16, 81–9, 153
 - child abuse 87, 88–9
- acceptance, social 20–1
- achievement 20–1
- adaptive systems 9
- adolescence 96–8
- adoption 66–7, 134
- Africa 80–1
- African-Americans 21–2, 30–2
- age
 - and caregiving and childcare 94–5
 - at first marriage 79
- Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) 31
- allowance system 110
- Alzheimer's disease 3
- anomie 97, 133–4, 153
- anticipatory socialization 96–8, 153
- Arabs 5, 84
- Arber, S. 95
- arranged marriages 20, 79–80, 153
- Asia 23–6, 79–80
 - see also under individual countries*
- Australia 6, 20–1, 26–7, 37, 100, 112
- autonomy 20, 25–7

B

- Beck-Gernsheim, E. 65
- Becker, G. 115
- birth weight, low 131
- Bittman, M. 94
- Blumer, H. 58
- boundaries, family 3, 59–60, 155
- breadwinner 153
 - male 111, 113, 116
- breadwinner/homemaker family 12–13, 153
- bridge generation 51, 153
- Britain 18–19, 21, 22, 58, 66, 94, 126

- care of the elderly 95, 141
- financial practices 110, 111, 112
- leaving home 60
- lone mothers 135–7
- normative guidelines 45
 - see also* England; Scotland
- British Household Panel Survey 37, 53
- Burch, T. 54
- Burgess, E. 74

C

- Canada 6, 26, 54, 56–7, 66, 74, 121
- child poverty 43
- childcare and time stress 99, 100–1
- elderly people 25
- financial practices 110
- leaving home 60–1
- lone-parent families 113, 135–6
- surrogacy 134
- women and family income 114, 118
- care deficit 106, 153
- care packages 141
- caregiving 91–107, 147, 153
 - family priorities 37, 45, 50
 - family roles, social identities and self concepts 101–4
 - intergenerational relations in the welfare state 140–2
 - social distribution 93–6
 - time use 96–101
- Caribbean 145
- caring about 102, 153
- child abuse 87, 88–9
- child experts 105
- child poverty 42–3, 131–2
- child support 43–4
- childcare 49, 91–107, 144, 153
 - family roles, social identities and self concepts 101–4
 - gender and employment 116–18

- intensive mothering 104–5, 124, 158
 - paid childcare services 124–5
 - social distribution 93–6
 - strategies for balancing employment and family life 119–25
 - time use 96–101
 - children
 - adolescents 96–8
 - adoption 66–7, 134
 - after divorce 43–4, 62–5
 - contribution to family income 112
 - impact of parenthood 56–60
 - punishment of 87, 88, 104
 - stepfamilies 61
 - surrogacy 67, 134–5, 162
 - Children Act 1989 65
 - China 72, 133–4
 - Christianity 4, 23, 80
 - class 111
 - caregiving 95–6
 - situational diversity 30–2
 - social networks 144–5
 - underclass 22
 - ‘Cleveland affair’ 88–9
 - cohabitation 6, 22, 56, 101, 112, 153
 - cohorts 54, 153
 - Coleman, M. 44
 - collectivization of childcare 124–5
 - commitment 46–7, 153
 - commodification 103, 134–5, 154
 - communitarianism 141
 - companionate marriage 72–6, 89, 111–12, 129, 154
 - companionship family 72–7, 89
 - and violence 84–6
 - Conger, R. 132
 - conjugal family 40, 154
 - conjugal relationship 39, 154
 - conservative pro-family movements 16
 - control 74
 - financial 110, 156
 - illusion of 85–6, 157
 - convergence thesis 22–3
 - co-providers 116–17, 154
 - corporatist welfare state 139–40, 154
 - critical sociologists 10
 - cultural alternative 78, 154
 - cultural contradiction 80–1, 154
 - cultural diversity
 - family complexity 19, 20–7, 34
 - family priorities 39–41
 - cultural ideal 20
 - custodial parent 61, 62–3, 154
 - custody 43–4, 61, 62–5
- D**
- d’Abbs, P. 37
 - daughters 14, 45, 142
 - daughters-in-law 45
 - daycare 102–4, 124–5
 - deaths, violent 82–4
 - children 89
 - decision rules 39–40
 - decommodification 147, 154
 - demand 15
 - demography 15–16, 48–50, 154
 - dependence 25–7, 85, 125–6, 154
 - Depression 13–14
 - Derné, S. 20
 - descent, biological ties of 9, 47, 49–50
 - developing countries 142
 - discourse 135–7, 154
 - diversity
 - cultural 19, 20–7, 34, 39–41
 - situational 19–20, 27–32, 34
 - division of labour 12–13, 154
 - adolescents 96–8
 - companionate marriage 75–6
 - rational choice theory 115
 - divorce 22, 26–7, 31, 60, 72, 76, 90
 - and care of children 94
 - economic effects 42–4, 62–4
 - and family priorities 47–8
 - role exit 62–5
 - Dobash, R.P. 82
 - domestic service 124
 - dual-career couples 99–101, 113, 155
 - Duncan, S. 118–19, 136
 - durability model 64–5
 - Durkheim, E. 97, 133
 - Dykstra, P. 69
 - dysfunctional relationships 8

E

- economic determinism 14, 155
- economic development 13, 23
- economic stress 132
- economy
 - family economy *see* family economy
 - market economy 13–15, 129–35, 158
- economy of pleasure 77–8, 155
- education 79
- Edwards, R. 118–19, 136
- Egypt 79
- Eichler, M. 118, 150
- Elder, G. 13–14, 132
- elderly 15
 - caregiving *see* caregiving
 - family priorities 40–1
 - living arrangements 25
 - welfare state and care of 140–2, 147
- emotion work 76, 155
- employment 145, 146
 - balancing with family life 119–25
 - and gender 57–8, 114–18
 - impact of parenthood 57
- employment reduction strategy 122–3
- encapsulation 85, 155
- endogamy 21, 155
- England 6, 45, 126
 - see also* Britain
- Esping-Andersen, G. 138–40, 147
- ethnomethodology 11, 155
- events
 - family 53
 - important 37
- exchange, social 12–13, 125–6, 161
- extended family 5, 24, 30, 155

F

- family
 - change 5–6, 14–16, 48–50, 149; public policy and 15–16, 146–7
 - connections to other social groups 13–16; *see also* social environments
 - definition 3–4, 6, 7–8, 9, 11, 155
 - functions *see* functions

- members 2–6, 8; *see also* family complexity; family dynamics; family priorities
 - sociology, modernity and 149–51
- family boundaries 3, 59–60, 155
- family of choice 76–7, 155
- family complexity 18–35
 - cultural diversity 19, 20–7, 34
 - individualization 32–4, 34–5
 - situational diversity 19–20, 27–32, 34
- family composition 19, 24–5, 155
- family construction 58–60
- family daycare providers 102–4
- family disorganization 30–1
- family dynamics 52–70, 155
 - role entries 54–60
 - role exits 60–5
 - voices off-stage 66–9
- family economy 108–27, 156
 - balancing employment and family life 119–25
 - family income 57–8, 112–19, 142–3
 - financial practices 109–12
 - social exchange 12–13, 125–6, 161
- family farms 132
- family formation 55–6, 156
- family-friendly policies 122, 156
- family history 47–8
- family income 57–8, 112–19, 142–3
- family income testing 143
- family life 152, 156
 - balancing employment and 119–25
- family life cycle 53–4, 156
- family obligations 47, 50
 - normative guidelines 44–7
 - situational change 41–4
- family of orientation 29, 156
- family of origin 29, 156
- family practices 12–13
- family priorities 36–51, 66
 - cultural factors 39–41
 - family history 47–8
 - normative guidelines 44–7
 - situational factors 41–4
 - structural change 48–50
 - structure of family relationships 37–9
- family of procreation 29, 156

- family roles *see* roles
 family size 24, 48–9, 137–8
 family strategies 14–15, 156
 family structure 7, 37–9, 162
 and leaving home 61
 structural change 48–50
 family subcultures 21–2
 family ties 72–7
 family values 10, 20–1, 23
 family/work strategies 119–25
 fathers
 and childcare 94, 116–17
 and children after divorce 62, 63, 65,
 66
 impact of parenthood 57
 non-residential 66
 support payments 43–4
 feminism 10, 11, 16, 82, 83, 142–3
 fertility 15, 48, 156
 filial piety 24, 156
 filial responsibility 93, 156
 financial control 110, 156
 financial help 126, 145–6
 financial practices 109–12
 Finch, J. 42, 44–6, 48
 Finland 78, 141
 forced sex 84, 90
 foster parents 124
 Fox, B. 56–7
 friendships 68–9
 functional prerequisites 9, 156
 functionalism 8–10, 37–9, 157
 functions 6–10, 156
 see also caregiving; childcare; family
 economy; intimate relationships
- G**
 gender
 childcare and caregiving 94, 95, 102
 division of labour *see* division of
 labour
 employment and 57–8, 114–18
 and family income 113–18
 and family priorities 39
 leaving home 60–1
 and parenthood 56–8
 relations in the welfare state 142–3
 segregation 20
 stereotypes 96, 97
 time stress 99–101
 time use 96–8
 gender role segregation 99–101, 122–3
 gendered moral rationalities 118–19,
 157
 German Democratic Republic
 (GDR) 151
 Germany 33, 139–40
 Gerson, K. 116–17
 Giddens, A. 28, 33, 150
 Ginn, J. 95
 Great Depression 13–14
- H**
 Haitians 27
 hamula 5, 10
 Hashimoto, A. 40–1
 Hernandez, D. 137–8
 heteronormative social order 83, 157
 heterosexual companionship family
 73–6
 hierarchy of preferences 45, 50–1
 high modernity 150, 157
 Hindu family culture 20
 history, family 47–8
 Hochschild, A. 106
 home 75, 157
 homelessness 144
 homeworking 120–1, 157
 homosexual relationships 6, 8
 companionship family 76–7
 violence 86–7
 honeymoons 73
 Hong Kong 14
 household 4, 157
 housekeeping allowance 110, 157
 housework 57, 96–101
 housing 53–4, 113, 127
 human capital 132, 157
- I**
 Iceland 66
 identity
 moral 117–18, 118–19, 159
 social 101–4, 162

- ideology 72, 157
ie (stem family) 24–5, 29, 30
 illusion of control 85–6, 157
 in-kind assistance 126
 in-laws, relationships between 47–8
 income
 family 57–8, 112–19, 142–3
 gender differences 42, 57
 inequalities 130–1
 pooling 109–12, 142, 160
 income support programmes 139–40,
 140, 142–3
 cuts for lone mothers 119
 see also welfare state
 independent management 112, 157
 India 20, 23, 123, 124, 144
 individual responsibility model 118
 individualism 21, 26, 46, 141
 individualization 32–4, 34–5, 157
 industrialization 73–4, 74–5, 120, 157
 Informal Carer's Allowance 141
 inheritance 49–50
 intensive mothering 104–5, 124, 158
 intergenerational relations 49–50, 51
 Japan 24–5
 transfer of wealth 50
 in the welfare state 140–2
 interhousehold transactions 92, 158
 intimacy 20
 intimate relationships 71–90
 family ties 72–7
 modernizing marriage 78–81
 sexual relations 77–8
 violence and abuse 81–9
 intrahousehold transactions 92, 158
 involved fathers 117
 Islam 5, 79
 isolated nuclear family *see* nuclear family
 Israel 5, 84
- J**
 Japan 15, 117
 employment reduction strategy
 122–3
 family composition 24–6
 family priorities 40–1
 intensive mothering 105, 106
 situational diversity 29–30
 joint actions 58, 158
 joint families 20, 23, 158
- K**
 Kendall, L. 80
 kinship groups 9
 kinship terminology 3, 158
 Knipscheer, C. 49
 Korea 80
- L**
 large families 137–8
 leaving home 26, 60–1
 legal system 43–4, 63, 64–5, 69–70
 legitimate excuses 47
 legitimation 84, 158
 lesbian relationships 86–7
 see also homosexual relationships
 Levin, I. 58, 64
 liberal welfare state 138–9, 158
 life course 54, 158
 situational diversity and change over
 27–30
 life cycle, family 53–4, 156
 life expectancy 23
 lone-parent families 18–19, 22, 146
 children leaving home 61
 family income 113, 114, 118–19,
 131
 moral identities 118–19
 public discourses 135–7
 social networks 143–4
 US 31, 135–6
 welfare state regimes and 139–40
 long-term care 141
 longevity 48–50, 158
 longitudinal data 13–14, 158
 Loosley, E. 75
 loss, feelings of 63, 103
 low birth weight 131
- M**
 Maccoby, E. 43
 Malaysia 23
 Malinowski, B. 9
 marital status 158

- changes in 42–4
 - and receiving care 92–3, 95
 - see also* divorce
 - market economy 13–15, 129–35, 158
 - marriage 22, 26, 55–6
 - arranged 20, 79–80, 153
 - companionate 72–6, 89, 111–12, 129, 154
 - crisis in China 133–4
 - modernization of 78–81
 - negotiated 80, 159
 - rape within 90
 - remarriage 60
 - marriage work 68–9, 158
 - Marxism 151
 - Mason, J. 42, 46, 48
 - matricentric (matrifocal) family 22, 158
 - McDonald, P. 20–1
 - means testing 139, 159
 - men 46
 - changing lives 114–17
 - male breadwinner 111, 113, 116
 - reporting of violence 82
 - strategies for balancing work and family 94, 116–17
 - unemployment 32, 117
 - see also* fathers; gender; sons
 - migration 21–2, 23, 25, 27, 145
 - military personnel 68
 - Mnookin, R. 43
 - modernity 149–51, 159
 - see also* high modernity; postmodernity
 - modernization 22–3, 149, 159
 - marriage 78–81
 - modified stem family 29
 - money 108, 129
 - financial help 126, 145–6
 - see also* family economy
 - money management 110–11, 159
 - moral identity 117–18, 118–19, 159
 - moral panics 87, 159
 - mothering 102
 - intensive 104–5, 106, 124, 158
 - mothers
 - birth mothers and adopted children 66–7
 - and custody 61
 - lone 118–19, 135–7, 139–40, 143–4
 - moral identities 117–18
 - non-custodial 62–3
 - surrogacy 67, 134–5, 162
 - multigenerational families 48–50
 - stem family 24–5, 29, 30, 162
 - Murdock, G.P. 9
 - Murray, C. 31–2
- N**
- negative labels 135
 - negotiated marriage 80, 159
 - neolocal residence 26, 159
 - Netherlands 28, 33, 49, 56, 61, 113
 - networks, social 36, 40–1, 143–6, 162
 - Nigeria 81
 - night shift working 121
 - non-standard hours strategy 121
 - normal violence 87, 159
 - normative guidelines 44–7, 159
 - Norway 58, 141
 - nuclear family 4, 20, 29, 30–1, 159
 - nurturance 11
 - nurturant socialization 9, 159
- O**
- off-stage voices 66–9
 - official statistics 10–12, 18–19
 - Oliker, S. 68–9
 - one-person households 26, 27, 28, 33
 - ‘outside marriages’ 81
- P**
- paid childcare services 124–5
 - Palestine 4–5, 10
 - parents 127
 - custody of children 43–4, 61, 62–5
 - impact of parenthood 56–60
 - lone *see* lone-parent families
 - in stepfamilies 58–60
 - see also* fathers; mothers
 - Parsons, T. 30–1, 37–9
 - part-time employment 123
 - patriarchal model 118
 - patriarchy 10–12, 83, 84, 159
 - pensions 140

- personal care *see* caregiving
 personal networks 36, 40–1, 143–6
 Philippines 125, 142
 Pixley, J. 94
 pleasure, economy of 77–8, 155
 political economy 129, 130
 polyandry 5, 159
 polygamy 5, 160
 polygyny 5, 80–1, 160
 pooling of income 109–12, 142, 160
 population aging 15, 160
 positivism 11, 160
 post-familial family 65
 postmodernity 150, 160
 poverty, child 42–3, 131–2
 power 64
 imbalance and family income 110
 patriarchy 10–12, 83, 84, 159
 priorities, family *see* family priorities
 private sphere 15–16, 87–8, 160
 pseudomutuality 94, 160
 public discourses 135–7
 public policy 19, 106
 and family change 15–16, 146–7
 and family violence 86–8
 lone mothers 118–19, 135–7
 shift from patriarchal model to social
 responsibility model 118
 welfare states 137–43
 public sphere 15–16, 87, 135, 160
 Puerto Ricans 21–2
 punishment of children 87, 88, 104
 pure relationships 33–4, 160
- Q**
 Qureshi, H. 45, 50
- R**
 race 30–2
 Rajulton, F. 54
 rape, wife 84, 90
 rational choice theory 115, 160
 rationality 115
 Ravanera, Z. 54
 reallocation of domestic labour 123–4
 reciprocity 125–6, 160
 recommodification 147
 reflexivity 136, 160
 Reher, D. 49–50
 Reiss, I. 9
 remittances 145, 160
 Renzetti, C. 86–7
 rites of passage 55–6, 160
 role conflict 57, 161
 role differentiation 64, 161
 role segregation 99–101, 122–3, 161
 roles 7, 161
 entries 54–60
 exits 60–5, 69–70
 social identities and self
 concepts 101–4
 romantic fusion 84–5, 161
- S**
 Scandinavia 124–5, 140
 see also under individual countries
 Scotland 61, 82
 see also Britain
 secularization 5–6, 161
 Seeley, J. 75
 self concepts 101–4, 161
 self-development 33
 self-provisioning 109, 161
 separation 31, 42–4
 see also divorce
 service sector 117, 161
 sexual abuse 81, 84, 90, 161
 children 87, 88–9
 sexual relationships 77–8
 companionate marriage 76
 ethics 16
 homosexual 76–7
 market economy 133–4
 shared management of money *see*
 pooling of income
 Silva, E. 6
 Sim, R.A. 75
 Simons, K. 45
 Singapore 28, 124
 single-parent families *see* lone-parent
 families
 single-person households 26, 27, 28,
 33
 situational changes 41–4

- situational diversity 19–20, 27–32, 34
 size, family 24, 48–9, 137–8
 Smart, C. 6, 64
 social acceptance 20–1
 social capital 144, 161
 social-democratic welfare state 140, 161
 social distribution of work 93–6, 161
 social environments 13–16, 128–47
 markets 13–15, 129–35
 public discourses 135–7
 social networks 36, 40–1, 143–6
 welfare states 137–43, 146–7
 social exchange 12–13, 125–6, 161
 social exclusion 137–8, 162
 social identities 101–4, 162
 social inclusion 137, 162
 social movements 16
 social networks 36, 40–1, 143–6, 162
 social responsibility model 150–1
 sociology 149–51
 sons 45, 142
 Spain 49–50
 spouses 37, 45, 50
 spurious correlation 131, 162
 standard family theory 38
 state 135, 162
 public policy *see* public policy
 welfare state *see* welfare state
 statistical information 10–12, 18–19
 stem family 24–5, 29, 30, 162
 stepfamilies 58–60, 61, 162
 stereotypes 96, 97, 162
 stigma 33, 63, 135
 strategies 162
 balancing employment and family life 119–25
 family strategies 14–15, 156
 structural prerequisites 9, 162
 structure 162
 family *see* family structure
 subcultures 21–2
 substitution model 64–5
 suicide 97
 support payments 42–4
 surrogacy 67, 134–5, 162
 survival strategies 14
 Sweden 28, 124–5, 135, 140
 symbolic interactionism 58, 59, 162
 symmetrical families 99–100, 163
- T**
- Taiwan 120, 151
 taking care of 102, 163
 targeted programmes 139, 163
 teenage parenthood 31
 teleworking 120
 Thèry, I. 64
 time-space distanciation 28, 67–8, 163
 time stress 98–101, 163
 time use 96–101
 trajectories 54, 163
 transactions 12, 91–2, 126–7, 163
 social exchange 12–13, 125–6, 161
 transitions, life-course 54–65, 163
- U**
- underclass 22
 unemployment 32, 117
 unit of analysis 138
 United Kingdom *see* Britain
 United States (US) 55, 61, 90, 94, 105, 134
 class, race and family 30–2
 companionate marriage 76
 Depression 13–14
 family farms 132
 family priorities 40–1
 family subcultures 21–2
 fathers and child support 43–4
 income inequality 130
 large families 137–8
 lone-parent families 31, 135–6
 time use 96–8
 urbanization and
 industrialization 73–5
 violent deaths 82–4
 welfare state 139, 141–2
 universal programmes 139, 163
 urbanization 73–4, 163
- V**
- verticalization of family life 49
 violence 8, 81–9, 89–90, 163

- between partners 82–6
 - normal 87, 159
 - public responses to family
 - violence 86–8
- Vosko, L. 143
- W**
- Waerness, K. 115
- Walker, A. 50
- weddings 55–6
- Weeks, J. 6
- Weijie, Z. 133
- welfare state 137–43, 146–7, 163
 - dependence in US 31–2
 - gender relations 142–3
 - intergenerational relations 140–2
 - regimes 138–40, 154, 158, 161
 - social responsibility model 150–1
- West Indians 22
- whole wage system 111, 163
- Whyte, M.K. 55
- wife rape 84, 90
- Willmott, P. 99–100
- Wilson, W.J. 32
- women 20, 75–6
 - age at marriage 79
 - changing lives 76, 113–14
 - economic impact of divorce 42–3, 63
 - employment 113–14, 117–18, 123
 - forced sex 84, 90
 - friendships 68–9
 - impact of parenthood 57–8
 - Japan 25, 29, 122–3
 - sexual abuse 84, 90
 - social networks 143–4
 - see also* daughters; daughters-in-law;
 - gender; mothers
- work practices, altering 121–2
- Y**
- Young, M. 99–100
- young adults 26