THE NATURE OF THE FAMILY PROJECTED BY THE HOME ECONOMICS PROFESSION AS EVIDENCED THROUGH EXAMINATION OF THE AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION LITERATURE

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JOAN IRENE QUILLING
1970

THESIS

3 1293 10346 8561

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
THE NATURE OF THE FAMILY PROJECTED BY THE HOME ECONOMICS PROFESSION AS EVIDENCED THROUGH EXAMINATION OF THE AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION LITERATURE

presented by

Joan Irene Quilling

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph. D. degree in Education

Major professor

Date June 8, 1970

O-169

BINDING BY
HOAG & SONS'
BOOK BINDERY INC

FEB 5 1973 R8

~~MAR 1976~~ R37

~~JUN 4 76~~ R15

~~JUL 23 76~~ R29

199 R1

~~OCT 1 76~~ R 264

~~R293~~

~~ZIP~~ 006

ABSTRACT

THE NATURE OF THE FAMILY PROJECTED BY THE HOME ECONOMICS PROFESSION AS EVIDENCED THROUGH EXAMINATION OF THE AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION LITERATURE

By

Joan Irene Quilling

Philosophy builds bridges from the unknown to the known. It produces an awareness of what we are about, moves a field or discipline from incoherence to coherence or from subjectivity to objectivity. For these reasons, philosophy is coincidental to any area of study. Home economics' philosophy has evolved from a knowledge system which is composed of many subsystems or conceptual schemes. They are directed toward one all encompassing concept--the family: home economics attempts to educate individuals to live effective family lives. To be proficient, teachers of home economics knowledge and skills must understand the nature of their field. Failure in this respect prevents the educator from sorting out the important from the trivial or designing learning experiences which help students understand the nature of the subject matter. To overcome the field's present philosophical deficits, the professional

needs to be concerned with the meaning, use or functionalism of his expressions--home economics requires language awareness. An appreciation of verbal expression reveals the knowledge communicated through language and the structure of such conceptual knowledge. Explicit conceptual schemes become comprehensible and/or coherent. Home economics' conceptual usage determines the limits of its educational development. The family is one of the concepts around which the field has built a structure of knowledge and theory. It provided the focal point for this study because: (1) the educational sector of the field attempts to work with and through individuals to strengthen families; (2) the concept is central to the field's activities; and (3) a gap is apparent in the literature relative to a critical examination of the field's focus.

Home economics draws its knowledge and theory, for the most part, from the surrounding disciplines. Three recognized as possible contributors from the field's inception were anthropology, sociology and psychology. By examining the discipline's use of the concept "family," the field's influencers are revealed and its directional tendencies made evident. Consistently raised questions concerning families were singled out and studied for the disciplines' and home economics' responses. The study revealed how each area has used the term in its research and literature. By responding to questions of general

concern, home economics builds a systematic set of answers to basic philosophical questions--thus developing its own philosophy.

Books labeled by the disciplines as of concern to families and written between the years 1958 and 1969 were used for the study. Since home economics' most recent tentative statement of philosophy and objectives reached completion in 1958, that year was selected as the starting point for the analysis. Also, the study was concerned with present as opposed to historical statements. The field's responses to the general questions were examined through the American Home Economics Association's journals and literature. Since the Association is the official voice for the profession, represents the total field and provides continuity of thought through its journals, it was the most applicable source for recent thought.

After each of the disciplines and home economics responded to the questions, the field's replies were submitted to a critical analysis using theories from ordinary language philosophy and conceptual analysis. This approach is based on the theory that if conceptual usage is clarified, arguments relative to philosophical direction can be explained and expunged. To facilitate the analysis, a framework was designed based on the tenets of the philosophy of language. Home economics' statements were then subjected to an examination using the framework. The analysis clarified: (1) the field's use of the concept

"family" between the years 1958 and 1969; (2) the profession's status with regard to the term; (3) the gaps and areas of depth relative to its use; and (4) the directions for further study.

The American Home Economics Association's use of the term family revealed the following characteristics:

-The Association's use of the term is largely influenced by sociology's knowledge and theory. Although home economics claims to draw its materials from a variety of disciplines, the bulk came from sociology.
-The Association's use of the concept "family" is based in sociology's institutional approach. Other conceptual schemes have been suggested but the former predominates in the literature and guides much of the field's research in combination with the developmental approach.
-The Association suggests that home economics can strengthen families by moving them from a life style characterized as independent, self contained, and self sufficient to one which is interdependent, more open to cultural influence and socially supported.
-The Association maintains that home economics attempts to train individuals who will build families that have the following characteristic life style: They are primarily middle class, stable, unified, responsible to society, healthy, normal, their needs relative to food, clothing and shelter are adequately met, they strive to improve

their life style, and they promote the culture's political ideology.

-The Association's use of the term is enclosed within specified boundaries and based on distinct values which guide and limit the comprehensiveness of home economics' conceptual frameworks.

Implications drawn from the study suggest that: (1) conceptual analysis can clarify home economic's philosophical statements; (2) conceptual analysis is a necessity if the field is to achieve a penetrating, comprehensive, and flexible philosophy; and (3) home economics has skeleton conceptual frameworks which could be amplified and made relevant for the field.

THE NATURE OF THE FAMILY PROJECTED BY THE HOME ECONOMICS PROFESSION AS EVIDENCED THROUGH EXAMINATION OF THE AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION LITERATURE

By

Joan Irene Quilling

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1970

G- 65470
1-20-71

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Twyla Shear who provided the opportunity for her student to study home economics' philosophy, Dr. Marjorie Brown for lending assistance in clarifying philosophical problems, Drs. Dale Alam, Mary Gephart, and Norma Bobbitt for their helpful criticisms and constructive comments during the course of the study, and Dr. Marvin Grandstaff, guidance committee chairman and thesis director, who willingly helped a neophyte philosopher explore ideas, crystallize her thoughts, and without whose patience and support this dissertation could not have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background and Problem for Study	1
	Significance of the Problem	3
	The Concept "Family"--A Focus for Study	5
	Approach to be Used	6
	Selection of the Major Sources	8
	Model for Inquiry Into the Disciplines	11
	Objectives of the Analysis	16
	Limitations of the Study	17
II.	ANTHROPOLOGY'S REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY"	20
	Introduction	20
	Is the Family Viewed as an Appropriate Area of Study for the Field?	21
	What Goals Are to be Achieved by the Field in Working With and Through the Family?	24
	How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? What is the Family's Relation to the Social Order?	26
	How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? Is the Family Still a Strong Part of Society?	30
	The Family--A Weak Link in Society	30
	The Family--A Strong Societal Link	31
	What Does the Field Conceive as Desirable in the Family?	34
	What Questions Have Been Raised by the Field Relative to the Family?	41

Chapter Page

How Does the Field Differ in Its Conception of the Family From That Concept of the Family Held by Other Disciplines From Which It Draws Its Knowledge? 43
What Does the Field Predict for the Family's Future? 46
What Is the Definition of the Family As Presented in the Literature of the Field? 49

III. SOCIOLOGY'S REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY" 53

Introduction. 53

Is the Family Viewed as an Appropriate Area of Study for the Field? 53
What Goals Are to be Achieved by the Field in Working With and Through the Family? 56
How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? What is the Family's Relation to the Social Order? 61
How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? Is the Family Still a Strong Part of Society?. 64

The Family--A Strong Part of Society. 65
The Family--A Weak Part of Society . 68

What Does the Field Conceive as Desirable in the Family? 70
What Questions Have Been Raised by the Field Relative to the Family?. . . . 79
How Does the Field Differ in its Conception of the Family from that Concept of the Family Held by Other Disciplines from Which it Draws its Knowledge? . . 81
What Does the Field Predict for the Family's Future? 84
What is the Definition of the Family as Presented in the Literature of the Field? 93

Chapter Page

IV. PSYCHOLOGY'S REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY" 101

Introduction. 101

Is the Family Viewed as an Appropriate Area of Study for the Field? 102
What Goals Are to be Achieved by the Field in Working With and Through the Family? 105
How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? What is the Family's Relation to the Social Order? 109
How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? Is the Family Still a Strong Part of Society?. 112
What Does the Field Conceive as Desirable in the Family?. 116
What Questions Have Been Raised by the Field Relative to the Family?. . . . 124
How Does the Field Differ in its Conception of the Family from that Concept of the Family Held by Other Disciplines from Which it Draws Its Knowledge? . . 127
What Does the Field Predict for the Family's Future? 130
What is the Definition of the Family as Presented in the Literature of the Field? 133

V. HOME ECONOMICS' REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY" 137

Introduction. 137

Is the Family Viewed as an Appropriate Area of Study for the Field? 138
What Goals Are to be Achieved by the Field in Working With and Through the Family? 141
How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? What is the Family's Relation to the Social Order? 150
How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? Is the Family Still a Strong Part of Society?. 153
What Does the Field Conceive as Desirable in the Family?. 156

Chapter Page

What Questions Have Been Raised by the Field Relative to the Family? . . . 165
How Does the Field Differ in its Conception of the Family from that Concept of the Family Held by Other Disciplines from Which it Draws its Knowledge? 171
What Does the Field Predict for the Family's Future? 176
What is the Definition of the Family as Presented in the Literature of the Field? 181

VI. A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ASSOCIATION'S CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE "FAMILY" AND THE IMPLICATIONS FROM THE CONCEPTUALIZATION. . 186

Introduction 186

Is the Family Viewed as an Appropriate Area of Study for the Field? . . . 188

Philosophical Implication(s) . . . 194

What Goals Are to be Achieved by the Field in Working With and Through the Family? 195

Philosophical Implication(s) . . . 203

How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? What is the Family's Relation to the Social Order? 203

Philosophical Implication(s) . . . 209

How Relevant is the Family to the Social Order as Viewed by the Field? Is the Family Still a Strong Part of Society? 209

Philosophical Implication(s) . . . 216

Chapter Page

What Does the Field Conceive as Desirable in the Family? 217

Philosophical Implication(s) 227

What Questions Have Been Raised by the Field Relative to the Family?. . . . 227

Philosophical Implication(s) 234

What Does the Field Predict for the Family's Future? 235

Philosophical Implication(s) 242

What is the Definition of the Family as Presented in the Literature of the Field? 242

Philosophical Implication(s) 252

Overall Implications Drawn from the Field's Conceptualization of the Family 252

VII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 254

Summary 254

Context. 258
Reality. 258
Adaptability 260
Alternatives 262
Educational Implications 263

Directions for Further Study 265

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 268

APPENDICES

Appendix

A. 286
B. 287
C. 289
D. 292
E. 296
F. 299
G. 303

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Problem for Study

The field of home economics views as its purpose: " . . . service primarily concerned with strengthening family life. . . . "[1] During June, 1958, the most recent tentative statement of home economics philosophy and objectives was prepared for review by the American Home Economics Association Committee on Philosophy and Objectives. The Committee's purpose was to determine "whether home economics is yet making the potential contribution envisioned for it by its founders."[2] The tentative statement resulted in the final booklet: Home Economics New Directions published by the Association in June, 1959.[3]

---

[1]American Home Economics Association Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics, New Directions (Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1959), p. 4.

[2]American Home Economics Association Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics, "Tentative Statement of the Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics" (Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1958), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[3]New Directions, op. cit., pp. 4-14.

As a field, home economics works through a variety of agencies such as schools, business concerns, social welfare programs, et al., to achieve its goals. In sum, education provides the field with one port of entry to individuals in families. The Association[4] firmly supports the belief that education can strengthen and improve family life. But, as Smith points out:

> It has long been recognized, at least theoretically, that it is important for the teacher to understand the structure of the discipline he teaches. Without such an understanding, how can he judge what is important as against what is trivial? Without such understanding, how can he judge what sort of preparatory exercises are necessary for students to grasp what he is trying to teach?[5]

The advent of the seventies brings an urgency to determine the fundamental concepts upon which the field of home economics is based. Neglecting such examinations can only breed vague and ill-defined theoretical foundations which in turn lead to incoherence among the field's practicing professionals.

Both Brown and Chadderdon have noted that home economics is lacking critical analysis and formulation of theoretical bases leading to a firm foundation for growth

---

[4]The term Association is used in the remainder of the study and refers to the American Home Economics Association.

[5]Philip G. Smith, Philosophy of Education (New York: Harper and Row, 1965), p. 145.

towards identifiable objectives.[6] A firm foundation, then, cannot be built on a continuing lack of research into concepts undergirding home economics. Examination of the field's concepts presents a wide variety to choose from; to examine all would be an impossible task for one study. Since the field's goals center around strengthening family life, the concept "family" has been selected as the starting point leading to a critical analysis and search for its use by the field.

Significance of the Problem

Examination of a conceptual block forming the base for a field of action (home economics in this case) falls within the realm of philosophical analysis. Such scrutiny, Randall suggests, examines "the nature, methods, procedures and foundations of all human reflection--the latter consisting in the institutions of art, science, religion, and ordinary social communication."[7] It concerns clarification, criticism, and definitions.[8] Smith adds that a philosophy

---

[6]Marjorie Brown, "The Need for Philosophical Study of Home Economics" (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1967), p. 1. (Mimeographed.); Hester Chadderdon and Alyce M. Fanslow, Review and Synthesis of Research in Home Economics Education (Columbus: The Center for Research and Development in Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, August, 1966), p. 1.

[7]To this series, the writer would add the family.

[8]John Herman Randall, Jr., and Justus Buchler, Philosophy: An Introduction (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1966), p. 41.

of this nature involves proposals for action which, if lacking, develop a scheme wherein understanding and ordering are absent. The field is forced to remain at its most simplistic level along with its practicing professionals. Only through a "systematic conceptual scheme" can one subject "conflicting proposals . . . to orderly inquiry and adjudication."[9] These thoughts form the foundation for this thesis which strives to develop an orderly model for analyzing the conceptualization of families held by four distinct areas of study concerned with this societal phenomenon. Such a scheme was aptly supported by Smith when he explained that philosophical analysis provides a comprehensiveness of thought furnishing an arrangement for our beliefs forming some coherent whole. Further, philosophical thinking provides three characteristic advantages for an analytical study: (1) comprehensiveness of outlook: the press of the immediate and particular is resisted; (2) penetration: a feature helping to alleviate vague doubts and assisting in the formulation of specific questions revealing what is fundamental in a situation; and (3) flexibility of thinking: flexibility provides a wide degree of procedural and behavioral tools leading to effective or successful living.[10]

---

[9]Smith, op. cit., pp. 64-65.

[10]Ibid., pp. 4, 10-12.

Home economics cannot achieve clarity of thought or direction nor comprehensiveness of outlook, penetration, or flexibility until it begins to critically analyze the conceptualizations it holds--one of which is the family.

The Concept "Family"--A Focus For Study

Home economics along with such other disciplines as sociology, history, and psychology has singled out the family as an object of study. This concept provides a point towards which disciplines direct thought and action, achieve objectives concerning the concept, and consolidate viewpoints contributing to a distinct body of theory. Underlying this study is the assumption that the family has been a consistent area of focus for the field. Recently a number of educators from home economics, vocational education, and higher education have restated the importance of the family for the field.[11] Blind adherence to the view that the family is important, however, does not achieve the goal of strengthening family life. Brown emphasized this fact by stating:

> . . . the presuppositions or beliefs upon which a field rests must be made explicit since they comprise the premises leading to the conclusion that intensive study with the focus identified is justifiable. Not only must the presuppositions be made explicit but they must be examined for their defensibility and for the validity of the argument presented.[12]

---

[11] Refer to Appendix A.

[12] Brown, op. cit., p. 4.

Thus, the concept "family" as a major focus for study was selected for three reasons: (1) the educational sector of the field attempts to work with and through individuals to strengthen family life; (2) "family" is one of the central concepts upon which the field is based; and (3) a gap exists in the literature relative to the critical examination of the field's focus.

Approach to be Used

Home economics is compelled to find the use it assigns to the concept "family." This term alone forms the foundation for the thesis. How it was used in each of the four areas (anthropology, sociology, psychology, and home economics) was the study's central concern; professional home economists lacking such an assessment will be steering a rudderless ship. The course of the field's future is grounded in the suppositions of the present. Philosophical analysis can help home economics determine its direction and actions; the question is how? Philosophy, like home economics, is an emerging field of inquiry. Randall notes that each age has organized experiences in different ways and it must be redone for each age.[13] That it is not a separate entity unto itself in this instance is clear, for it serves as the base from which any field or discipline determines its direction. Barnett summarized

---

[13]Randall, op. cit., p. 25.

the contribution philosophy could make to any field of inqury when he said:

> Traditionally, philosophy has sought to define the nature of the good life. Today, the quest for wisdom has in large part been superseded by the quest for clarity.[1] Thus, the task of the philosopher is not to develop a body of propositions but to clarify propositions.[14]

The search for clarity confronts the philosopher with language, one means of communication among men. As Henle says, "Our linguistic utterances, then, . . . reveal us, not only to others, but to ourselves; they are stages on the way to self knowledge."[15] Caton suggests further: "If I know the meaning of a word or phrase I know something like a body of unwritten rules, or something like an unwritten code or general recipe."[16] Wilson, in two of his references reinforces the importance of language as a source for clarifying thought:

> Words enable us to achieve this [understanding] purpose for one all important reason. They act as signs. A sign is something which conveys meaning and can be interpreted.
> . . . . . .

---

[14]George Barnett, ed., Philosophy and Educational Development (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), p. xiii. Footnote entry (1) appears in the original text and refers to the author's comment: "Or if philosophy is still the love of wisdom, it is wisdom of another kind, to be found in a different place, through the use of different methods."

[15]Paul Henle, ed., Language Thought Culture (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966), p. 164.

[16]Charles E. Caton, ed., Philosophy and Ordinary Language (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963), p. 120.

> It is our agreement about its use, not the sign itself which enables us to communicate.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The significance of any sign, therefore, depends on the context in which it is used.[17]

Elaborating additionally, Wilson stresses that questions of concept must be isolated and given priority in order to understand and contribute to decisions pertinent to the concept.[18]

Selection of the Major Sources

Home economics draws a portion of its knowledge from existing disciplines. Massey suggested that "sociology, economics, art, psychology, history, philosophy, literature, anthropology, chemistry, physics, bacteriology . . . " represent a few of the contributors to the field.[19] Dressel added to this thought by stating:

> A vocational field may develop its own concepts, principles, and values, but to a large extent these are dependent upon, emergent from, and adaptations of those arising in the basic fields of knowledge upon which the profession depends.[20]

---

[17]John Wilson, Language and the Pursuit of Truth (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967), pp. 13, 14, 16.

[18]John Wilson, Thinking with Concepts (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967), p. 24.

[19]Lelia Massey, "Home Economics Faces Change," Illinois Teacher, XI (Winter, 1967-1968), 207.

[20]Paul L. Dressel, "The Role of Concepts in Planning the Home Economics Curriculum," Home Economics Seminar (French Lick, Indiana, July 24-28, 1961), p. 16.

Drawing the concept "family" from other disciplines requires an examination of the conceptual framework that a discipline gives to the term. To borrow a term wholesale from another discipline without thorough examination could easily lead to its ambiguous use in the field's publications and research, in turn contributing to a blurring of directional focus. Yet, examination of all the contributors to the field is beyond the scope of one thesis; therefore, a selection was made based on previous historical analysis in the field.

A study done in 1957 by Budewig examined the field's origin and growth attempting to determine its purpose and function. From this study, three disciplines were identified as contributing to the home economics movement. Originally, because of the field's sociological implications, home economics received the Dewey Decimal classification of 339.[21] Further, at the ninth Lake Placid Conference, psychological and anthropological influences were identified and discussed. Neither psychology nor anthropology were as yet designated as formal disciplines

---

[21]Caroline F. Budewig, "Origin and Development of the Home Economics Idea" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Minnesota, St. Paul, August, 1957), p. 210, citing Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics, Proceedings of the First, Second and Third Conferences (New York: Lake Placid Conferences, September 19-23, 1899 to June 28-July 5, 1901), p. 7.

since they were too new and emerging.[22] These three disciplines have grown to a considerable extent since 1907 along with their contributions to home economics. Home economics, too, has developed a considerable body of literature since that time.

The three disciplines (anthropology, sociology, and psychology) plus home economics provided the four areas examined for their use of the concept "family." Since the American Home Economics Association Committee on Philosophy and Objectives reviewed the past fifty years of home economics in 1958 and found that the "basic tenets of the founders still apply . . . ," 1958 was selected as the starting point for the analysis.[23] Examination was confined to books[24] in three disciplines dealing with the family, published between the years 1958 and 1969, and available for examination in the library at Michigan State University. The study's purpose was not to exhaust the literature in these areas. Instead, the brief summarizations of prevalent positions were used to determine the

---

[22] Ibid., p. 232, citing Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics, Proceedings of the Ninth Congerence (New York: Lake Placid Conference, 1907), pp. 152-53.

[23] New Directions, op. cit., p. 3.

[24] Books rather than periodicals were selected for review because they presented a more concise summary of relevant points on the family. Also, the books were selected on the basis that they labeled themselves as being concerned with sociology, psychology or anthropology of the family.

general direction of the disciplines' influence on the field of home economics, not to specifically analyze each area's use of the concept "family." How home economics has used its own as well as the additional materials from the disciplines received the major emphasis.

Model for Inquiry Into the Disciplines

In beginning an analysis of the concept "family," one is faced with a generally vague term needing an organizational scheme. In addition, the three disciplines (anthropology, sociology, and psychology) present a unique problem because volumes of material are available; yet, no apparent order exists except that given by each writer within his own particular work. Analysis of these materials requires developing a plan for traversing the disciplines' mazes unhampered by endless points of view selected because of their relevance to families.

The analysis began with the compilation of materials to be included in the study. On further inspection, topics appeared to fall into categories of interest (see Appendices C, D, and E); these in turn were examined to determine the underlying purposes necessitating the selection of topics. In other words, what was the discipline generally attempting to accomplish by collecting data pertinent to a particular topic. The proposed accomplishments were summarized and phrased as questions of direct concern to all the disciplines included in the study. A question

such as--How has Freud directly influenced the field?--would have psychology as its major source; however, not all of the disciplines dealt with this theme. Consequently, it was not used as a specific question guiding the study. The framework, then, was based on the premises that all the areas were concerned with these topics, that these appear to be problems to which answers are sought by each discipline and for which facts and theories have been forwarded. Seeking answers to these questions will ultimately contribute to theory building in the field of home economics because the field borrows from these disciplines; what is of concern to them is of concern to the field. Smith advocated a similar action when he suggested that to develop a systematic set of answers to basic philosophical questions is to develop a philosophy.[25] The review culminated in the following list which served as a guide for the literature review:[26]

1. Is the family viewed as an appropriate area of study for the field?[27]

---

[25]Smith, op. cit., p. 16.

[26]This list can by no means be construed as complete. Further analysis will undoubtedly reveal even more questions than those included here, for philosophical examination is an endless process of questioning.

[27]Substitute anthropology, sociology, psychology, or home economics for the word field.

2. What goals are to be achieved by the field in working with and through the family?
3. How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field?
   a. What is the family's relation to the social order?
   b. Is the family still a strong part of society?
4. What does the field conceive as desirable in the family?
5. What questions have been raised by the field relative to the family?
6. How does the field differ in its conception of the family from that concept of the family held by other disciplines from which it draws its knowledge?
7. What does the field predict for the family's future?
8. What is the definition of the family as presented in the literature of the field?

The Journal of Home Economics is officially designated as the organ of the American Home Economics Association and as such provides a body of literature pertinent to the profession. The Association's journal provides a ready and significant source for examination of the use and application of the concept "family" because: (a) The

Association is viewed as providing continuity of thought through individual leadership; (b) the Association has been actively designated as the official voice for the profession of home economics; and (c) the Association represents the field rather than a particular segment.

Home economics' journals and additional publications furnished by the Association produced between January, 1958 and June, 1969 were reviewed. Articles selected and included in the study were based on the following criteria: the term family appeared in the title, the article was contributed by the family life or family economics department of a university, only articles as opposed to abstracts or reviews were selected,[28] the article could represent a talk given before a family life oriented conference, or the preface to the article stated that its purpose involved families. At least one of these criteria was present in selecting the materials. Additional publications from the Association were selected on the basis that the term family appeared in the title, and they were published within the same time span as the journals. To summarize: anthropology, sociology, psychology, and home economics provided the four areas analyzed to determine the use of the concept "family" (within the framework of questions) by each.

---

[28]This was necessary because short reviews could only give a general tendency as opposed to a fuller explanation of why statements were made in the body of an article.

In addition to answering the questions within the context of the four areas, home economics received further analysis using the following framework:

The context within which the points about families were made:

- -Who said them
- -When were they said
- -Why were they said
- -What was the contextual source (home economics, sociology, anthropology, or psychology)

The direction given to the material (type of statements made):

- -Exhorting to action
- -Presentation of theory
- -Collection of data for interpretation by the field
- -Presentation of imperatives or attitudes

The continuity of the material:

- -Comprehensiveness of the areas dealt with relative to the family
- -Variety of viewpoints held in a particular area of examination
- -Consistency, agreement, and disagreement of the material dealing with the family

Finally, the three disciplines and home economics were compared in order to: (a) point out similarities and differences; (b) identify gaps in the literature; and (c) determine consistencies and inconsistencies and where they exist.[29] The examination helped to clarify to what extent the three disciplines have contributed to the field, the kinds of contributions they have made, and how home economics has used the information.

Objectives of the Analysis

The responses received to the questions in each of the four areas, as well as the critical analysis of home economics literature, contribute to home economics education through: identification of the field's use of the concept "family," determination of the present status of the profession regarding its position on the family, identification of gaps or areas of depth pertinent to the concept "family," and direction for further study discerned through such an examination. Ultimately the latter four contributions lend clarity, meaning, substance, and contribute to the body of theory in the field which will, in

---

[29]This framework was developed and adapted by the writer for the study from the following references: Charles E. Caton, ed., Philosophy and Ordinary Language (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963); Paul Henle, ed., Language Thought Culture (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966); John Wilson, Language and the Pursuit of Truth (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967); John Wilson, Thinking with Concepts (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967).

turn, be put into action by the professional practitioners in home economics education.

Limitations of the Study

The study presents one attempt to clarify how the field of home economics has used the concept "family" for which it advocates support. Limitations in philosophical analysis are unavoidable due to the paucity of these kinds of materials in the field at this time. So little philosophical research has been done that home economists have little to draw upon as a starting point. Additional limiting factors include:

- -The emphasis in the study was on the ideal[30] of the concept "family" as opposed to the real or actual.
- -The selection of specific resources (according to the criteria developed for the thesis)[31] limits the range of the material used.
  - a. Emphasis on recent materials pertinent to the family as opposed to historical developments presented a more specific, narrow framework.
  - b. Articles, due to limited space in publication, are more restricted in presenting

---

[30]What has been written does not always agree with what is practiced.

[31]Refer to pp. 10, 13-14.

topics in depth; books, on the other hand, provide a medium for elaborating with greater comprehensiveness. To compare the two may place articles at a distinct disadvantage in the last analysis, because publication limitations could necessitate omitting pertinent points or elaborations.

-Other concepts may be equally as important to the field; this study, however, was concerned only with the concept "family."

-The use of specific questions limited the scope of analysis.

-No attempt was made to define the four areas. Materials were selected on the basis that they labeled themselves as belonging to a specific area of study.[32]

-The disciplines used have numerous interdependent links but the study attempted to examine each as though it were a separate and distinct entity.

-No attempt to develop a philosophy for the field was made. The primary purpose of the study was to define a base from which further work could be done.

---

[32]Refer to Appendix B.

-No attempt at seeking right answers to the questions was made, rather, presentation of what was in the literature received primary focus.

-The framework of analysis was limited and presents only one approach of the number possible that could be used for analysis.

-The framework developed for the study is subject to revaluation with the advent of new knowledge or development and revision of theories. Its purpose here was to provide for an orderly analysis which, in turn, could vary with the viewpoint taken.

CHAPTER II

ANTHROPOLOGY'S REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY"

Introduction

Anthropology's replies to those questions consistently recurring in the literature of the three disciplines (anthropology, sociology, and psychology) were the major concern of this section. A general examination of the selected materials concerning the concept "family" revealed a large body of research related to small isolated cultures. In the main, these studies contributed little towards the development of a global conception of the family, for emphasis was placed on a descriptive presentation of cultural status. These materials were deleted from the study for they made no application to Western or American families (a fuller explanation of this restriction appears in Appendix B). Instead, volumes indicating a relationship between cultures and presenting generalizations pertinent to a wide variety of cultural situations were used for this portion of the thesis.

The writer sought responses to each question through a review of the literature and selected from the wide

variety of materials presented on the family those statements which directly related to the questions. The responses to the questions were distinctive for each area of study; replies were limited by degree of emphasis and the number of writers dealing with the questions. A brief summarization of the replies received follows. As the literature in the field was not totally exhausted, the summarizations are in no way complete. They do, however, present general tendencies for the discipline.

Is the family viewed as an appropriate area of study for the field? Anthropology approaches the question via two routes: the needs of society and the needs of man. The former approach indicates that society's endorsement of families illustrates their worth. Schrecker upheld this approach when he said:

> An association established by the laws of nature--and an institution that supports, and to some degree is supported by, any civilization, sanctioned by religion, protected by the law, approved by knowledge and wisdom, in its best instances exalted by literature and art, invested with definite functions by any form of economy --the family is unquestionably an intrinsic element in human life.[1]

---

[1]Paul Schrecker, "The Family: Conveyance of Tradition," in The Family: Its Function and Destiny, ed. by Ruth Nanda Anshen (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), p. 488, hereafter referred to as Family Function and Destiny.

Further, Anshen suggests that families provide for a good life because they are the hub of ethics and morality and transmit society's concept of the good.[2]

The family is important to society because it performs needed functions enabling cultural continuation. Elaborating on this point Nimkoff says:

> It has two essential functions which either cannot be transferred to, or are not performed so well by, other institutions or agencies. These functions are reproduction and socialization of very young children.[3]

Blisten, Mead, and Horkheimer suggest several more family functions which include: (1) sexual satisfaction; (2) psychological and physical security for all members; (3) protection and provision for adults while they work in other areas; (4) provision for a common heritage consisting of a common language; (5) social organization; (6) religion and political ideology; (7) and finally, the family prevents men from relapsing into barbarism as well as helping to develop individuals capable of responsibly managing complex affairs in democratic societies.[4]

---

[2]Ruth Nanda Anshen, ed., "The Family in Transition," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 4.

[3]M. F. Nimkoff, Comparative Family Systems (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 362.

[4]Dorothy R. Blisten, The World of the Family (New York: Random House, 1963), p. 257; Margaret Mead and Ken Heyman, Family (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965), p. 11; Max Horkheimer, "Authoritarianism and the Family," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 398.

In sum, the family is essential to society because: (a) if society supports the family, it must be important to it; (b) the family leads men to the good life by transmitting the desired morals and ethics of the culture; (c) the family performs essential functions for the society which are: reproduction, socialization of the young, sexual satisfaction, psychological and physical security; they ensure continuity of the social order, reduce man's barbaric tendencies, fit individuals into highly complex social organizations, and transmit the political ideology of the regime.

A second reason for supporting the family identified by the discipline centers around the fact that societies are made up of individual men; therefore, families will persist, according to Blisten, because they provide a specialized and distinct arrangement "best suited to meet some of the basic needs of mankind." Then too, family life appears to be a phenomenon of all human societies suggesting that "there are some universal human conditions that give rise to family organization, and that all families provide for some universal human needs."[5] Both Blisten and Linton feel that man's psychological needs are for affection, security, emotional response and expression, self esteem through regular access to people, provision for stability and predictability, and promise of a more

---

[5]Blisten, op. cit., pp. 277, X.

intimate relationship than can be achieved in the surrounding society.[6] These can best be supplied by the family.

Society and man are the basic components which provide anthropology reason enough for supporting the concept "family" which acts as an intermediary between culture and man. The literature gives every indication that the family will continue to be a viable segment of any culture and as long as the family continues, the discipline will maintain interest in it.

What goals are to be achieved by the field in working with and through the family? The family's cultural materiality is of central concern to anthropologists because, says Anshen, "The wish to strengthen the family is almost universal. . . . "[7] This goal overarches the ways and means the discipline chooses to accomplish its task. Several procedures have been used and identified in the literature. One pointed out by Liebman included the examination of the family's formation and development. Investigations in this realm illustrate historical continuity and forward proposals as to the origin of various family life styles.[8] The research lends support to the hypothesis of

---

[6]Ibid., p. 13; Ralph Linton, "The Natural History of the Family," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 49.

[7]Anshen, Family Function and Destiny, p. 513.

[8]Samual Liebman, ed., Emotional Forces in the Family (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott, Co., 1959), p. 1, hereafter referred to as Emotional Forces.

the general universal need for families. Another procedure for examining the family centered on the socialization process which clearly links individual family members to society. The family, in the act of carrying out society's ideals, subsequently provides the discipline with a small enough system to make intensive investigations, for Lewis says:

> Whole family studies bridge the gap between the conceptual extremes of the culture at one pole and of the individual at the other, making possible observation of both culture and personality as they are interrelated in real life.[9]

In the process of socializing individuals, the family feeds them into society which feeds them into familial relations through its support, thus creating a never ending cycle of cultural perpetuation.

Anthropological research also assists in strengthening the family through the comparative examination of other cultures. Studies of this type, according to Tomasson, Leslie, and Kenkel, help us to understand our own culture better, create an awareness of the widest range of solutions to human problems, and develop an appreciation of intercultural variability, objectivity, awareness, consequently enlarging general hypotheses.[10] Through theory building

---

[9]Oscar Lewis, "Poverty as a Source of Lower-Class Subculture," in Comparative Perspectives on Marriage and the Family, ed. by H. Kent Geiger (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1968), p. 215, hereafter referred to as Comparative Perspectives.

[10]Richard F. Tomasson, "Why Has American Fertility Been So High?," in Kinship and Family Organization, ed. by

the discipline broadens perspectives on the family. No longer is it a local isolated phenomenon; rather, the family becomes a universal general cultural arrangement in which all men in all societies prefer to live.

Summarizing, the discipline ultimately seeks to strengthen families and does so by examining them historically, postulating theories of family development contributing to an understanding of how the American or Western family systems evolved, determining the relations between individuals and the society which are linked by the family, comparing family systems to determine the universal characteristics of all families, and developing a body of theory contributing to a better understanding of why man lives in families.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (What is the family's relation to the social order?) According to the anthropological literature, the family relates to the social order in three ways: (a) it mirrors the society; (b) it is shaped by the society, for the most part; and (c) it socializes the individual to society. That which society upholds as important for its maintenance is mirrored in the family life style.

Bernard Farber (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966), p. 335, hereafter referred to as Kinship; Gerald R. Leslie, The Family in Social Context (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 4; William F. Kenkel, The Family in Perspective (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), p. 6.

Continuity of the society results when individuals raised in families can take a responsible place in the wider culture. Societies, then, seek to shape families in order to preserve and maintain their structure. Linton and Zimmerman point out that each family type is the result of a particular local evolution meeting the defined needs of that society and although the family is an imperishable institution, it incurs considerable modification by the societal structure.[11]

The family in our society is distinctively characterized by free choice and nonauthoritarian characteristics because, Benedict says, "It has become consistent with major emphases in our national life."[12] The family pictured in an integral relationship to the society's economic structure receives the discipline's primary interest. The type of family as well as the relationship between couples is promoted through the economic interdependence with society. Nimkoff suggests that an industrial nation stresses the independent family system proliferating this particular type because: "A free economy grows in part by proliferation of individual wants."[13] Also, an industrial

---

[11]Linton, Family Function and Destiny, p. 33; Carle C. Zimmerman and Merle Frampton, "Theories of Frederic LePlay," in Kinship, p. 15.

[12]Ruth Benedict, "The Family: Genus Americanum," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 61.

[13]Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 63.

society promotes equality of the paired relations for, speculates Goode, the economy needs all possible skilled hands in order to meet the wants of individuals.[14] A democratic society molds the familial system to its needs gradually; conversely, a dictatorship can, Nimkoff says, "undertake radical transformations in family policy in part because it has monopolistic control over the instruments of mass communication and mass socialization."[15] Perpetuation of the society begins with the family for, Blisten says:

> Family experiences and the associations it engenders, lay the groundwork for the perpetuation of the status quo. They predispose individuals to remain attached to the social arrangement and beliefs to which they were introduced when young.[16]

That the family is solely dependent for its structure on the society is open to question. Nimkoff, for one, says:

> The family in a complex system is both an object and a source of change but a review of the literature shows that social scientists have paid considerably more attention to the family as the dependent than as the independent variable in social change.

There are many books on the economic changes affecting the family but only a few dealing with the affects of the family on economic organizations.[17] Some disagreement as to

---

[14]William J. Goode, World Revolution and Family Patterns (New York: The Free Press, 1963), p. 20, hereafter referred to as World Revolution.

[15]Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 55.

[16]Blisten, op. cit., p. 18.

[17]Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 34.

whether the family is an independent as well as dependent social institution exists among anthropologists and has not as yet been resolved due to the lack of research by the discipline in the former area.

Finally, the family socializes its individual members to the cultural order. Although it cannot provide the fullest range of socialization experiences, it does fit the child into societal groupings and disciplines the child, Merton points out, "in terms of the cultural goals and mores characteristic of this narrow range of groups."[18] Thus, the family provides a mirror for society in that it transmits those societal characteristics viewed as worthy of preservation; secondly, the family is shaped by the society for the most part, although some disagreement among anthropologists does exist. The family may strongly influence the economic organization of the society but to date, this has been inadequately studied by the discipline. Society shapes the family type as well as family relationships; thus, it comes to amplify the political order and maintain society by postulating its ideals and inculcating individuals with them. Third, the family socializes each individual not alone but with society's assistance so that man has a diversity of social relationships consequently achieving social maturity.

---

[18]Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie: Revisions and Extensions," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 309.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (Is the family still a strong part of society?) A dichotomous reply was presented in the literature pertinent to this question: According to one view--the family is hopelessly weak; according to the other, it is performing much needed tasks and therefore will continue ad infinitum.

The family--a weak link in society. The family, although supported by the discipline, is sharply criticized by some anthropologists for its weakness and vulnerability. Proponents of this view assert that the family is totally dependent on society. Not only is it shaped by society's demands, according to Blisten, but its smallness in size reduces "the extent of control by families on the resources of a society and thus of individuals. . . . "[19] Although the family is failing, it is needed by the society to perpetuate cultural ideals; hence, state and local governments have had to assume responsibility by providing a variety of resources and services to prevent its extinction. Nimkoff and Blisten pointed out this recent development when they said:

> With the loss of cohesion in industrial society, and the growth of resources within government, the state takes over and elaborates services to the family.
>
> Since autonomous nuclear families have little control over the society and material resources necessary to their maintenance, their efficiency in the

---

[19]Blisten, op. cit., p. 13.

> performance of family functions is far more dependent upon assistance from non-family sources than is that of corporate or extended families.[20]

Provision of family services is under suspicion by some anthropologists as further evidence of disruption rather than assistance, for kinship unity and aid is minimized or ignored.

Not only is the family weak, totally dependent on society, and goaless, emphasizes Anshen, but it is also nihilistic and suffering from a lack of group cohesion.[21] Further, the family will disintegrate completely as evidenced by its continuing loss of functions, speculates Torres-Rioseco.[22]

The family--a strong societal link. In the main, the greater number of writers in anthropology present more material directed towards family strengths than weaknesses. Both Llewellyn and Mead agree that the family is a going concern in all cultures.

> The family is the oldest, most firmly grounded human institution. However great the changes may be in the proportion of the population that is married, in the age of marriage, or in the number of years people live within the family, whatever the size of the family may be, however much or little time members of the family may spend together, and whatever else they may

---

[20]Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 57; Blisten, op. cit., p. 254.

[21]Anshen, Family Function and Destiny, p. xvii.

[22]Arturo Torres-Rioseco, "The Family in Latin America," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 103.

> do individually, apart from the others, still the family survives.[23]

The family is not weak nor totally dependent on the society. Queen stresses that one cannot truthfully say the family is disintegrating, rather that it "is no longer the social group which performs most of the functions necessary for man's survival."[24] Greenfield saw the family as a strong influence on society when he said:

> The prior existence of the small nuclear family as the basic kinship unit of the people who industrialized Great Britian and the United States may have been responsible for the very form of social organization that developed along with the machines.[25]

Men existing in any social arrangement exhibit the need for families. Attempts to eliminate it from the social order have not succeeded for long because, Mead says:

> Again and again, in spite of proposals for change and actual experiments, human societies have reaffirmed their dependence on the family as the basic unit of human living--the family of father, mother, and children.

Although a society attempts to find ways of making the bond between mother and child more flexible, it has found no substitute for the mothering relationship.[26] Each family

---

[23]Karl N. Llewellyn, "Education and the Family," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 328; Mead, op. cit., p. 80.

[24]Stuart A. Queen, Robert W. Hubenstein, and John B. Adams, The Family in Various Cultures (Chicago: J. B. Lippencott Company, 1961), p. 490.

[25]Sidney M. Greenfield, "Industrialization and the Family in Sociological Theory," in Kinship, p. 417.

[26]Mead, op. cit., pp. 78, 18.

places the child in the society giving individuals the means for distinguishing between one another. This feature is the principle of legitimacy (the child receives the parent's surname) and no culture exists that does not adhere to this principle. Also, families provide the foundation for building socially mature individuals and "no other arrangement," says Blisten, "has been found to work so well."[27]

The reduced size of the family, which has been viewed by some as an inherent weakness, is seen by Dennis and Blisten as increasing solidarity between partners. Not only is the small family best suited to the needs of its members and society, but through its smallness, it wields great power.

> [The family] exerts its influence on the abilities of its members to cooperate with their fellows; on their evaluations of the ethnic, religious and racial traits of the people they meet; on their potential preferences; on their tastes and goals.

In addition, the family also controls and imposes limits on the biological needs of individuals thereby bringing order to society, and acts as society's agent in maintaining public health and hygiene.[28]

---

[27]Blisten, op. cit., p. 12.

[28]Norman Dennis, "Modern Society and the Popularity of Marriage," in Comparative Perspectives, p. 7; Blisten, op. cit., pp. 266, 8, 16.

A summarization of the replies received to the question of family strength presents two views: either the family is weak and will eventually disintegrate, or it is a vital, going concern of the society. The latter view has received the discipline's major emphasis. Points for maintaining that families are weak links in society include: (1) they are wholly dependent on the society and must adapt to it; (2) families exert little power in modern societies; and (3) the proliferation of societal agencies developed to support families indicates their weakness.

Conversely, the family has proponents indicating that it is still a strong part of society because: (1) it orders relations among individuals; (2) it provides for man's psychological needs; (3) it builds a socially mature individual; (4) it affects as well as is affected by the society; (5) it may have formed the base for our present social organization; and (6) the family is in tune with and performs functions for society.

What does the field conceive as desirable in the family? The terms, "desirable in the family," appearing above refer to the discipline's conception of the ideal. This feature has received extensive study and several elements are identifiable: first, anthropologists agree that the custom of marriage, no matter what form the ceremony, establishes the family. Societies assume, according to Goode and Blisten, that almost all persons

should and do get married, and that marriage is valued as an end in itself giving each couple the opportunity to establish an autonomous family unit.[29] A socially sanctioned ceremony, then, proclaims the founding of a new family to all of the society's members, and only this procedure gives the family legality in society's eyes.

Secondly, the societal configuration exerts influence on the way marriages may be contracted: rules of mate selection may be tacit or verbalized and upheld by laws. Farber emphasized this when he said:

> Rules regarding mate selection in a society are of crucial importance in determining the extent to which family culture will be preserved. Since the bride and groom must come from different domestic groups, marriage seems to be the point at which new norms and values can most readily enter into family culture.[30]

Anthropological research has delved into the characteristics of mate selection and developed several theories in conjunction with sociology. Boalt presented three which were: (1) the theory of homogamy: Husbands and wives select each other on the basis of similarity in background and interests. Possible mates are found among current contacts, friends, working relationships, ethnic groups, and one's social position; (b) theory of heterogamy: Mates are

---

[29]William J. Goode, Jr., "Steady Dating, Imminent Marriage, and Remarriage," in Kinship, p. 202; Blisten, op. cit., pp. 46-47.

[30]Bernard Farber, "Family and Kinship," in Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family, ed. by Marvin B. Sussman (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), p. 13, hereafter referred to as Sourcebook.

selected from those exhibiting traits which one lacks. Couples differ markedly from one another and attraction may be sexual rather than social; and (3) theory of summation: Partners select each other on the basis that the weakness in one partner is balanced by a strength in the other. This theory appears to hold good for homogenous groups.[31] The validity of these theories has yet to be firmly established although they have received some experimental testing. Homogany, however, appears to be the most widely accepted concept governing mate selection leading to greater stability in marital relations.

Third, the ideal in marriage and family relationships has been comprehensively dealt with by the discipline. Western or American marital relationships are expected to express a certain style to be viewed as successful. The style applies, however, primarily to the Western or American white, Protestant, urban middle class for it sets the tone for the whole of society. Characteristics include the increasing democratization of the martial relationship. Elder, in a cross cultural study, found that of the four cultures studied, Great Britain and the United States had the most democratic family life styles, while the families of Italy and Mexico exhibited fewer of

---

[31]Gunnar Boalt, Family and Marriage (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965), pp. 27-28, 30.

these ideals.[32] A "good" marriage will, according to Blisten, bring happiness to the individuals because the partner was selected on the basis of personal choice, the marriage is founded on love, sexual satisfaction is most rewarding in marriage, and family life is maintained for the personal satisfaction of its members.[33]

Other successful features commended by a number of authors include: (1) fidelity; (2) mutual purpose; (3) an exchange of mutual rewards; (4) the right to dissolve the marriage if personal satisfaction and happiness can no longer be achieved; (5) love and esteem; and (6) companionship. Ideals, however, are often difficult to achieve as well as being ill-defined. For example, the companionship and romantic characteristics so idolized in American culture are, De Rougemont, Lowrie and Dennis suggest, features which can lead to fragile and even pathological disruption of the relationship.[34] Achieving the ideal appears to be difficult and its rewards open only to a selected group--primarily the middle class.

---

[32]Glen H. Elder, Jr., "Role Relations, Sociocultural Environments, and Autocratic Family Ideology," in Kinship, p. 291.

[33]Blisten, op. cit., pp. 35-37.

[34]Denis DeRougemont, "The Crisis of the Modern Couple," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 462; Samuel H. Lowrie, "Early and Late Dating: Some Conditions Associated with Them," in Kinship, p. 198; Dennis, Comparative Perspectives, pp. 8-9.

Fourth, marriage heralds the founding of a family and society, according to Mead and Thomasson, expects that children will be born to the new couple for they are necessary to the good life.[35] Married adult individuals are expected to perform as parents who will provide for the newborn that which the society views as the right of every individual. Mead feels that the parental goal in child rearing is to provide the setting where "serene happy children, . . . do not need to spend their lives making up for defects in their upbringing, ..."[36] Benedek elaborated further when she said: "Actually, the parents' goal is achieved if the children become able to make independent decisions and are free from conflict with themselves and with society."[37] The goals of child rearing, then, work towards developing children who are happy, free from conflict, and secure in their ability to make decisions. One child is not enough because, Mead and Farber suggest, brothers and sisters help to shape a child's world. They are to be treated as equals in American society. From such treatment, equalitarian and companionate ideals are fostered and these characteristics are in

---

[35]Mead, op. cit., p. 78; Tomasson, Kinship, p. 332.

[36]Mead, op. cit., p. 83.

[37]Therese Benedek, "The Emotional Structure of the Family," in Family Function and Destiny, p. 378.

turn the prominent goals in modern marriages.[38] The treatment and setting the child receives and grows in influences the individual's future desire to repeat the family cycle lending continuity to societies.

The fifth desired familial characteristic revolves around kinship relations. In our society, such relations are centered in small interlocking family units. Each individual marries, leaves his parents, and forms a family of his own. Although family generations are separated spatially, they are not totally divorced from communication with one another. Today's highly technical society provides individuals with many means of contacting kin and maintaining family ties. Sussman and Farber stress that the kinship network today is supportive of the small conjugal unit. The equality of kinship relations of both spouses is a positive feature, for studies have reported that children socialized to both parents' relatives fare better in society as a whole.[39] Sussman and Mead posit that kin also perform the additional functions of assisting families in times of crisis, and helping young children

---

[38]Bernard Farber, "Kinship Laterality and the Emotionally Disturbed Child," in Kinship, p. 70.

[39]Marvin B. Sussman and Lee G. Burchinal, "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning," in Sourcebook, p. 73; Farber, Kinship, p. 69.

cope with change.[40] Finally, all societies, notes Blisten, provide for the elderly in some way.[41] In no case are they left to totally fend for themselves although the manner of care may vary greatly between cultures.

The sixth and final desired characteristic[42] of the family stressed by anthropologists, focuses on the need for adequate living arrangements. In Western societies, a home for each family is accepted as the best way to live. Abrams theorizes that having a home has particular meaning for Americans in that it: (a) reflects the ego; (b) provides for expression of personal tastes; (c) provides privacy; (d) provides a place of security and bolstering emotions; and (e) serves as a center for family activities; to date, however, research in this area has been minimal.

The formation of new families, then, is a primary cultural goal. People are expected and should marry, relations between sexes are so ordered that each individual is encouraged to marry one most compatible with himself, individuals are to function as parents and produce additional societal members who receive the benefit

---

[40]Marvin B. Sussman and Lee G. Bruchinal, "Parental Aid to Married Children: Implications for Family Functioning," in Kinship, p. 250; Mead, op. cit., p. 124.

[41]Blisten, op. cit., p. 8.

[42]The limits are only set by the literature and many more may be identified by the discipline in other materials.

of adequate nurturance and finally, families are to have living space separate from others: this feature heightens each member's individuality and contributes to the goals of individualism so desired in a democratic society.

What questions have been raised by the field relative to the family? Examination of the discipline's literature indicates that questions have been raised within seven[43] primary areas pertinent to the family. One question overarching all others deals with anthropology's purpose. Development of the discipline is a relatively recent phenomenon. At the time of the ninth Lake Placid Conference (1907) anthropology had yet to be identified as a formal discipline.[44] Since it is so new, anthropology's aims and goals remain only partially clarified; too, as new knowledge and theory develop, the goals of the discipline may undergo a transition. Basically, anthropology's purpose is to build a system for the comparative analysis of cultures determining global universals applicable to the family. To do so, the discipline has abstracted those elements in the society which seem to occur in all cultures and have

---

[43]Any numbering in this fashion is arbitrary and limited to the literature reviewed. The classification is the writer's own and open to examination and review. Its purpose was to provide an overview of those areas appearing in the literature. A list of the classifications appears in Appendix C.

[44]Budewig, op. cit., p. 232.

been institutionalized.[45] Although families in cultures differ; yet, many features are the same. The latter assumption serves as the base for a wide number of general speculations concerning worldwide family development.

The discipline has used historical methodology to examine family transition as well as postulate theories of origination. Such research provides a theoretical basis for family continuity and persistence over time in turn leading to its examination in a variety of cultures. Too, anthropology has approached the study of the family from a number of viewpoints and examined its structure, functions, interrelationships, patterns and so forth. These approaches are shared by sociology and psychology. A blending of the latter two with anthropology helps the discipline frame its universal conception of the family.

In review, anthropology has been concerned with the following areas regarding the family: (1) the discipline's purpose in focusing on the family; (2) theories of family origin; (3) family universals; (4) families in varying cultures; (5) the family as an institution; (6) social and emotional influences on and within the family, and (7) ways and means of approaching family studies. Questions arising in these areas have to date been answered sketchily but

---

[45]According to Leslie, op. cit., p. 5, the family is an institution of social norms which are rules of conduct forming patterns and the character of the institution.

recognition of the gaps is becoming increasingly apparent in the literature.

How does the field differ in its conception of the family from that concept of the family held by other disciplines from which it draws its knowledge? An examination of the replies received to those questions designed for the study exposed elements distinguishing one discipline from another. Divergence revealed a more composite picture of each discipline's conception of the family. Following the Model for Inquiry into the Disciplines,[46] the first question asks whether anthropology views the family as an appropriate area for study. The discipline unconditionally endorses the family's worth for any cultural order. Its support is based on the premise that all men in all cultures have some universal human needs; the family fulfills these needs. For this reason, every culture fosters families to ensure that its members willingly preserve and perpetuate the social order. Each culture shapes the family to its own particular needs. By meeting society's specific needs, the family contributes to the achievement of cultural goals. Achievement of cultural goals leads to the good as defined by the particular society. Thus, family studies expose cultural goals and reveal man's universal needs.

---

[46]Refer to page 11.

Anthropology's goal in studying the family is similar to that of sociology and psychology--namely, to strengthen the family. Through a comparative research of cultures, the discipline examines and discloses why families have existed over time. This type of research builds a foundation supporting the general universal need for families hypothesis. Building a case supporting the family's need, strengthens it. Sociology also uses the comparative approach but not to the degree and purpose that anthropology has. Its goal: discovering cultural universals concerning the family, sets anthropology apart from sociology and psychology.

The discipline's concern with the family's relation to social orders is divided at present into two theoretical camps. The first argues that families are fused with society through their elasticity in submitting to change. If society alters, the family accepts the alteration and adapts as best it can to meet whatever demands are placed on it. The second viewpoint maintains that those anthropologists touting the family's dependency have had tunnel vision. Instead, the family is really an effecter as well as an affected part of society. Today's family life style may have caused the present modern or Western social order to develop in response to family needs. Neither of these views has received extensive verification, but rather, they have been used as self-evident premises by most anthropologists.

Since anthropology is a relatively new discipline and seeks directional foci, the question of purpose overarches its interest in families. Cultures consist of various institutionalized elements. If these are studied and compared cross-culturally, a pattern of supporting evidence clarifying human behavior and man's universal needs emerges. The discipline's areas of interest vary little between sociology and psychology. However, its purpose is placed in the context of a larger world order rather than an intensive study of one or many similar cultures.

Anthropology's view of families theorizes that they are a universal cultural phenomenon. At the present time, the nuclear concept of the family (consisting of father, mother, and children) predominates the discipline's research. Some effort has been directed toward establishing a more versatile definition replacing or supplementing the nuclear concept. To date, few of the discipline's resources have been directed toward this end. So, the nuclear concept prevails in the bulk of the literature and is applied internationally in cross-cultural family studies.

Although some anthropologists doom the family to extinction, the majority agree that it will either continue to function in its present form or could in the future assume additional functions. Its power will lessen as cultures become increasingly atomized causing the family to specialize in a few selected cultural services.

Kinship bonds will continue to weaken. And, although the rapid changes affecting today's families are often thought to be detrimental, in reality a new core of family individualism is emerging that will be more capable of meeting man's universal needs.

According to anthropology's use of the concept "family," two identifying features distinguish it from other social institutions. Together, these features contribute to a broad general configuration of modern or Western families. First, since the family has existed throughout history, its tenacity suggests that man is incapable of managing without it. Secondly, the presently existing family life style (the nuclear family) is a product of social need. The family is molded to meet the social and human ends of a particular culture. The family as an institution characterized by longevity and adaptability over time distinguishes anthropology's use of the concept from sociology and psychology.

What does the field predict for the family's future? Predictions about the family appear to only a limited degree in the literature of the discipline. Future projections were based on the continuing stability of Western or American societies and the family's present status. Because the family and society are inevitably intertwined, it will continue to provide specified functions contributing to the social order's maintenance. Blisten

feels that as Western ideals come to permeate the globe, fewer societies will exist where the family wields primary control.[47] Society and families share a number of functions as well as each having its own sphere of activity. Nimkoff believes that as the family transfers its functions one by one to the social order, it assumes new ones. For example, socialization of the child will increasingly be appropriated by other institutions in the society; conversely, families will assume greater responsibility for family planning, income management, marketing, and use of leisure time.[48] In general, societal changes foster family transition; thus, families come to assume society's new features while its older functions are gradually displaced and assumed by other agencies.

The marriage relationship, adds Nimkoff, will shift its emphasis from economic unity for survival to psychological and sentimental considerations.[49] Further trends suggested by Goode include: (1) increasingly permissive sexual behavior; (2) continued reduction in kinship influences due to their lessening importance in inheritance transfers; (3) greater family mobility; (4) both partners increasingly contributing economically to the family as well as finding individual expression through an occupation

---

[47]Blisten, op. cit., p. 278.

[48]Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 363. [49]Ibid., p. 347.

outside the family; and (5) divorce becoming widely accepted as a means of dissolving a no longer satisfactory relationship.[50] Children, though continuing to maintain an important place in the family, will receive their rewards more immediately through education, maintenance, and love. Finally, these new emerging family patterns, stresses Goode, offer a potentially greater fulfillment for individuals even though few incorporate them into their personal family patterns.[51]

Although few anthropologists have concerned themselves with the family's future, those who do, hold an optimistic view. Increasingly the family will transfer its present functions to the wider society yet continue to assume new facets of responsibility; the marriage relationship will tend toward ever greater personal satisfaction with terminations of unsatisfactory relationships becoming the rule. Children will have their needs gratified more immediately in families. Each adult partner will have greater numbers of activities outside the family, and finally, these patterns will offer future couples the opportunity for greater satisfaction in family life for heightened individualism lies at their core.

---

[50]Goode, World Revolution, pp. 37, 39, 53, 86.

[51]Ibid., p. 380.

What is the definition of the family as presented in the literature of the field? Anthropology's definition of the family is composed of three elements: two are linked with the family's functions and structure; the third concerns the family's ideal continuity. Blisten and Horkheimer see the overall functions of the family centering on man's biological orientation and society's economic structure.[52] In each culture, families exhibit a structure peculiar to the society. Leslie summarizes three theories of family structure to explain how particular family life styles arise. First, the cyclical theory postulates that family life style changes recurr. As societies develop, families move from the trustee[53a] style, through the domestic,[53b] to become atomistic.[53c] The final type leads to the family's and society's decay; hence, the trustee family is again reinstituted to strengthen the social order. The second theory is progressivist viewing the family as a passive adjusting entity to social change. The reduction of family functions occurring in modern Western cultures places affectional and personality development foremost as family goals.

---

[52]Blisten, op. cit., p. 63; Horkheimer, Family Function and Destiny, p. 385.

[53a]Leslie, op. cit., pp. 248-48. Trustee family: individuals are subordinated to the needs of the family; [b]domestic family: familiasm and individualism are in the balance; [c]atomistic family: individualism is stressed above all else in the family.

Third, the structure-function theory assumes that the family is most closely integrated with the occupational system. It becomes the primary affecter for young men, in particular, leave their families at the point at which they enter an occupation, marriage and not kinship forms the keystone of the system, and the relationship is based on love. The latter two characteristics weaken the family's structure.[54] Horkheimer, too, agrees that concomitant with modern family development and its loss of functions is the stress on the relationship which is now of primary concern: marriage has become synonomous with the family.[55] Each of these theories has weaknesses as well as strengths and remains to be verified.

Based on examination of Western cultures, anthropologists have conceptualized the family within a variety of social arrangements. Leslie, Nimkoff, Boalt, and Blisten discussed those concepts of family existent in present societies. They see the family as basically nuclear (a relatively modern life style), consisting of two adults and their respective children, found in highly industrialized societies, and meeting the needs of these societies.[56] Networks of kin are inconspicuous.

---

[54]Leslie, loc. cit.

[55]Horkheimer, Family Function and Destiny, p. 385.

[56]Leslie, op. cit., p. 13; Nimkoff, op. cit., p. 15; Boalt, op. cit., p. 14; Blisten, op. cit., p. 254.

Deviations from the prevalent nuclear life style exist also, according to Leslie, for if aid (financial or affectional) is furnished to children by parents or vice versa (after separation from one another), a link between generations results and the nuclear family becomes a modified extended family.[57]

Some disagreement exists between anthropologists relative to the nuclear family concept. Levy presented one study which attempted to alter the presently accepted definition. He saw the family as a "small kinship-structured unit which carries out relevant functions rather than a single social unit in society."[58] Not only would such a definition assist anthropologists in cross-cultural work, but the socialization process would be placed in a more highly differentiated frame for clearer analysis.

The family life cycle theory is the third element conceptualizing the family and concerns its progressive order. A number of anthropologists have used this theory in their work and one was selected as a typical example to illustrate the theory's components. In many Western cultures but primarily in the United States, Leslie points out, the following cycle is typical for the family: (1) premarital interaction: may involve dating, mate selection,

---

[57]Leslie, op. cit., p. 332.

[58]Marion J. Levy and Lloyd A. Fallers, "The Family: Some Comparative Considerations," in Kinship, p. 12.

courtship and engagement; (2) marriage: adjustment of the partners to each other; (3) child bearing and rearing: the child is socialized to the family and society; (4) marriage in the middle years: child rearing comes to an end as children leave home and partners become reacquainted; (5) post-parental phase: parents come to be on the receiving end of aid from children; (6) widowhood: most often the man dies first leaving women to cope with being alone. Disruptions of the cycle may occur due to divorce or remarriage, the latter receiving little study at this time.[59] Usually if the order is interrupted, individuals will seek to remarry and reintroduce themselves into the cycle at the point they find most suitable for their relationship.

---

[59]Leslie, op. cit., pp. 365-671.

CHAPTER III

SOCIOLOGY'S REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY"

Introduction

Of the three disciplines examined for their use of the concept "family," sociology has the greatest volume of materials. It has conducted extensive research focusing on the family as one component of social orders comprised of many elements. Home economics from its inception, clearly recognized sociology as a discipline that provided a major contribution to the field. Although many materials are available, the extensiveness of the replies to those questions designed for the study was highly variable. Clearly, sociology's analysis is the most complete to date and could therefore be expected to make the greatest contribution to home economics.

Is the family viewed as an appropriate area of study for the field? Sociology gave five basic reasons for supporting and maintaining its interest in the family. They were: (1) the degree of interest for the family exhibited by society; (2) the family's reproductive function

in society; (3) the control and continuity it provides the society; (4) its ability to meet the needs of man; and (5) the support society gives to the family. The degree of interest exhibited by society for the family emanates from a wide variety of sources providing sociology with one reason for studying the family. One source of interest mentioned by Burgess was the large number of dissertations found to concern the family.[1] Since interest is expressed, it behooves sociology to examine a social agency eliciting such interest. A second reason the discipline supports the family concerns its major purpose in society--namely reproduction. The children produced provide the family with its most indispensible feature. Its existence and solidarity furnishes, suggest Parsons, Farber and Havighurst, the most functional socialization for young children, fosters their mental and moral growth and to date, no other invented means of child rearing has proved better than the family.[2] These three features contribute to the discipline's central concern--socialization.

---

[1]Ernest W. Burgess, and Harvey Locke, The Family: From Institution to Companionship (New York: American Book Company, 1960), p. 681, hereafter referred to as Institution to Companionship.

[2]Talcott Parsons, "The Normal American Family," in Sourcebook, p. 36; Seymour Farber, Piero Mustacchi, and Roger H. L. Wilson, eds., The Family's Search for Survival (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. viii, hereafter referred to as Family Survival; Robert J. Havighurst, "The School and the Family--From the Viewpoint of the Educator," in Helping the Family in Urban Society, ed. by Fred Delliquadri

Third, Bell posits that the family has survived many centuries indicating its durability and capacity to control social behavior.[3] The social order's continuity, according to Kirkpatrick, is preserved because of this unique contribution.[4] Without the family societies would be chaotic; consequently, its preservation becomes essential. Fourth, the family meets some essential needs of man. Burgess and Winch point out that families provide affection, personality development and intimate relationships "in which to share hopes and fears, triumphs and anxieties."[5] Parsons places one restriction on the family's ability to meet man's needs in the American society, particularly, for it is basically the young child's needs that are met for the most part.[6] Apparently adult behavior must fall into predictable patterns if the child's wants are to be satisfied.

(New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), p. 23, hereafter referred to as Urban Society.

[3]Robert Bell, Marriage and Family Interaction (Homewood: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1963), p. 215.

[4]Clifford Kirkpatrick, The Family as Process and Institution (New York: The Ronald Press, 1963), p. 4, hereafter referred to as Process and Institution.

[5]Burgess, op. cit., p. 685; Robert Winch, The Modern Family (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 23.

[6]Parsons, Sourcebook, p. 40.

Finally, the social structure supports the family through welfare plans and proposals. These plans are based, Laurie suggests, on two major assumptions: (1) that the family has intrinsic worth; and (2) that it should be buffered by the government against disease and deprivation--both socially and economically.[7]

Sociology finds the family an appropriate area of study because people are interested in it; hence, such interest invites inquiry; families furnish the best means for socializing the young child, they provide solidarity and continuity for the society, they meet certain of man's needs, they are intrinsically valuable, and they need endorsement so that young children are socialized to strive for cultural ideals.

What goals are to be achieved by the field in working with and through the family? Underlying sociology's selection of the family as a focus for study are three basic purposes: (1) to develop a systematic research structure culminating in the determination and clarification of the family's present reality; (2) to examine the socialization process occurring within a specific boundary limit; and (3) to inspect family problems and attempt to seek solutions for them. To achieve the first purpose a research structure has been built from an examination of

---

[7]Norman V. Laurie, "Public Welfare Services and Family Life," in Urban Society, p. 45.

various family life styles. Bell, Rodman and Kohn comment that the examination has progressed from determining the ideal family by inspection of the middle class primarily, to the realization that many family variations exist and need to be accounted for if a total picture is to develop.[8] This realization has led to the inclusion and documentation of a number of family life styles.[9]

Burgess and Bell submit that an examination of the various family types has served to provide an orderly framework for discussing relationships, to guide and give direction to future research, to provide logical consistency, and to clarify and synthesize family research.[10] The result of this examination has served to define the present structure of families in modern societies. A total picture of all family types is still not available and perhaps never will be for as society changes the family also changes.

---

[8]Bell, op. cit., p. 9; Hyman Rodman, "On Understanding Lower-Class Behavior," in Sourcebook, p. 176; Melvin L. Kohn, "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation," in Marriage, Family and Society, ed. by Hyman Rodman (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 243, hereafter referred to as Marriage and Society.

[9]Sister Frances Jerome Woods, The American Family System (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1959), pp. 53-225, documented ten different family types, each of which was similar to yet different from others. These were the: rural family, urgan family, suburban or fringe family, ethnic family, e.g., Chinese, Mexican, Jewish, Negro, and lower, middle, and upper class life styles.

[10]Burgess, op. cit., p. 183; Bell, op. cit., p. 319.

The use of a systematic research structure remains unclarified by the discipline. At present two opposing views are evident. Burgess, expressing one point of view, holds that all research evidence is to be analyzed only, not to be evaluated.[11] Such a course of action presents only what exists but makes no decisions as to the worth of that existence. Bell and Nye, however, see a different course open to the discipline. All the amassing of facts and information should perform some service: to guide in decision making or provide an "armory of ideas."[12] In other words, members of the discipline struggle towards an end other than the documentation of present reality. Sociology, along with other areas of study, is faced with a vast accumulation of material brought about by burgeoning knowledge. Systematization has barely begun for the discipline and until developed, the question of purpose will remain ill-defined.

Understanding the socialization process is the second reason for sociology's interest in the family. Theories of socialization remain unclear and indistinct. Burgess posits that sociology's theories are based on the belief that man is born without a personality. "Human

---

[11]Burgess, op. cit., p. 539.

[12]Bell, op. cit., p. 183; F. Ivan Nye and Felix M. Bernardo, Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967), p. 4, hereafter referred to as Family Analysis.

association in the first months and years of life seems to be essential for the transformation of an infant into a fully functioning human being."[13] Understanding the socialization process will reveal new knowledge about human behavior. According to Kohn and Sewell, a fuller understanding of the process can help to differentiate between social structure and behavior effects as well as furnish a point upon which psychologists, anthropologists and sociologists can converge and pool information of benefit to the three disciplines.[14] Ultimately, Havighurst and Laurie suggest, the elaboration of the theory can help society as a whole "effectively and efficiently supplement the family," in turn assisting families to solve their present problems and prevent new ones.[15] Seemingly, sociologists feel that society does not exert enough control over families, for if it did, families would present fewer problems for the culture. Evidently they are troublesome elements, and need to be assisted towards a more uniform behavior subsequently eliminating the problems they are now causing, e.g., broken homes, ill cared for children and general instability. Only further intervention into

---

[13]Burgess, op. cit., p. 187.

[14]Kohn, Marriage and Society, p. 243; William H. Sewell, "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," in Sourcebook, p. 321.

[15]Havighurst and Laurie, both in Urban Society, pp. 31 and 52 respectively.

the family setting by society can strengthen it. Hence, sociologists work unceasingly towards loosening the family's internal cohesion to be replaced by the external bonds of society.

Finally, family problems need to be solved, studying them can assist in the process. The family, according to Schur and Suckow, is a vulnerable grouping.[16] Collecting data pertinent to families can assist in knowing what problems exist as well as how to best ease them. For example, many marriages are unhappy as evidenced by high divorce rates. Examination of effective relationships can lead to predictions for marital success. In turn, if the couple is aware of possible problems, they can seek to circumvent them or not marry at all; in the last analysis, they are at least prepared.

The family furnishes sociology with a small, definable, semi-closed group having systematic relationships. As a result, it provides an ideal setting in which to examine and postulate theoretical frameworks leading to a definition of present status; in addition, problems and processes can be illuminated, studied and defined or eased. Finally, family studies can assist man in gaining a fuller

---

[16]Edwin M. Schur, ed., The Family and the Sexual Revolution (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964), pp. 11-14, hereafter referred to as Sexual Revolution; Miriam P. Suckow and Florence E. Cuttrell, Families in New York City (New York: Community Council of Greater New York, May, 1966), p. 1.

understanding of himself. Such knowledge helps to reveal the purpose and plan of cultures, and order is derived from what was once thought of as incomprehensible or believed to be foreordained.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (What is the family's relation to the social order?) Sociologists for the most part emphasize the family's responsibility to the social order. It exists to ensure continuity through the functions it performs for the community. To assure that these functions are carried out over time, society places restrictions on the family. Wood emphasized this when she said: "Whatever the governing unit, prescriptions and prohibitions regulate the family from its establishment at mating through the full cycle of family life."[17] Marriage, which founds the family, is regulated by requiring individuals to marry outside their own decent groups. This obligation, Goode suggests, subordinates the family to the society, keeps it from becoming more powerful than society, and subordinates erotic interests to societal interests. The ritual itself pulls the couples relationship apart in the following ways: (a) the ceremony involves deciding issues

---

[17]Woods, op. cit., p. 26.

external to the relationship; and (b) the ceremony emphasizes the partners dependence on other collectivities.[18]

The social order surrounding the family dominates it. Reproduction of the species is of primary importance but, says Slater:

> Left to themselves, human beings would mate entirely in response to instinctual demands and psychological affinity. The establishment of socially defined aesthetic norms brings sexual choice under social control. . . .[19]

Indiscriminate mating would loosen the social order's bonds; hence, tight reign in the form of laws and sanctions needs to be enforced to ensure stability. The degree to which a society controls the family is relative. Burgess and Vincent agree that time, place and societal need serve to fashion prevalent family life styles. The highly industrialized and rapidly changing social order, existing in modern societies, "necessitates a family system that both structurally and functionally is highly adaptive to the demands of other social institutions externally and the needs of its own members internally."[20] Because families exist in societies and reproduce their membership, they

---

[18]William J. Goode, "The Theoretical Importance of Love," in The Family: Its Structure and Functions, ed. by Rose Laub Coser (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964), pp. 55, 219, 235, hereafter referred to as Structure and Functions.

[19]Philip Slater, "Social Limitation on Libidinal Withdrawal," in Structure and Functions, p. 242.

[20]Burgess, op. cit., p. 490; Clark E. Vincent, "Mental Health and the Family," in Sourcebook, p. 470.

must share their members with the larger group, suggests Winch, to ensure the cyclical replacement of trained societal members, distribution of goods and services and the melding of individual goals with those of society.[21]

Children are placed in the social order by the family. In modern societies, Winch points out, status is usually conferred by the husband's position in the occupational system.[22] Davis and Winch concurred by suggesting that "each individual is created in the family and placed in the class system whether he wills it or not." Along with a position in the system, the family also furnishes connecting links to others in society and provides a name for purposes of recognition.[23] No child is left in any society, stresses Kenkel, to be socialized by the family alone.[24] Because the family is subordinate to yet necessary for the social order, its functions are interwoven into the social fabric so tightly that neither society nor the family can exist apart, for its members must fit into established social groups. Without the family legitimate reproduction could not take place; hence,

---

[21]Winch, op. cit., p. 14.

[22]Ibid., pp. 274-75.

[23]Kingsley Davis, "The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict," in Sourcebook, p. 385; Winch, op. cit., p. 23.

[24]Kenkel, op. cit., p. 266.

each (the family and society) needs the other. Ultimately, individuals owe their first allegiance to the social order and can exhibit such allegiance, feels Malinowski, through responsibly assuming "the duties and burdens as well as the privileges connected with the process of reproduction."[25]

To summarize, the family is related to the social order through its responsibility to it, its adaptability, its socialization function, and its allegiance to the order preserving continuity.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (Is the family still a strong part of society?) The sociological literature is subdivided into three schools of thought: (1) the family is balanced with society; (2) the family is a forceful institution; and (3) the family is abysmally weak and deteriorating progressively. Since the family performs specified societal functions, Winch and Parsons hold that it is in a state of equilibrium with society. "Basic societal functions have individual-serving as well as society serving functions." The style of institution which presently exists in modern societies seems to be the best agency for helping today's citizen balance a wide variety of "complex contexts of obligations and expectations, to be ready to enter into

---

[25]Bronislaw Malinowski, "Marriage: Past and Present," in Sexual Revolution, p. 313.

many, but not arbitrarily to sacrifice the interests of some to others."[26] Farber notes that the law and economy form a base helping the family maintain balance with the society; the law by building a foundation equalizing family relationships and the economy by supporting families through the occupational structure. In turn, families provide society with secure individuals able to cope with modern complexities.[27] All these factors serve to keep the institution balanced with the society; thus, it is neither weak nor strong.

The family--a strong part of society. Pessimists have for too long been crying "wolf" believing the family to be failing and that it will eventually cease to exist. They base their suppositions on the continuing loss of family functions prevalent in today's society. According to Vincent, the pessimists "equated a loss of functions with a decline of the family." It was not until the 1940's that this view changed and optimism appears to be on the increase.[28] Modern societies are subject to rapid change and a high degree of specialization. Burgess, Parsons and Woods point out that this is molding a new family unity. The family has become specialized in its functioning as

---

[26]Winch, op. cit., p. 20; Parsons, Sourcebook, p. 43.

[27]Farber, Family Survival, p. 12.

[28]Vincent, Sourcebook, p. 472.

has the society; so, the transfer of a number of its former functions to other segments of the community is logical.[29]

Frankel and Parsons stress family gain over loss. Society has elevated and idealized the family as the desired way of life for all. Further, although divorce rates in modern societies are rising, they do not indicate a decline in the family's importance but exactly the reverse. "Divorce is an index of the severity of the burden placed on the marriage relationship in modern society, and back of that, of the importance of its functions."[30] Too many sociologists, Kirkpatrick feels, have not fully analyzed the said loss of family functions. In reality the family may not have lost functions at all, they may only be redirected.[31] An example pointed out by Winch noted that educational functions, so important today, have shifted from providing education in the family, to providing the opportunity for education.[32]

---

[29]Ernest W. Burgess, Harvey Locke, and Mary Thomas, "The Companionship Family," Marriage and Society, p. 259; Parsons, Sourcebook, p. 37; Woods, op. cit., p. 44.

[30]Charles Frankel, "The Family in Context," Urban Society, p. 21; Parsons, Sourcebook, p. 44.

[31]Kirkpatrick, op. cit., p. 5.

[32]Winch, op. cit., p. 122.

Conversely, Rodman holds that families are losing some former functions, but those that remain are now more vital than before.[33] These vital functions include, according to Moore, Frankel, Ellis, Winch, and Woods, personalizing a mass society, developing a feeling of individual uniqueness, providing for the child's nurturance through emotional security, and socializing the child to fit into the larger community.[34] Peterson summarized by saying:

> The American family may be struggling for survival, but it is a vigorous struggle, and is being waged on many fronts. It may very well turn out that our definition of the struggle may be in error--that what we are really about is the birth struggle of a new and vigorous family system.[35]

Sociologists appear to disagree about the family's strength. Is it strong because of what it does for the society or is it strong because of its adaptability to changing social orders ultimately developing a new form? To date the literature fails to resolve the problem and gives no indication of doing so in the near future.

---

[33]Hyman Rodman, "Talcott Parson's View of the Changing American Family," in Marriage and Society, p. 268.

[34]Wilbert E. Moore, "The Family," in Sourcebook, p. 48; Frankel, Urban Society, pp. 16-18; Albert Ellis, "The Folklore of Sex," in Sexual Revolution, p. 39; Winch, op. cit., pp. 290, 294; Woods, op. cit., p. 44.

[35]James A. Peterson, "Catastrophes in Partnership: Separation, Divorce and Widowhood," in Family Survival, p. 79.

The family--a weak part of society. Many sociologists hold that the family is weak and in need of social support. More appear to stress this position than uphold the family's strength even though Vincent, see page 65, maintained their number was declining. Burgess, Frankel and Winch feel that features in modern societies such as urbanization, industrialization and technology have placed inordinate pressure on families causing their structure to weaken.[36] Frankel goes on to suggest that the family is so weak it can do nothing to change its steadily declining course.[37] From a once strong institution the family, through its progressive loss of functions is, according to Vincent and the Rapoports, the least organized and least able to set its own standards.[38] The family's adaptability which some sociologists tout as its strength is, in reality, its greatest weakness. According to several sociologists, further evidence is found in the loss of social and sacred roles, rapid social mobility vertically and horitontally weakening family ties and the family's smallness which

---

[36]Burgess, Institution to Companionship, p. 575; Frankel, Urban Society, p. 5; Winch, op. cit., p. 118.

[37]Frankel, Urban Society, p. 4.

[38]Vincent; Robert Rapoport and Rhona Rapoport, "Work and Family in Contemporary Society," both in Sourcebook, pp. 475 and 58 respectively.

breeds a high degree of anxiety in children dependent upon its structure.[39]

If the family were strong, Sorokin and Ploscow speculate, adult criminality, juvenile delinquency, mental disease, insecurity, and frustration would be practically non-existant; yet, the opposite is true. Divorce, too, further indicates the family's loss of strength:

> If husbands and wives were required to choose their mates more carefully, if the law made certain that the choice of a husband or wife was a free one, made after mature reflection, there would be less likelihood of incompatible matrimonial alliances and less need for the dissolution of marriages through annulment and divorce.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In our opinion, divorces should only be granted to husbands and wives after a thorough-going attempt had been made by a panel of experts to adjust the differences between them.

The high number of "fluid marriages" is producing "a superabundance of the physically, morally, mentally defective children, or no children at all."[40] Society needs to take a hand, then, in preventing marital dissolution by serving as the expert in deciding whether a marriage should or should not be dissolved.

A review of the literature in sociology reveals three views of family strength. The first, having the

---

[39]Woods, op. cit., p. 104; Burgess, op. cit., p. 490; Winch, op. cit., p. 497; Davis, Structure and Functions, p. 468.

[40]Piterim Sorokin, "The American Sex Revolution;" Morris Ploscow, "Sex and the Law," both in Sexual Revolution, pp. 154-55 and 187, 191, respectively.

fewest adherents, holds that families are balanced and functioning well in present day societies. Secondly, the family is strong, third, it is weak. Some of the same points are used by the latter two but a different interpretation is placed on the statistics by each. The family's strengths center on its adaptability to the society, its growing importance for society and its performance of needed functions. On the other hand, the family is weak because society is required to support it economically, it is gradually losing its purpose in societies and the high number of divorces illustrates family instability. Helping the family, according to sociologists, generally indicates supporting societal intervention in order to strengthen and secure it in the social order.

What does the field conceive as desirable in the family? Sociology's concept of the desirable in families pivots on its capacity to reflect society's and man's needs. Only through a system of orderly relationships can such a task be accomplished; hence, orderliness provides the fulcrum on which rests all that the family is and can be. Orderly relations are prescribed by societies for kinship situations, for married partners, for parents and for children; the prescriptions can change and alter over time but are essential for meeting the goals of culture and man. Societal law orders kinship relations in the form of an incest taboo. Heterosexual intercourse between specific

kin, according to Woods, is closely circumscribed.[41] Rodman suggests that the taboo reduces jealousy and rivalry in nuclear family and kin groupings, forces family members to take an interest in other families around them and promotes contact of families with society so that ideas and techniques can be exchanged.[42]

The partners in a family relationship take precedence in American or Western cultures. Komarovsky points out that to be excessively dependent on kin outside the husband-wife relationship is viewed with suspicion in our culture.[43] But, partners are not completely divorced from ties to relatives. For if the partners withdrew unto themselves and functioned only for their own benefit, society could not find individuals willing to give time and effort towards promoting social ends. To prevent this, children are taught to seek many desires outside the family. They gain their independence in order to meet individual, socially developed and directed needs. Continuity between the generations, submits Woods and Streib, is maintained usually by establishing a network of mutual aid, e.g., love, affection and financial assistance. "Parents play

---

[41]Woods, op. cit., p. 27.

[42]Hyman Rodman, "Mate Selection: Incest Taboos, Homogamy, and Mixed Marriages," in Marriage and Society, p. 50.

[43]Mirra Komarovsky, "Functional Analysis of Sex Roles," in Sourcebook, p. 260.

active roles in assuring successful economic stability and occupational placement of their children."[44] Kinship is so ordered, then, that it binds yet releases individuals: It binds them to one another by providing security yet releases them to assuage their desires and perform needed tasks for the general welfare of the total society. Essentially the relationship functions efficiently when it is maintained in balance.

Between married partners the desired orderly relationship reflects unity or oneness. Parsons and Burgess suggest that such a state can be achieved through an enduring relationship, mutual affection, emotional interdependence, sympathetic understanding, consensus, family rituals, interdependence of roles, and equality in sexual behavior. Those persons best prepared for such a relationship are sociable and conventional, to be otherwise is to invite dissent between partners.[45] If conflict should ensue and become detrimental for the couple, societies provide an orderly system of divorce. Sociologists continue to volley pro and con arguments about the positive or negative effects of divorce in modern societies. That it does exist and seems here to stay is lauded by its

---

[44]Woods, op. cit., p. 361; Gordon F. Streib, "Family Patterns in Retirement," in Sourcebook, p. 405.

[45]Talcott Parsons, "The Incest Taboo in Relation to Social Structure," in Structure and Functions, p. 52; Burgess, op. cit., pp. 366, 310, 434.

proponents and grudgingly admitted to by its opponents. Bell summed up the controversy when he said: "To be against divorce may be emotionally satisfying but is often not socially realistic."[46]

Married partners, continues Bell, usually become parents because, in general, societies believe that children are a function of the family.[47] Having them in unlimited numbers is not approved behavior, however. Control of procreation is desirable because, posits Guttmacher, the partners have time before conceiving and rearing children to become firmly established as contributing societal members, the health and happiness of all family members is assured due to limited child bearing and financial resources are in direct relation to the number of children born. In no case should quality be sacrificed to quantity.[48] Partners are to responsibly assume parenthood with prior reasoning and planning for additional members, for if children are poorly cared for they drain rather than contribute to society.

Parental behavior is ordered or prescribed. Winch, supporting this point said:

> To know how to nurture and to control a child in the manner approved by one's society--if there is consensus

---

[46]Bell, op. cit., p. 418. [47]Ibid., p. 325.

[48]Alan F. Guttmacher, "Rx for Birth Control," in Sexual Revolution, pp. 320, 323.

> on the topic--is to know the crux of the parental roles as defined in that society.[49]

Parental roles are exemplified by the culture and regarded as achievable goals having many rewards, and open to all if social codes are upheld, e.g., having a legal ceremony as a preface to family life, bearing and providing for children, et al. Motherhood, comments Schur and Coser, is highly lauded while fatherhood is upheld legally for he gives the child a status position in society.[50] Together the father-mother role complex melds to form the family setting from which a child comes to know and understand the world around him. Parents form an indispensible unit which, continues Coser and Bell, helps the child to know reality (the parental view of reality), to understand a variety of social roles in the present and future and to comprehend sex role models.[51] These functions are indispensible and are presented to individuals in a cultural totality (a "family") as having great worth and high desirability.

Finally, children contribute to a family's ordered relationships. They must conform to some specific prescriptions--for the child too, Farber stresses, is a person

---

[49]Robert F. Winch, "Rearing by the Book," in Sourcebook, p. 334.

[50]Edwin M. Schur, "Abortion and the Social System," in Sexual Revolution, p. 379; Coser, Structure and Functions, p. xvii.

[51]Ibid., p. xxiv; Bell, op. cit., p. 341.

in his own right having obligations and freedoms within society.[52] Schorr suggests that the relationship between parent and child is typically reciprocal, for parents provide the child with support and education while the child returns love and esteem.[53] How can the child, a relative neophyte, reciprocate to any degree? Typically he does so, points out Burgess, by reflecting the expected behavior communicated to him by the family members around him. If the parents have done an adequate job, ultimately the child will exhibit an integrated personality showing "little or no conflict between the roles he plays in relation to other members of the family."[54]

To summarize, the family's primary purpose is to provide an orderly set of relations between members freeing individuals to move forward toward meeting society's and man's needs. Society's needs receive the first priority of the discipline. Sirjamaki submits that the family is a "social system through which fundamental life-purposes can be achieved."[55] It is, Van Den Haag and Woods insist, a way of life and if not chosen, labels individuals

---

[52]Farber, Family Survival, p. 10.

[53]Alvin L. Schorr, "Filial Responsibility and the Aging," in Marriage and Society, p. 190.

[54]Burgess, op. cit., p. 194.

[55]John Sirjamaki, "Culture Configurations in the American Family," in Sourcebook, p. 71.

as abnormal.[56] So pervasive is the desirability of marriage and family, suggests Kenkel and Parsons, that it is often difficult to recognize the points of agreement for what they are--unanimous uniformity of cultural thought. In short, " . . . in a society that in most respects has undergone a process of very extensive structural differentiation, there has emerged a remarkably uniform, basic type of family."[57]

Such an ideal, as Frankel sees it, could be construed as misleading and is often an unrealistic standard.[58] Not all families achieve the ideal nor perhaps, do they want to. The ideal is, however, so all pervasive that even those not living according to the desired life style have in mind the ideal and are aware of not having achieved it. The social order supports readily that version of the family which mirrors society's values most closely. Variations from the societal ideal are prodded, through social welfare legislation, to achieve the desired configuration.

---

[56]Ernest Van Den Haag, "Love or Marriage," in Structure and Functions, p. 194; Woods, op. cit., p. 495.

[57]Kenkel, op. cit., p. 224; Parsons, Sourcebook, p. 40. F. Ivan Nye, "Child Adjustment in Broken and Unhappy Unbroken Homes," in Sourcebook, p. 434, elaborated and summarized the American or Western basic family type when he said: "The family of mother and father living together with their offspring is construed to be ideal for the happiness of every member and to increase the probability of developing characters and appropriate personality characteristics in children."

[58]Frankel, Urban Society, p. 14.

Woods, Burgess and Goode clarify those values society fosters and desires families to reflect. They include: The bearing of new cultural members, provision for the child until of adult status, the release of the child from the bonds of his present family to found his own family, and the promotion of the society's political ideology. In a democratic society this includes features such as equality among partners, and democratic decision making including the children.[59]

In addition, Hill says that successful families "share the resources of good marital adjustment, family adaptability, and to a lesser degree, family integration."[60] Woods and Kirkendall add to this list the provision of a self supporting and self reliant base from which members can operate in the wider society and the provision of an arena of solidarity emcompassing trustworthiness, confidence, integrity, and self respect in relationships.[61] Such a socio-psychological setting prepares the promotes

---

[59]Woods, op. cit., p. 275; Burgess, op. cit., p. 651; Goode, Structure and Functions, p. 205, developed this point further when he said that the adolescent and peer emphasis in today's culture frees youth to fall in love and motivates individuals to conform to proper marital behavior.

[60]Reuban Hill, "Social Stresses on the Family," in Sourcebook, p. 450.

[61]Woods, op. cit., p. 275; Lester A. Kirkendall, "Sex Education, and Family Stability," in Family Survival, p. 126.

individuals capable of reflecting the desired values of society within the familial framework.

Sociologists postulate that the family can serve two masters: society and man; yet, in examining the literature available, society has the stronger position by default, for little research is in evidence relative to the family-man's needs cluster. Either sociologists believe the question of how families meet man's needs beyond their frame of inquiry, have little interest in such inquiry or they believe it to be a self evident fact needing little verification. The literature predominates in the latter viewpoint. Fitzpatrick, Winch and Burgess bore this out by generalizing that the family provides for personal happiness and fulfillment, promotes individual welfare and has the "opportunity and a responsibility to develop a type of family according to its own aspirations and objectives."[62] At present the aspirations and objectives appear to be purely of social origin and have no quality of uniqueness or difference. Much further clarification as to the source and meaning of happiness, fulfillment, welfare and individual aspirations and objectives is necessary before the answer to how man's needs are met through the family will be evident. To date, such an examination is lacking in the discipline's literature.

[62]Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, "Values, Ethics, and Family Life," in Urban Society, p. 70; Winch, The Modern Family, p. 651; Burgess, op. cit., p. 673.

To sum up, sociologists conceive of the desirable family as one which provides and confines cultural members to a socially defined arena of interrelationships. These relationships are ordered for the purposes of developing future functioning societal members and providing a secure framework insulating individuals from larger cultural activities. The family, with its ordered relationships, frees men to accomplish their own and society's needs; however, society's needs appear to be the primary goals of families while man's desires are only incidental to it. To date, the literature presents a one-sided view exemplifying those families which achieve the ends of society.

What questions have been raised by the field relative to the family? Nine areas[63] concerning the family have received scrutiny by sociologists; they include: (1) the family as a universal; (2) family forms; (3) the family and the surrounding society; (4) family stability and disruption; (5) mate selection; (6) sex education and the family; (7) psycho-social factors and the family; (8) selected family members; and (9) family research. The questioning pattern which appears to be at work within the discipline consists of the following premises and assumptions: What is called "family" exists in all societies. The family is one of many elements needing study to

[63]For a fuller listing of the elements in each area, refer to Appendix D.

determine an overall picture of the social order, its organization and purposes. To gain the broadest picture of this phenomenon, investigation of all its many forms is necessary.

Social orders incase families and exert orderly and disorderly influences upon them. Therefore, identification of the general features of family formation (mate selection), relationships between the individuals (sexual relationships) and the roles that individual members assume (psycho-social factors and selected family members) can help present a fuller picture of what the family is and does. From this information theoretical constructs can be postulated helping to define the use and meaning of the concept "family."

Sociology has expended considerable effort to document a wide variety of family forms, postulating theoretical frameworks for family study and determining the family's relationship to the larger society. Interest in single family members has occurred in more recent studies but as yet research remains limited. The combination of psycho-social factors affecting the family is beginning to appear also in the literature indicating that sociology realizes it cannot exist exclusively with group research while neglecting to account for the elements making up the group. Apparently the discipline recognizes that group examination has reached its maximum usefulness and the next logical step is to focus in on the individual components determining how they meld to form the group.

Of the three disciplines examined, sociology has the most complete frameworks for family study perhaps because it achieved the status of a discipline before anthropology or psychology. It was the first of the three disciplines to develop a taxonomic ordering of family constructs, for with its materials accumulating to such massive proportions, any alternatives to ordering would have led to muddled thinking or inconclusive results in its research.

How does the field differ in its conception of the family from that concept of the family held by other disciplines from which it draws its knowledge? Sociologists have for some time concentrated their interest and support on the family. Three reasons in particular distinguish sociology's prolonged interest from anthropology and psychology: First, the efforts of the discipline are directed toward understanding the structure of social orders. The family--one part of any order--contributes towards this understanding. Cultures consistently support the family; by clarifying the reasons for their support, the family's purpose is revealed. Two additional reasons for sociology's support of the family center around its dual function of replacement and the socialization of new cultural members. The family's ability to provide for and induct new members into the intricacies of the social order has been carefully scrutinized. Sociologists conclude

that cultures cannot function efficiently without the family's services.

Understanding and clarifying present reality governs the discipline's aims in family research. But, two opposing arguments are waging between sociologists regarding the use of knowledge. One view holds that sociology's knowledge should be analyzed only; the other suggests that analysis should serve as a guide to decision making. Since research has revealed a family oppressed by problems, the latter view is taking precedence. Solutions to family problems are occupying a greater portion of sociology's research. Increasing society's control seemingly offers an efficient route toward alleviating family problems. Thus, defining reality, forwarding solutions to problems and increasing society's control over the family are the discipline's distinctive goals.

The family, a small group exerting pressure on individuals, relates to society through its socialization activities. An individual learns to achieve his personal desires via socially approved means. When he leaves the family, his desires (if the family has accomplished its socially defined tasks) are in direct agreement with social goals and further cultural continuity. Each person is a part of his family and of the larger culture. Families bridge the gap between the two elements. An individual's first allegiance lies with society. The family's

responsibility is fulfilled by freeing its members to enter into larger cultural activities.

To meet society's and man's needs, sociology conceptualized the desirable in families as a set of orderly relationships guiding individuals through the socialization process. Orderliness is achieved through those norms, mores and laws developed in each culture to govern individual behavior. Relatives, parents and children, to name a few socially defined roles, assimilate these directives into their personalities. Their relations are then prescribed and consistent. Each knows the expectations of others and responds to them secure in the knowledge that they have committed a right action. The family inculcates individuals with these necessary behaviors so that they respond to society in approved ways and function free of doubt about their relations with others.

Unconditionally, sociologists view the family as a working whole. It is a small semi-closed group characterized as a system or arena of relationships. Individual needs are sublimated or redirected toward group ends. The family oversees individual behavior, provides orderly channels for the expression of desires, and directs individuals toward larger group goals. Society's ends are the family's ends.

The use and meaning sociology ascribes to the family have been conceptualized in theoretical frameworks governing

its research. Five frames based on a distinguishing feature include the:

-Interactionist approach

-Structure function approach

-Situational approach

-Institutional approach

-Developmental approach[64]

An additional set of frameworks derived from the literature by the writer was based on family form or organization and included the nuclear and kinship centered families. Other frames based on cultural background, social class and occupation, to name a few, could be eventual possibilities for conceptual frameworks. The discipline's research is governed by the underlying conceptual premises. Elaboration and differentiation of these postulates awaits further research and analysis.

What does the field predict for the family's future? "Family sociologists" have given considerable thought to the family's future. Their predictions were based on present trends occurring generally in society and refer particularly to the middle class on the assumption that this group will continue to be the most pervasive in modern societies. The literature identified seven family features which could be affected by change in the future.

---

[64]Further elaboration of these conceptual frames appears on pages 93-100.

Presumably any features not identified would continue functioning as they do in the present. Those identified centered around trends taking place in: (1) mate selection and marriage; (2) kinship relations; (3) parenthood; (4) family dependents; (5) family disruption; (6) family services; and (7) family research.

Individuals are gaining a greater voice in deciding whether to marry and establish a family or to remain single. Personal satisfaction and gratification, points out Kirkpatrick and Reisman, are the principle features of mate selection.[65] Burgess, Frankel and Fitzpatrick suggest that a gradual transition has taken place here. Formerly, mate selection was based on a prospective mate's economic, educational, health, protective, and religious qualities as well as an alliance between two families. Today the emphasis is on affection, tempermental compatibility, mutual interests, social status, level of living, and companionship. In the future, use and practicality will be downgraded.[66] Previously individual survival made family life imperative; today and in the future, with technological advances widely available to all, the individual will

---

[65]Clifford Kirkpatrick, "A Statistical Investigation of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection," in Sourcebook, p. 247; David Reisman, "Permissiveness and Sex Roles," in Marriage and Society, p. 316.

[66]Burgess, op. cit., pp. 21, 289; Frankel and Fitzpatrick, both in Urban Society, pp. 12 and 74, respectively.

survive alone to a better degree. However, societies need legitimate replacements so family life is elevated to "an heroic goal to be striven for," insists Goodman.[67] Such inducement appears to be effective because marital trends, as summarized by Park and Glick, indicate that most people marry.[68] The idealization of marriage and family life will carry into the future.

As society becomes more homogenous due to the widely available social and economic advancements, status groups will eventually break down and intermarriage between subgroups will occur at an ever increasing rate. For example: Negro-white status differences are being gradually reduced. Heer suggests that "it is likely that any decreasing difference in status between Negroes and whites may increase the intermarriage rate" thus causing further status equalization and "racial intermarriage does appear to be increasing."[69] So, greater freedom of individual choice will occur at the stages prior to family inception which begins with the marriage ritual. Families offer a desirable life style to individuals choosing their partners

---

[67]Paul Goodman, "Growing Up Absurd," in Sexual Revolution, p. 55.

[68]Robert Parke, Jr., and Paul C. Glick, "Prospective Changes in Marriage and the Family," in Sourcebook, p. 108.

[69]David M. Heer, "Negro-White Marriage in the United States," in Sourcebook, p. 139.

for their affective rather than economic qualities. Individuals will have freer choice of partners in the future for status separation (e.g., upper, lower, middle, ethnic, and racial subgroupings) will gradually be reduced.

Because economic survival was a major reason for marriage in the past, the husband, as the bread winner, and his family had considerable authority. Today, however, two forces are causing a change in kinship relationships: women are receiving more equal status with men and the individual's life span is steadily lengthening. The two have combined, posits Rodman and Bell, to place both couple's parents on a more equal footing and to furnish longer connecting links between family generations. Parents, grandparents and even great grandparents may maintain an affective link with the young, newly initiated family.[70] Equality of relationships and longevity will place kinship relations in an expanding and prominent light. The length of such relationships will only be stopped by man's inability to extend the life span beyond a certain point. Longevity effects on families are emerging as a whole new area needing greater study.

For the present, parenthood is the logical result of marriage in modern societies. Along with the impressive advances in medicine will come the ability for all who desire children to have them. The Population Bulletin

---

[70]Rodman, Sourcebook, p. 172; Bell, op. cit., p. 381.

predicts that the childless couple will become "all but extinct." Linked with the ability to have children will be the growing acceptance "that the knowledge and facilities to make voluntary parenthood universal must be recognized as a basic human right."[71] No longer will parenthood be the logical outcome of marriage. Those who choose parenthood, however, will be expected to achieve greater social expectations than before, e.g., according to Bell, the "good mother" of the future will have to be dedicated, knowledgeable and exhibit a sense of creativity "similar to that found in the professions."[72] Not only will future wives be called upon to function professionally as mothers, they will have a wider sphere of interests (e.g., job, schooling, community services) along with their profession of motherhood. Winch and Lundberg hold that the new view stresses: "Parents have rights to gratify their own impulses as well as duties to provide such care as will insure the proper development of their children's personalities. . . . "[73] It will be more and more common for women to combine a home and child care with a career or

---

[71]Population Bulletin, "'Boom Babies' Come of Age: The American Family at the Crossroads," in Sourcebook, p. 121.

[72]Bell, op. cit., p. 261.

[73]Winch, op. cit., p. 463; Ferdinand Lundberg and Marynia Farnham, "Women: The Lost Sex," in Sexual Revolution, p. 234.

other outside activity. Whether "professionalism" can function along with "parental rights" remains to be clarified. Are parental rights above, equal to or below the demands of a professional parent? Then too, it is the mother's role which seemingly will incur the greatest change in the future: the father's family position evidently will remain much as it is now (primarily one of providing legal status and position to family members in society).

The family is responsible for those adult and child members dependent on its structure. The responsibility for dependents of the lower class, Winch points out, is passing increasingly from the family to private and social agencies.[74] For other status levels of the society, however, responsibility for dependents will waiver back and forth between family and society. The mentally ill, one example given by Vincent, have had their care moved from home and community to state mental institutions. With the advent of tranquilizers, however, patients in growing numbers return to their homes to complete their convalescence.[75] It would appear that developments in society will exert ever greater influence on the family's ability to assume responsibility for its members.

---

[74]Winch, op. cit., p. 163.

[75]Vincent, Sourcebook, p. 467.

Children suffering from poor care or neglect will become less of a problem for society since parenthood will be increasingly voluntary. The Population Bulletin points out that "some demographers now predict that the time will come when the well-to-do will average more children than those in low-income brackets."[76] Children increasingly will become the responsibility of those who are best able to support them. Consequently, the huge machinery of child support prevalent today will gradually decrease if not disappear completely. Parents, according to Davis and Kenkel, will hold less ultimate authority over the child. "Already children appear to be taught how to get along with others rather than to get ahead in a bureaucratic society."[77] Reproduction and the child's economic support will remain as the family's major responsibility while the socialization process will shift progressively to society.

Families today appear to be in trouble. Divorce, a sign that trouble exists, is one indication of the apparent dissatisfaction with familial relationships. Stokes and Burgess feel that unhappiness and marital breakup are likely to get worse before they get better. The present time period is a precursor to a new foundation for marriage and family stability. Factors which will lead to

---

[76]Population Bulletin, Sourcebook, p. 122.

[77]Davis, Sourcebook, p. 384; Kenkel, op. cit., pp. 250-52.

stability include a slower population increase, less immigration, transition of the economy from a risk to security basis, and the growing services available to families.[78] The present time period is one of upheaval and discontent; families, who only reflect what is so prominent in the surrounding society must, then, mirror disorder. Gradually stability will return and with it family solidarity. Society's increasing homogenization will reduce the possibility of marriage between people of widely divergent backgrounds. Similarity of background will help to mold more stable families in the future: stable societies breed stable families.

Family services will continue to expand. Pollak predicts:

> With governmental services . . . offering higher standards of care . . . it may well become a function of the modern family to integrate these services and to develop expertise in their use and orchestration.[79]

The family of the future could conceivably furnish legitimacy and economic support for society's replacements, but beyond that, care of the individual would be removed completely from it and left to a wide variety of social organizations. Parents would be able to select the socialization processes (all of which would be socially sanctioned) they

---

[78]Walter R. Stokes, "Our Changing Sex Ethics," in Sexual Revolution, p. 101; Burgess, op. cit., p. 685.

[79]Otto Pollak, "The Outlook for the American Family," in Sourcebook, p. 571.

wish their child exposed to, while functioning themselves primarily in a supervisory capacity. Just how far society will go in offering services to the family and the kinds and types of services it will offer over and above those presently proposed, remains largely unexplored.

Research on families will continue to expand and this predominantly private sector will be submitted to greater scrutiny. The purpose of such research, submits Burgess, is "to provide the knowledge of human behavior essential to family welfare and happiness."[80] Research, adds Cottrell, can "identify what we may call the components of personal competence for functioning in a democratic social system." In order to find out what conditions enhance or inhibit the "components of personal competence," experimental testing will be necessary.[81] Sociologists and others will cross over the barriers placed between the social and private sector subjecting families to sharp scrutiny: first to find out what is, secondly to experiment and determine possible alternatives. Perhaps such studies would result in a socially more functional family form that would ideally develop more competent societal members. Presumably, there could be an alternative to the present family structure that would offer greater happiness

---

[80]Burgess, loc. cit.

[81]Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., "New Directions for the American Family," in Sourcebook, p. 563.

and personal welfare to family members; without testing, however, new forms will remain unknown.

What is the definition of the family as presented in the literature of the field? Within the last decade, a few sociologists have concluded that unless some logically consistent framework is developed identifying the concept "family," sociology will encompass conflicting theories, have a reduced level of communication among its adherents and contribute further to the already accumulated materials lacking discriminate thought. Hill and Hansen pioneered with the construction of five conceptual frameworks for family analysis; subsequently, Nye, influenced by Hill and Hansen's work, constructed and posited eleven frames.[82] Both are open to question, suggestion and revision. Because Hill and Hansen's frames were developed earlier than others and served to influence further elaboration, they are briefly presented here as one example of the research taking place in family analysis. Hill and Hansen's frameworks are based on a primary or distinguishing feature. The writer includes an additional set of frames based on form and having two elements, at this point in time. Both frames are governed, however, by Hill and Hansen's generalization that the family is defined according to the

---

[82]Hill and Hansen, Sourcebook, p. 489; Nye, Family Analysis, p. 7.

approach used.[83] Hill and Hansen's frames include: the interactionist approach, the structure-function approach, the situational approach, the institutional approach, and the developmental approach. The following defines each and clarifies its distinguishing features:

The interactionist approach holds that: "The family is a unity of interacting persons, each occupying a position(s) within the family to which a number of roles are assigned."[84] Elaborating further, Cogswell noted that the roles affect each member of the family group throughout the entire life cycle.[85] Behavioral roles include that of father, mother, child, sister, et al.; each having its elements defined by the social milieu within which the family operates. Pribram, Slater and Hill and Hansen point out that although this approach has generated many studies accounting for the internal behavior of families, little research effort has been directed toward the interaction of families with the surrounding community and society.[86] In summary, family members have culturally defined and

---

[83]Hill and Hansen, Sourcebook, p. 489. [84]Ibid.

[85]Betty Cogswell, "Socialization Into the Family: An Essay on Some Structural Properties of Roles," in Sourcebook, pp. 367, 370.

[86]Karl H. Pribram, "Committment to Dreams," in Family Survival, p. 175; Philip Slater, "Parental Role Differentiation," in Structure and Functions, p. 370; Hill and Hansen, Sourcebook, p. 489.

assigned positions called roles whose affect and effect form the conceptual core of the approach.

The situational approach to family analysis suggests that "the family is a unity of interacting persons who experience relatively continuing relationships." In addition, family behavior is viewed as a social situation or "unit of stimuli acting toward a focal point (e.g., child)."[87] Hill stressed this last feature when he said:

> A family is generally an integrated, well-knit group of individuals who share common goals, where roles, ascribed and achieved, permit each member to perform tasks necessary for the continuity and survival of the family as a social unit.[88]

Carrying the thought further, Hansen adds that even though a family may lack the ability to form a solid relationship having direction, members may continue to function together because the majority of interacting relationships continue to afford satisfaction.[89] The relationships become so solidified that Hill and Walter conceive of the family as basically "a set of intermeshing, mutually facilitating habits."[90] Thus, continuity, directional focus and

---

[87] Ibid., pp. 492-93.

[88] Hill, Sourcebook, p. 440.

[89] Donald A. Hansen, "Personal and Positional Influence in Formal Groups: Propositions and Theory for Research on Family Vulnerability to Stress," in Sourcebook, p. 452.

[90] Reuban Hill and Willard Walter, "Habit Systems in Married Life," in Marriage and Society, p. 452.

mutually satisfying behaviors are the main features of this frame.

The structure-function approach defines "family" as "one of many components of a complete social system (society) and as best studied for the functions it performs in society."[91] Research in this framework, according to Hill and Hansen, has been concerned primarily with the family's structure and its contribution to society's total maintenance. Conversely, the change and dynamics of its functions have received only minimal analysis.[92] Parsons and Winch find that family members are having to contribute more to society outside familial confines than within forcing the family to become increasingly specialized; however, it remains structurally intact having the primary function of replacement.[93] Maintenance of family boundaries, the purpose of such boundaries to the functioning social order and the effects of change on family functions are the central themes for this approach.

The institutional "family" is "a social unit in which individual and cultural values are of central concern."[94] The latter receives the greater emphasis by

---

[91]Hill and Hansen, Sourcebook, p. 490.

[92]Ibid., p. 490.

[93]Parsons, Sourcebook, p. 43; Winch, op. cit., p. 12.

[94]Hill and Hansen, Sourcebook, p. 493.

sociologists. Kirkpatrick and Winch identified several social functions the family provides for such as: (1) sexual expression; (2) reproduction; (3) child rearing; (4) intergenerational relationships; (5) social continuity; and (6) essential introduction to society's members.[95] Individual values of "central concern" to the society receive little clarification in sociology's literature. Society appears to take precedence and two factors may have caused this one dimensional focus: Either society's values offer so great an area of study that until their research is complete, individuals retain a secondary position or the approach itself precludes that individual needs are met through the accomplishment of society's goals. To date, clarification of this noticeable gap in the literature is absent. Society's general features, e.g., its norms, mores, laws, folkways, etc., as upheld and promoted by the family, form the substance of this frame.

Finally, the developmental approach attempts to transcend the boundaries of several conceptual schemes. The "family" is defined as "an arena of interacting personalities, intricately organized internally into paired positions (e.g., husband-father, son-brother)."[96] The

---

[95]Kirkpatrick, Process and Institution, p. 4; Winch, op. cit., p. 12.

[96]Hill and Hansen, Sourcebook, p. 495.

life-cycle of the family (its growth and change from inception to demise) forms the base for this frame. Positions are the main focus of analysis; these grow and change with time. Developmental research, points out Hill and Hansen, implies the longitudinal approach. To date, this type of research has been less than adequate since a great deal of time and expense is required in following families through their life cycle.[97] Duality of position (husband-father, wife-mother) and the effects of time altering such positions provide the frame's central themes.

A second general framework for family analysis hinges on form or organization of two basic types at present: The nuclear family and the kinship centered family. The nuclear family is composed of parents and children and, stresses Kirkpatrick, is universal.[98] Further, Bee suggests that it is atomistic, for kin are not involved to any degree with family functions.[99] Sussman and Burchinal qualify such a conception of the family by noting: "The discription of the isolated nuclear American family system, if valid, is most suited to the white, urban, middle class

---

[97] Ibid.

[98] Kirkpatrick clarifies further, op. cit., p. 4, that the nuclear family exists within all types of family arrangements, whether monogomous or polygamous, for it is the basic unit from which all new members spring.

[99] Laurence S. Bee, Marriage and Family Relations (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), p. 9.

segment of American society."[100] This conception of the family is based on closeness and consolidation of individuals; such a concept is limited to a distinct group, doubt exists as to its reality; yet, it is a widely held and used conception.

The kinship based family was recognized by Suckow who noted its use by the Bureau of Census which defines a "family" as: "Two or more persons living in the same household who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption."[101] Further, the Rapoports argue that kinship based families are the prominent style in American and Western cultures because "longevity has tended to retain or restore a kind of 'timeless' (or at least long-time) orientation to the family as an enduring organization."[102]

Thus, family composition and kinship relationships serve as two additional forms for family analysis. Their full significance has yet to be evaluated. The latter are only sketchily developed and much further work in analysis of the elements, affects of time and value systems underlying them have yet to be clarified, defined and evaluated. These are not the only variations in form that exist for Burgess and Winch point out that families could be defined

[100]Sussman and Burchinal, Sourcebook, p. 74.

[101]Suckow, op. cit., p. 3.

[102]Rapoport and Rapoport, Sourcebook, p. 53.

according to cultural backgrounds, occupational variation, social class, and so forth.[103] Such differences could go on in an endless array. Frankel, however, summed up the issue when he said:

> One of the greatest problems affecting the future welfare of what we choose to call 'the family' is the persistence of the notion that there is one proper model for the family, and that all efforts to repair the condition of the family should be guided by this single conception of what it is to be a proper family.[104]

Hill and Hansen's generalization that a family is defined according to the approach used seems to govern any definition of the family. Two overall conceptual frames were presented here: One based on a specific distinction or feature, the other on the family's form or organization. Many more conceptualizations are possible. The task of arranging the voluminous material available into some conceivable order began during the last decade. Perhaps no single definition of the family can or will be agreed upon. Whether this is an asset or detriment remains to be verified. However, the groundwork in identification of frameworks is laid and perhaps once fully clarified, if such is possible, will lead to concepts widely applicable for almost all situations. Conversely, the family's conceptual reality may never be quantified.

---

[103]Burgess, op. cit., pp. 19-21; Winch, op. cit., p. 259.

[104]Frankel, Urban Society, p. 15.

CHAPTER IV

PSYCHOLOGY'S REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY"

Introduction

The family was not one of psychology's central concerns until shortly before the 1960's. Ackerman's The Psychodynamics of Family Life, published in 1958, represents one of the early works concerned with family psychology. He emphasized the dynamics of the total family structure.[1] Few psychologists have used this framework, preferring to maintain the discipline's traditional stance --that of the individual's development apart from group influence.

Both anthropology and sociology stress the relationship of whole to part (group priority above individual priority). Conversely, psychology begins by examining the relation of the part to the whole (individual influence on the group). As Moore posits, "The relation of part to

---

[1]Nathan W. Ackerman, The Psychodynamics of Family Life (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958), hereafter referred to as Psychodynamics.

whole is not the same as that of whole to part. . . . "[2] Psychology, then, has traditionally differed from anthropology and sociology in its approach. As a discipline, it seemingly ignored the whole to part relationship. Ackermen's work recognized the importance of uniting both points of view by noting that togetherness is the focal point for the development of humaness.[3]

Anthropology, sociology and psychology generally seek to define reality through an examination of specific elements (anthropology and sociology focus on groups, psychology focuses on individuals). Today, however, the disciplines appear to be converging on certain points, each contributing its own reality to the total concept "family." To date, psychology's frameworks remain limited and unclarified.

Is the family viewed as an appropriate area of study for the field? Although psychology retains the individual as its most important element for study, the literature clearly recognizes the family's significance as a small human organization having three features without which individual survival would be at best, precarious. First, the family is an integral part of any operating social order, secondly it has man and societal serving

---

[2]G. E. Moore, Principia Ethica (Cambridge: The University Press, 1959), p. 33.

[3]Ackerman, op. cit., p. 18.

purposes, and third, it is the bulwark of human personality. Families are a part of the cultural whole providing one setting for the study of individuals. Since society influences individuals indirectly through families, individuals in families are increasingly occupying greater proportions of psychology's research.

Psychology repeats sociology's claim that the family has functions that serve both individuals and society. Its societal functions, according to Ackerman, Lidz and Meerloo include providing for: (1) individual survival; (2) intergenerational linkages; (3) role and status positions; and (4) educating the child to fit into larger social orders. Those functions concerning the individual include the development of man's essential humanness, and personality direction.[4] It is a primary social group setting individual direction by personalizing society. Man is a social being. His survival depends on the group; his needs are channeled by it. Ultimately, families make man human and help each one identify with all others. Sullenger suggests that to date, no other social

---

[4]Ibid., p. 50; Theodore Lidz, The Family and Human Adaptation (New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1963), p. 45; Joost Meerloo, "The Development of the Family in the Technical Age," in Emotional Forces in the Family, ed. by Samual Liebman (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1959), p. 7, hereafter referred to as Emotional Forces.

organization has been found to do these tasks better or more efficiently.[5]

The family's individual-serving functions are focused on personality development. Ackerman stresses that the family is the "psychic agency of society, the cradle of personality." Healthy families produce healthy individuals.[6] If environmental conditions are unfavorable, Spitz points out, the child progressively deteriorates both mentally and physically.[7] Families start the child on the road to becoming a distinct personality, different from all others yet having commonalities that make communication with others possible. Because the family has an exclusive hold on the child (at least for the first few years of life), its importance in individual development is clear. Spitz postulates that these first few years of exclusive residence in the family set the course for the whole of the individual's development in later years.[8]

The family will continue to be important for, and supported by, the discipline because it is the prevalent

---

[5]Thomas Earl Sullenger, Neglected Areas in Family Living (Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1960), p. 345.

[6]Ackerman, loc. cit.

[7]Rene A. Spitz, "Hospitalism," in Structure and Functions, p. 424.

[8]Ibid., p. 418.

system for fostering individual growth (and perhaps the best system), although it needs strengthening to ensure the utmost in human potential.

What goals are to be achieved by the field in working with and through the family? Psychology's interest in the family is a recent phenomenon. Originally it focused attention primarily on the individual; only within the last decade has it begun studying family dynamics and influence on individuals. Although families purportedly change and adapt to newly imposed social conditions, psychologists believe that its adaptation has been less than successful, its structure has weakened and it performs societal services poorly. Family studies help psychologists discover what adaptive behavior can be incorporated into the structure enabling individuals to face society's vicissitudes. Such behavior, insists Ackerman and Lidz, will contribute to the individual's optimum mental health.[9] Four concerns presently govern the discipline's decision to turn attention towards families. The concerns include: (1) the need to strengthen the family; (2) integrate its socio-psychological features; (3) understand human behavior; and (4) foster the child's individuality, self worth and growth.

Since the family is presently nurturing individual deficiencies and suffering from feelings of inadequacy,

---

[9]Ackerman, op. cit., pp. 127, 344; Lidz, op. cit., p. 2.

Sullenger posits that psychology's task is to restore "to the family . . . feelings of adequacy and the enabling of individual members to build individual and family competency."[10] Further, Handel suggests that research be concentrated on the "kinds of integration [that] lead to harmony and feelings of well-being among the members and which does not."[11] The quality of the relationship involves adaptive behavior. If the partners use their potential in destructive rather than nurturant ways, the individual's concept of self and the identity of the total relationship is blighted causing the family structure to weaken. Psychology can accomplish the goal of increasing family strength by restoring feelings of adequacy through the determination of effective adaptive behavior. In addition Ackerman and Bee suggest the extension of therapy suited to present family problems, development of criteria for successful marriages and counseling services aiding family members to adjust to the totality of the relationship.[12]

Psychology's conversion from a strictly individual to family emphasis was brought about through the realization that social-psychological forces in combination

---

[10]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 203.

[11]Gerald Handel, "Psychological Study of Whole Families," in Sourcebook, p. 519.

[12]Ackerman, op. cit., p. 127; Bee, op. cit., pp. 190, 317.

greatly affect individuals. Those forces acting upon an organism have equal if not greater influence than inborn characteristics. Both Meerloo and Lidz concur on the latter point. The original concern with the individual's well-being is gradually being combined with the "newer emphasis on the individual among all his interpersonal relationships, especially with the persons significant to him--the members of his family." The gap between the biological and social is slowly being closed. From this combination of features, "a unification essential for a comprehensive understanding of human organization, motivation and behavior" is derived.[13] The major core of the conceptual scheme still remains uniquely focused on the individual. But, instead of the social group's importance, as maintained by anthropology and sociology, it is the interaction of personalities, according to Parsons, which accounts for the social system.[14] Because this scheme is virtually so new, it remains largely unexplored. Elaboration awaits more comprehensive inter-disciplinary research.

An additional need in family study concerns the effects of human behavior on individuals in family and marital relationships. Here psychology and psychoanalysis have, posits Sewell, combined their efforts increasingly,

---

[13]Meerloo, Emotional Forces, p. 1; Lidz, op. cit., p. 8.

[14]Parsons, Structure and Functions, p. 436.

pooling their information on social learning, behavior theory and psychology of the developing child.[15] Psychology attempts to find the meanings behind individual acts occurring in marriage and the family. By understanding interpersonal relationships, Bee suggests, one is freed from the more primitive forces of human nature and can deal more realistically and effectively with family members.[16] By not accepting behavior at face value, a new level of understanding is built into family relationships helping one to understand himself and others to a greater degree. Ackerman maintains that a fuller understanding of the social and psychological factors learned and influencing individuals, provides workable patterns for analysis and presentation of a composite picture of the family.[17]

Finally, many family identities are warped to some degree. They produce disturbed children increasing society's burden. If psychology helps children achieve freedom from the disturbed family relationship, points out Ackerman and Blenkner, the child will be emancipated, better able to see his family problems in perspective, help his parents gain new insights into their problems and break the cycle of

---

[15]Sewell, Sourcebook, p. 321.

[16]Bee, op. cit., p. 393.

[17]Ackerman, op. cit., p. 138.

poorly functioning families.[18] Children perpetuate the family and society. Assisting them to establish more functional family relationships liberates individuals to live in an atmosphere free from anxiety and tension, enables them to carry this freedom into the wider society and allows them to function at a more efficient level.

Psychology, in combination with psychoanalysis, seeks to build a frame for analyzing human behavior and accounting for the biological, social and mental disturbances affecting the organism. If psychology meets the family's felt needs and relieves its tensions, the discipline will have succeeded in building a new foundation for family adequacy.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (What is the family's relation to the social order?) The family relates to society through its affect on individuals. Ackerman acknowledged that social elements impress themselves on families and mold them to society's greatest usefulness.[19] Individuals reflect the social mold when they communicate with others. Communication has its affective as well as structural

---

[18] Ibid., p. 190; Margaret Blenkner, "Social Work and Family Relationships in Later Life with Some Thoughts on Filial Maturity," in Social Structure and the Family, ed. by Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 50, hereafter referred to as Social Structure.

[19] Ackerman, op. cit., p. 335.

components. Parsons, for example, theorized that all individuals value love highly. The value is learned in the family when the child internalizes those expressive symbols which help him to reach toward others and they toward him with understanding.[20] The economic structure, too, impresses itself on the family. Each individual takes his place and supports himself within the structure. Schaffner says, "The attitudes learned in relation to authority, expectations, work and satisfaction will be carried over directly into the future work situation. . . ."[21] The family comes to reflect a social order's ideals while its atmosphere is shaped by the surrounding society's structures.

The coming of a mass society has caused families to take on more general societal characteristics than formerly. Previously, families existed in smaller, more idiosyncratic communities. As the move to the cities began to show its effects, the family lost its individuality. Today, Marmor says:

> Peoples' personalities bear less and less of the stamp of the relatively individualized community subculture but instead become more and more responsive to the influences of the culture at large.[22]

---

[20]Talcott Parsons, "The Superego and the Theory of Social Systems," in Structure and Functions, p. 443.

[21]Bertram Schaffner, "The Individual, The Family, and the Boss," in Emotional Forces, p. 131.

[22]Judd Marmor, "The Individual, the Family, and the Community," in Emotional Forces, p. 107.

Man now becomes more "other-directed" than "inner-directed."

As a unit, suggests Ackerman, the family is a highly flexible and adaptive mechanism, with external and internal elements: externally "it must adapt to prevalent customs and mores, and must make wide and workable connections with racial, religious, social and economic forces," internally it "must . . . come to terms with the basic biological bonds of man and woman and of mother and child."[23] Families wield their greatest influence on the individual during his formative years. Since modern families are essentially weak and unable to effectively direct personal development, they are adversely influencing the individual's functioning apart from the family. Thus, society seeks to reinforce families through welfare and support measures thereby strengthening the culture as a whole.

Families relate and are bound to the social order through their flexibility and effect on the individuals they return to society. Flexible families have the ability to internalize and reflect cultural values through their use of the services society extends to strengthen and maintain them, and the family provides a long term, socially acceptable means of caring for individuals. The family's effect on individuals is reflected in the problems

---

[23]Ackerman, op. cit., p. 118.

it has created (tense, anxious, emotionally disturbed people) which society must somehow alleviate for its own and the individual's preservation.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (Is the family still a strong part of society?) Families exist and are integral parts of any social order having functioned historically for an indeterminable length of time. Psychology accepts the above as a self evident premise. Ackerman, one adherent, says: "There is nothing fixed or immutable about the family except that it is always with us."[24] The family's existence demands study for it is a primary affecter of human behavior. The literature revealed two approaches to the question of family strength: The first theorized that though weak, it still meets necessary conditions for human survival. The second found a weak diseased social unit needing treatment if it is to be saved at all.

The first approach considering family strength suggests that individuals need protection from the surrounding society until prepared to face larger world orders as adults. Families serve in this capacity. They are weak yet still provide the most efficient system preparing individuals for life. Weakness in the family, suggests Sullenger, is due to the delay in adapting family life to

---

[24] Ibid., p. 15.

modern industrial living.[25] Complicated societies require families with a full awareness of the complexities lying outside their margins. Today's families lack such an awareness. Still, they do provide for certain necessities in any society. According to Berman and Ackerman, these include: (1) providing for reproduction and introduction of new members to society; (2) serving as a buffer between individuals and society; (3) molding individuals to serve family ends; (4) helping to develop distinct personalities; (5) providing for sexual responsiveness; and (6) adapting individuals to society in an orderly manner through patterned relationships.[26] Though weak, the family is necessary; it still retains the ability to perform some essential services for modern cultures.

A second, and widely supported, approach to family strength finds that the general social structure is unsafe and detrimental to individual growth and development. The anxiety of the wider world places "an extra psychic load on the family," argues Ackerman, "for which it is not well equipped. It is hampered by insecurity in and outside of its confines."[27] Society's negative influence causes families to produce individuals who, posits Kubie, are bred

---

[25]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 348.

[26]Sidney Berman, "The Role of Children in the Family," in Emotional Forces, p. 53; Ackerman, op. cit., pp. 59, 19, 21.

[27]Ibid., p. 112.

for competitiveness and possessiveness. Behavior of this type stems from families "threatened by a deep and malignant illness, ..."[28] Further, Ackerman suggests that present day families are also breeding amoral, fickle and destructive human relationships.[29] Society is a lonely, hostile place; the family attempts to provide a refuge from the wider world. Since it reflects the social order, however, it succeeds only in developing individuals who contribute further to society's destructive features. "The family," says Ackerman, "seeks compensatory stability in a static pattern but this is maladaptive and predisposes to episodes of unreal, impulsive behavior."[30] Although families are idealized by modern societies as providing a haven for individuals, in reality they do no such thing, but instead, the reverse. Not only do they have insecurity and strife within, but they cause the strife and insecurity to be carried into the wider culture thereby promoting a continuous cycle of insecure, overly aggressive or dependently passive individuals.

Two cultural features bear particularly on the family's ability to successfully foster human development and welfare: the reduction of its functions and the forces

---

[28]Lawrence S. Kubie, "The Disintegrating Impact of 'Modern' Life on the Family in America," in Emotional Forces, pp. 145, 148.

[29]Ackerman, op. cit., p. 335. [30]Ibid., p. 118.

of technological development. Family life presents elements of uncertainty and insecurity to the wider social order. To alleviate these elements, society "began with all good intent," says Sullenger, "to usurp roles of the family in almost every area of life. How-to kits were developed by various disciplines with a view to turning out a happy or idealized family."[31] Usurping traditional family functions has had unexpected consequences. Besides being inexpedient, it has served to promote greater family anxiety rather than relieve it. Sullenger argues that in the past few decades, the family has been overwhelmed by feelings of inadequacy.[32] Removal of functions reduces family worth, individuals are taught that families are unable to assist in personal growth. The effects of such constant depreciation serve to create overly anxious family members and to promote what society attempts to alleviate --namely uncertainty and insecurity.

The second social feature having great affect on families is technological development. Technology was designed to serve yet today seeks to destroy a once viable organization--the family. Machines, gadgets and knobs have depersonalized society and limited communication between family members (e.g., the entertainment industry via television, film and other media has replaced the personalized recreation of family groups with depersonalized others, who

---

[31]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 202. [32]Ibid.

serve to fill the leisure time of separate family members). Meerloo and Ackerman suggest that these developments do not serve to release mutual tensions and force members to find security outside the family group.[33] Society becomes atomized causing the break down of family structure; the home becomes a sphere of aggravated tensions. Under such pressures, members are forced to find satisfaction of their needs elsewhere.

By far, most psychologists conceptualize the family as existing in a cold impersonal society. It is diseased and divorced from reality. Society imposes on the family by assuming its functions causing feelings of inadequacy to develop. Individuals flee from it to find security in other social organizations. A few psychologists find the family weak yet still the best structure for serving socio-cultural ends such as reproduction, nurturance and personality development. Both approaches decry the family's inability to support individuals.

What does the field conceive as desirable in the family? Psychology offers many suggestions for attaining the ideal or desired family. Of these, unity and health are the two overall conditions necessary for a successful family life. Unity suggests oneness, yet this is not the

---

[33]Meerloo and Nathan W. Ackerman, "Emotional Impact of In-Laws and Relatives," both in Emotional Forces, pp. 4 and 84 respectively.

whole of the matter for separateness is essential for an individual identity to emerge. Each member must function with and apart from the unit. In the wider society, a person works at and achieves various tasks--he returns to the family, however, for psychic support. Each person has two identities--his own and his family's. Where the individual interacts with the group, patterns of connectedness emerge. These patterns have unifying purposes, become solidified and personify family identity. Ackerman says, "The psychological identity of the pair as well as the developing identity of each of the partners is the core of the expanding identity of the new family."[34]

Health, the second general condition to be achieved by all families is implied in psychology's emphasis on adjustment. Realistic appraisal of the relationship and open communication are essential for adjustment. On the realistic level, Bee argues, one becomes aware of the partners attributes and liabilities and learns to live with them.[35] Communication, the second factor contributing to adjustment, can be a help or hindrance. For example, if sexual communication serves only to release physical tension rather than express what a couple means to each other, an avenue to adjustment and mental and physical health is

---

[34]Ackerman, Psychodynamics, p. 23.

[35]Bee, op. cit., p. 282.

closed. The family becomes a disunity of inadequately functioning individuals. The assets of adjustment, suggests Ackerman and Sullenger, include fulfillment between members, internal integration, resiliency, effective resolution of conflict, security, and maturity.[36] Conversely, poorly adjusted families are subject to breakdown because, Goldfarb says:

> When a family is held together by social pressures, by individual needs for gratification, and by imperative needs for assistance . . . then the family will be vulnerable to dissolution.[37]

Unified, healthy families are the product of satisfactorily patterned family relations centering on rational mate selection, incorporation of culturally patterned ideals, responsible parenthood and secure children, limited interference of relatives, and provision for stability and crisis. Marriage establishes the family. It is a momentous undertaking, involves a high degree of emotional involvement and psychic reward, and requires a great deal of thought on the individual's part. The foundation for a strong marriage begins with the right amalgam of individuals. One is ready for marriage, Sullenger feels, when he has a clear understanding of what it entails.[38]

---

[36]Ackerman, op. cit., p. 328; Sullenger, op. cit., p. 281.

[37]Alvin I. Goldfarb, "Psychodynamics of the Three-Generation Family," in Social Structure, p. 40.

[38]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 429.

Understanding comes with age and maturity. In our society, this usually occurs after high school. Although many may marry at younger ages, their marriages are viewed as premature and divorce-prone. Statistics appear to bear out this assumption.[39] Maturity, points out Bee, serves to clarify individual judgment which evaluates a mate's potential economically, socially, aesthetically, and intellectually.[40] The individual's age, understanding and maturity combine to help him select his mate autonomously.

Psychologists postulate that two theoretical frameworks govern mate selection: both are shared with sociology. First, the theory of endogamy submits that individuals seek others like themselves. Mates of like tastes and background are assured of having greater unity in their relationship. In addition, Sullenger feels that endogamy ensures the social accessibility of kin and greater marital success.[41] A second theory governing mate selection, used by psychologists, holds that mates are selected on the basis of complementary needs. If a choice is based on a personally felt lack or gap, the individual consciously or unconsciously seeks to fulfill himself through the prospective mate. Kenkel says:

---

[39]Refer to J. Joel Moss, "Teenage Marriage: Cross National Trends and Sociological Factors in the Decision of When to Marry," in Sourcebook, p. 145, for further elaboration of the statistics.

[40]Bee, op. cit., p. 231.

[41]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 433.

> A person is attracted to another who embodies the self that he can never be and he is attracted also to someone who by virtue of his own personality, allows or even helps him to be the person that he can be.[42]

Neither theory has been verified extensively. However, endogamy appears to be widely accepted and fostered by most psychologists as a positive force governing mate selection.

Those marriages effectively incorporating culturally patterned ideals are deemed most successful by individuals and society. Each culture has devised different criteria for success in marital relations. Sullenger and Bee suggest that families most closely achieving the ideal produce individuals who are tension free, secure and liberated to operate efficiently in the wider society. In modern or Western cultures, democratic ideals predominate. Essentially they include the qualities of equalitarianism, altruism and unity.[43] Such relationships are more purposeful, secure, companionable, unified, and adaptable. Families lacking such characteristics, disappoint their individual members and society as well.

Parenthood promotes family unity and health. Our culture, Bee points out, is "parent affirming."[44] Children are desired for their own sake. Parents are expected to

---

[42]Kenkel, op. cit., p. 378.

[43]Sullenger, op. cit., pp. 383-84; Bee, op. cit., p. 139.

[44]Ibid., p. 325.

perform within certain patterned social roles. Parenthood, stresses Lidz, demands that partners form a coalition maintaining "appropriate sex-linked roles, and be capable of transmitting instrumentally useful ways of adaptation suited to the society in which the family exists."[45] Role maintenance is most important during the child's developing years. Both partners function, Ness maintains, to provide an emotionally supportive atmosphere for the developing child.[46] Children are the family's most important assets. Families have the greatest responsibility for developing individuality. To fulfill this responsibility, Sullenger suggests that each child should be assisted to progress from infancy to adult life so smoothly that he has little difficulty in making the transition.[47] Only stable parental relationships can, argues Ness, foster individuals desiring to imitate and reproduce the family life which initially fostered them.[48]

Relatives can serve functionally in promoting family health and unity. They are, suggests Ackerman, extensions of the family serving as identity bridges to

---

[45]Lidz, op. cit., p. 75.

[46]Claire M. Ness, "The Role of the Father in the Family," in Emotional Forces, p. 41.

[47]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 274.

[48]Ness, op. cit., p. 43.

the wider world.[49] However, today's modern families, living in small isolated clusters, require independence from relatives to develop the maximum interpersonal relationships within the small self-sustaining unit. Sullenger argues that interference from relatives in the small family is deplored, for successful marriages are not derived from financial handouts nor from living with parents.[50] Relatives function most effectively when they remain in the background and lend affective support, but do not directly involve themselves in the affairs of the young family. Couples and their children appear to fare better with only minimal contact between the generations.

Family unity and health is promoted in a stable environment; however, if instability predominates, provision must be made to handle crisis. Psychology's conception of a stable family environment is best illustrated in its use of the family life cycle theory. Each individual must pass through various family and life cycle stages over the course of time. The optimum is achieved at each stage if the person is able to successfully complete demands placed on him at that particular stage. Poor task achievement results in disturbed, dissatisfied individuals unable to offer the maximum to themselves and

---

[49]Ackerman, Emotional Forces, p. 81.

[50]Sullenger, op. cit., p. 343.

others, nor can they progress through subsequent stages effectively. Failure compounds failure until finally the individual succumbs to mental breakdown or fosters maladaptive behavior in others through the establishment of ineffectually functioning families.

If families are disturbed greatly and individual members rendered incompetent because of mentally or physically damaging personal relationships, provision for separation of the unit's members must be provided for. Divorce, one channel of separation, performs, Bee feels, a constructive function by ending mutually self defeating relationships.[51] Individual dignity and worth must be preserved at the cost of the relationship should it prove detrimental to those concerned. Other crises such as death or children leaving home, if turned into constructive channels, can help individuals gain new and wider understandings fostering personal dignity and self worth. It is up to the individual's remaining family members and/or friends to help him find those channels best suited to his needs. Each man lives in a social environment and even crisis does not permit the individual to withdraw solely unto himself; to do so is psychologically harmful.

Unity and health contribute to psychology's conception of the desirable family. Both are achieved by fostering conditions that lead to rational mate selection,

---

[51]Bee, op. cit., p. 466.

the incorporation of cultural ideals in families, adherence to parental roles, provision for the child's security, relations with relatives limited to the affective level, and provision for stability and crisis. Unity of purpose, mental and physical health are the outcomes of successfully patterned interpersonal relationships.

What questions have been raised by the field relative to the family? Psychology's literature offers eight distinctive areas[52] of inquiry pertinent to the family. These include: (1) family history; (2) human potential and the family; (3) mate selection and marriage; (4) relatives; (5) parenthood; (6) family crises; (7) family services; and (8) family research. The family's origins, purposes and existence over time concerns psychology as it has anthropology and sociology. Families are the first social grouping to which the majority of individuals are introduced. How it began, has changed over time and in what form it exists at present serves to identify those qualities necessary for man's survival. Until recently, the family has been given only a cursory examination by the discipline. Individuals were its mainstay. It was to this end that the discipline sought knowledge. Within the last decade, however, psychologists realized that a more comprehensive viewpoint was possible concerning

---

[52]For a fuller listing of the elements in each area, refer to Appendix E.

individual development: That the unique combination of family member personalities fostered individualism. The family made man human. It personified the individual. It furnished each societal member with those qualities which differentiated yet identified each with another. The family's necessity over time and its ability to humanize man became the guiding suppositions for the discipline's present interest in and study of the family.

The stages prior to family inception including mate selection and marriage have received a large portion of the discipline's interest. Questions concerning who should marry, criteria for marital happiness, reasons for regulating sexual behavior, and the need for accommodation of one partner to another are major concerns for which answers have been sought. If marriages are established on a satisfactory basis, families exhibit less frustration and tension; the whole relationship is more free. Mate selection and marriage are the core of all that the family can be in the future.

Intergenerational connectedness and parenthood are the logical results of marriage. Two families are joined at this point. Parents can be supportive or detrimental to the newly formed relationship. Modern societies foster small family individuality and freedom from relatives. Separation of the generations is of benefit to both (the new family learns independence while the parental generation can now meet its own needs more fully). When

children are born to a new family, however, grandparents and other relatives may become actively involved with the child's family. They can serve as generational links and furnish expertise as to conduct in the wider society. Involvement with the children of a young family does not include taking a major part in the child's upbringing. But, affective support is highly desirable. Parenthood is welcomed and supported in most modern societies; its major contribution entails the provision of a satisfactory environment for child rearing. Psychology, then, seeks to determine what generational linkages sustain the present family life style and that family environment which best supports the child.

Examination of modern societies points up the fact that families are in a state of crisis. Present social orders are exerting disintegrating influences causing disturbed, inadequately functioning families, incapable of carrying out socially assigned tasks let alone meeting the biological and emotional needs of man. Utilizing this fact, psychology attempts to seek out family problems and determine where its services can be best used. Social welfare, counseling and therapeutic services have been instituted and evaluated to determine adequacy. Psychology seeks further ways of serving and strengthening families now and in the future.

Finally, family research has been instituted by the discipline seeking avenues for family assistance. Areas of concentration include family member roles, personality development, the family life cycle, and more recently, "whole-family" studies. A number of the approaches used have been borrowed from sociology. Psychology's most fruitful approach in the future appears to lie with "whole-family" studies. With its background in personality development, the discipline can make a unique contribution to understanding influence and interaction on individual personality development.

Psychology's questions in relation to the family center on its development, its humanizing qualities, its initial foundation through mate selection and marriage, the influence of relatives and the outcomes of parenthood, family services, and family research. Each of these areas is in a developing and expanding stage due to the discipline's belated interest in the family. Psychology's adherents feel it has a unique contribution to make to family study along with other disciplines.

How does the field differ in its conception of the family from that concept of the family held by other disciplines from which it draws its knowledge? As newly emerging disciplines, both anthropology and sociology saw that families were of crucial importance for individual and social development, while psychology lagged behind

them in this realization. For this reason, the two disciplines have a research structure of greater breadth and depth than psychology. Because the research of anthropology and sociology was at a more sophisticated level, psychology has borrowed a number of their constructs. Only recently has the discipline begun to reflect viewpoints differentiating it from anthropology and sociology. Psychology has reaped the benefits of family research in a relatively short time, for by using the relevant materials from other disciplines, it has been able to progress at a rapid rate. Its research might now be placed on par with that of anthropology and sociology.

Although psychology, sociology and anthropology agree that the family is an appropriate area to study, psychology's interest is characterized by its particular focus on the family's ability to guide and nurture each individual's personality, protecting him from the rigors of the wider society. Its capacity for providing security and promoting individuality demands that all available resources be mustered to ensure the family's survival now and in the future.

Since psychology has borrowed a large portion of its materials from anthropology and sociology, its questions differ little in content from those of its contributors. The discipline does, however, focus its research results on solutions that contribute toward improving individual

and family unity, health and functioning. Until psychology organizes its materials into conceptual frameworks, however, it will continue presenting a conglomeration of information on various topics felt to be of concern to individuals and families.

Psychologists have expended little effort toward delineating the family's future. The bulk of what is available was borrowed from sociology. Although sociology's interpretations of various family phenomena have altered over time, many of psychology's conclusions remain unchanged. The discipline continues to postulate theories based on demographic data that are no longer relevant. For example, psychologists assert that nuclear families fare better without the help of extended kinship relations. Sociology, however, has revealed through research that relatives interact more extensively with families than was once thought. Now with the lengthening life span, these interactions are spread over greater time periods. Yet, psychology still maintains that relatives interfere with nuclear families and should interact infrequently with them.

Those predictions that distinguish the discipline's position from others were deduced from its present goals. Psychology is operating on the assumption that its research will eventually reveal some optimum level for individuals functioning in modern or Western societies. Once this optimum level is clarified, family unity and health will

be more readily secured. The family will be strengthened through a rebuilding program in which its members incorporate the knowledge of optimum functioning. Future families will therefore be built by better adjusted persons free of present tensions and anxiety.

What does the field predict for the family's future? A clear statement of the family's future course is absent in psychology's literature. The discipline has acknowledged its necessity to society and man focusing on the developing personality in particular; its resources are therefore committed to strengthening families. Some of the demographic trends used by sociology have received recognition by various psychologists. For example, Bee recognized that early marriage brings about greater interaction of the generations over longer periods and that families are moving from institutionalism to personalism.[53] The predictions, however, have little bearing upon how the discipline approaches families. It continues to use the institutional approach for the most part in its literature and recommends that relatives should have only limited involvement with small nuclear family groups. If institutionalism is fading and more relatives are living and interacting with small family units, what will the long

---

[53] Ibid., p. 493; Bee feels that young people are today creating families concerned with meeting their own individual, idiosyncratic needs and goals rather than traditionally oriented towards societies norms, mores and laws.

term effects be and how does the change affect the approaches used? Changes in the social order have to date had little influence on the assumptions underlying the discipline.

The individual's existence in a sphere of interacting personalities has recently received some interest. Theories on the importance of interacting personalities have been forwarded (e.g., social orders are not based on the interaction of groups but on the interaction of personalities), and the influence of others on individuals has received increasing recognition. However, research is lacking to date; consequently, the framework remains unspecified. Because sociology has completed and supplied extensive studies on the family to other disciplines, psychology feels the need for interdisciplinary research. Research of this type probably will occupy more of the discipline's efforts in the future.

Additional predictions will, in any event, have to be made in light of psychology's goals since it fails to delineate the family's future course. Tomorrow's families will be as weak as today's for the discipline's aims are based on family frailty, poor mental health and need for extensive services. Human individuality is cradled in the family. It is an interactive arena fostering the unique in man. To preserve the family, preserve the individual. Whole family studies may serve as one

means for lending additional information about the effects of individuals on one another and the shaping forces that result. Ackerman paved the way for this kind of research in 1958. Psychology has yet to undertake such studies in force. So, how the discipline will strengthen families to foster individual worth remains ambiguous. Some optimum level for individuals functioning in social orders will continue to be sought by psychologists. Such a possibility was brought out by Ackerman who suggested the goal of defining, clarifying and forwarding those optimum mental health characteristics towards which societies should strive.[54] Presumably, if and when these characteristics are made explicit, families would promote them. Adaptability and achievement of cultural ends would be attained at progressively higher levels. As a result, individuals would be fostered in safer, secure environments and families would be increasingly composed of those capable of meeting their own and cultural ends. Weak, ineffective families would become a thing of the past.

Having a clear definition of optimum mental health characteristics would permit psychologists to extend therapeutic and counseling services to families. Individuals would thereby be adapted into the cultural order minus the tension and anxiety so evident at present. Today's families

---

[54]Ackerman, Psychodynamics, p. 344.

are not strong enough by themselves; thus, proliferation of services is the logical course for the future.

In summary, psychology predicts that interdisciplinary research will develop guidelines for optimum individual development, ultimately strengthening the family. The family is weak and has poor mental health. But, individuals are first exposed to social environments through families. These negative environmental factors will continue for some time to come. Through the proliferation of services to families, its strength will be restored and stronger more capable individuals will result. Future predictions for the family are unclear; those few given here were based on the discipline's present course of action. A clear statement of policy direction remains to be activated and does not appear to be forthcoming for some time.

What is the definition of the family as presented in the literature of the field? Psychology has conceptualized the family using three distinctive approaches: (1) its institutional character; (2) role relations network; or (3) internal affective responses. None of the three is governed by a highly developed research framework. The institutional approach acknowledges family necessity to society and man--the essential components of cultures. Families serve as mediators between society and man's needs

preventing total intrusion of one on the other. Man's biological and psychological qualities require direction for the maintenance of social orders. Families furnish the socially approved nucleus absorbing the otherwise disruptive pressures of both qualities. Further, a social system has demands to be met. By directing influence towards the family, its ideals are incorporated and accounted for. Lidz used this approach when he suggested:

> [The family is] a biologically required social institution that mediates between the biological and cultural directives of personality formation, and a social system in which the child assimilates the basic instrumentalities, institutions, and role attributors that are essential to his adaptation and integration.[55]

The family exists to serve dual ends; without it society and man suffers. It absorbs the shocks of society for individuals while returning to society those who are, at its best, strong and capable of succeeding, or at its weakest, failures. The family is what society makes it.

The family's network of role relationships governs a second approach used by psychology. It differs from the first which maintained that the family is a passive adjusting entity, primarily serving social ends, and absorbing and directing man's biological and psychological qualities into socially useful channels. Role process, however, finds the family more than a passive adjusting entity. Berman defines it as a "dynamic, semi-closed system of

---

[55]Lidz, op. cit., p. 75.

interacting personalities."[56] The approach focuses on family dynamism--its active characteristics. Individual uniqueness creates an internal role process wherein the values of society are reflected in the family system. Families actively adjust, participate in and provide a unique sphere socializing the child. They remain in tune with societal ends. Each family member learns prescribed social patterns. Knowing and assuming socially desired roles helps individuals to meet the expectations of others and relieves the pressures of disappointment and anxiety. For example, a man's traditional social role is to support the mother and child; a woman's social role is to mother the child and family. Should these roles be less clearly defined by society over time, confused, anxious and tense family members are the consequence. Role performance gives members a sense of accomplishment, worth and presents the family as a desired life style to and for the majority. The family is what society and its own actions make it.

The affective responses between individuals in families (a third approach to the concept "family") controls its continuation or demise. Families exist for individuals and their forms are as numerous as the variety of individuals in a society. The combined personalities of the family group provide a distinctive arena of interaction wherein individuals respond to one another. Each

---

[56]Berman, Emotional Forces, p. 51.

family forms a unique subsystem which ideally functions in harmony with all other family subsystems in the society. The family has its own identity and psychologists using this approach are confronted with the whole family not its distinct individual parts. Should a family appear to be detrimental to society and individuals, the social order attempts to redirect its destructive elements or dissolve the relationship through divorce. Families exist to foster not destroy individuals psychically or physically. Thus, the family is what its members make of it.

CHAPTER V

HOME ECONOMICS' REPLIES TO QUESTIONS DEALING WITH THE CONCEPT "FAMILY"

Introduction

Home economics, along with anthropology, sociology, and psychology, has sustained interest in the family. As a field, home economics draws from a variety of sources those materials that are relevant to families and that contribute to the field's goals. Three sources of knowledge (anthropology, sociology and psychology) have been examined and summarized. Since the purpose of the study was to determine home economics' conceptualization of the family, its replies to the questions will receive additional analysis. This section is concerned with the field's use and interpretations of the borrowed materials as well as its contributions to family study. The time has come for home economics to examine its position, reply to questions of concern raised by the disciplines and reveal its posture in response to these questions. The replies serve as a foundation for the future taxonomic ordering of those constructs used by the field, present a more concise picture of its growth and directional tendencies and clarify

needed present and future research foci. Clarification of the field's constructs builds a philosophical position based on logic and sound reasoning. Armchair philosophizing can serve the field no longer, instead, a perceptive analysis of the use and meaning it ascribes to the construct "family" must be undertaken if home economics is to set a well defined future course.

Is the family viewed as an appropriate area of study for the field? Home economics definitely feels the family needs to be studied. The field has, in selecting this cultural phenomenon as its focus, made a preferred value judgment. Recognizing this Klemer said:

> In this era of contraception, cafeterias, and collective child care, when most adults could live equally as efficiently without marriage partners, the continued existence of marriage and the family as we have known them is a value judgment in itself.[1]

Behind this value judgment lies the ability of the family to foster human-societal values, socialize the child, promote individual development, and perform additional services for society. These abilities comprise the family's purpose in society. Families are concerned with and promote human values. These values are housed within and correspond to the social order's direction. Families must channel their efforts into this highest of aims for family

---

[1]Richard H. Klemer, "The Empathic Approach to Teaching Family Relations," Journal of Home Economics, 57:620, October, 1965, hereafter referred to as the Journal. Italics were included in the original article.

life is, suggests Efferson, so all encompassing that "it might well be described as the crowning social objective in life in a democratic society."[2] Each man is humanized by these common family sociocultural goals. These qualities unite man with his particular cultural system.

Socialization of the child provides another impetus for the field's decision to concentrate on families. The child is so important that he alone could serve as the sole reason for the field's family focus. Klemer and Rutledge reiterated the child's importance for man and society when they stated:

> The only really creative thing that mankind does is childbearing; its only purpose for living made evident to us is child nurturing; the only immortality that is granted to us to understand comes from the children we have nourished, clothed, and guided.
>
> The family is the nursery in which individuals learn to live within the greater family of mankind.[3]

Then too, families shape individuals by establishing man's preliminary direction and course for the future. Without them, each individual would be lost in a social menagerie. Families place societies in perspective and order them for new cultural arrivals. Nichols noted that the social sciences have made this particular family ability apparent

---

[2]Norman J. Efferson, "An International Perspective for Family Economics," Issues in Family Economics, Report to the Family Economics Conference, June 21-23, 1967 (Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967), p. 68.

[3]Klemer, op. cit., p. 625; Aaron L. Rutledge, "Counseling for Competence in Family Living," Journal, 50:15, January, 1958.

to the field of home economics by emphasizing its importance "in developing fully functioning individuals who can lead significant lives in a rapidly changing society."[4] Also, the social order presents problems to individuals. How will they contribute, where do they fit in the wider society, to what ends were they born? Lucky submits that in order to have individuals capable of coping with these problems, the field must be concerned with the families that produce them.[5] Thus, families foster individual competence and the ability to cope with social problems. Additionally, families furnish supplemental social services. These include, says Dixon:

> Reproduction of the species, . . . economic support of individuals, . . . protection of the biologically dependent in both first and second childhood, and . . . education up to the age of five or six.[6]

So, the family's ability to foster human values, socialize the child, produce fully functioning individuals, and perform other necessary social services merits society's support. Similarly, according to Buchanan and Hawkes, these reasons support home economics' interest in families and justify the accumulation of knowledge and construction

---

[4]Addreen Nichols, "Organizational Processes Eliciting Help," Journal, 58:726, November, 1966.

[5]Eleanore Braun Luckey, "Education for Family Living in the Twentieth Century," Journal, 57:686, November, 1965.

[6]James P. Dixon, "Our Changing Society: Impact on Families," Journal, 55:496, September, 1963.

of an organized field of study concerned with its functions.[7] Because family functions serve to perpetuate the social order, families cannot be left to provide their services by chance. Walters particularly feels that the welfare of families is too important to be left to informal training.[8] Families must be supplemented in every way possible. Home economics can, by valuing the family, foster individuals capable of serving society's ends and preserving its values.

What goals are to be achieved by the field in working with and through the family? Home economics has chosen the family as its reason for being. Around it the field has built a framework of theories, content and goals stimulating and furnishing meaning, purpose and directional guidance to its practitioners who strive to strengthen families. The field has consolidated its efforts around service to families. Its services are offered in five identifiable areas which include: (1) the economic progress of all families, (2) restoration of feelings of adequacy to individual and family members; (3) education for improved interpersonal relationships; (4) improvement of the family's

---

[7]Helen E. Buchanan, "Teaching Family Relationships," Journal, 56:305, May, 1964; Glenn R. Hawkes, "In Family Relationships and Child Development," Journal, 51:573, September, 1959.

[8]James Walters and Nick Stinnett, "Should Family Life Education be Required," Journal, 60:643, October, 1968.

environment; and (5) betterment of family life through the facilities of research.

In promoting the family's economic progress generally, home economics submits that it frees the family to accomplish other desired individual and social goals. Until all have an opportunity for an adequate life style economically, the other advantages of family life (happiness, personal satisfaction and creativity) will be neglected. Economic progress is the route to a more satisfactory life for all families the world over. Since the United States has such a wealth of material goods, it behooves the field to work toward making these goods available to all, not just a select few. That which betters the family's life or eases an inadequate condition is held to be good for all families; consequently, the good becomes a standard or goal for the field. Home economists direct their efforts toward accomplishing the goal through social welfare, education and research--all of which serve families. Stewart says:

> The home economist can play a major role in the development of assistance standards [particularly], because of the wealth of technical knowledge in all areas of home and family life which she can contribute.[9]

By helping to erase poverty or indebtedness, Morse and Goldberg feel that family life is strengthened and

---

[9]Alice M. Stewart, "The Home Economist in Public Welfare," Journal, 56:390, June, 1964.

the child's welfare protected.[10] Morse adds that by focusing on the child, assisting in disseminating birth control information, providing educational opportunities, working for functional support programs, and setting standards for a minimum level of living, families in need throughout the world can eventually achieve an adequate standard of living as defined by the culture and the field.[11] Until now these standards have been set for some areas but not for others, i.e., budgets and food needs have received widespread consideration; standards in interpersonal relationships and life style remain unclear.

Yet, the field has not been fully cognizant of the ramifications of those standards it has set. Williams and Sen both leveled criticism at standard setting when they noted that although home economists are "missionaries at heart" they may, in wanting to improve the ways of those with whom they work, set standards impossible to follow. These may be construed as arbitrary, held up as exemplary and imposed on families who have little understanding, need or desire to know the meaning of such standards.[12]

---

[10]Richard L. D. Morse, "Haves and the Have-Nots," Journal, 59:640, October, 1967; Faith S. Goldberg, "Problem Users of Consumer Credit as Seen by a Caseworker," Consumer Credit, Report to a Financial Management Conference, October 9-12, 1967 (Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967), p. 92.

[11]Morse, loc. cit.

[12]Dorothy G. Williams, "The Value of Studies of Family Expenditures in Setting up Budgets for Use by Social

Conversely, by setting standards the field can illuminate or reveal its commitment to service in strengthening families, ensure feelings of adequacy among family members and redirect dysfunctional family activities into socially useful channels.

Economic well-being can restore feelings of individual and family adequacy, but it is not the sole element; other factors can also assist in restoring competency. At present Koch, Walters and Fulcomer verify that the field has been deeply concerned with those families that have not produced "contributing, belonging citizens" or are disrupted by the effects of early marriage and the lack of family life education.[13] Yet, the Association and Keenan feel that if home economics wants to achieve its goal of restoring feelings of adequacy to individual and family members, it must attempt to work with all families since they all need assistance for living creatively in a rapidly changing environment.[14] If families are to live creatively,

---

Agencies," Journal, 50:765, December, 1958; B. R. Sen, "Rural Families and FAO," Journal, 50:508, September, 1958.

[13]William H. Koch, Jr., "The North Carolina Fund," Working with Low Income Families, Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, March 15-19, 1965 (Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1965), p. 127; Walters, op. cit., p. 644; David M. Fulcomer, "What are Today's Families Like?," Journal, 55:698, November, 1963.

[14]American Home Economics Association, "Work with Low-Income Families," Journal, 57:782, December, 1965; Dorothy Keenan, "Exploring Value Patterns," Journal, 59: 776, December, 1967.

what life style will best achieve this end? Families, Chilman and Morgan stress, are important for preserving the American way of life. The family life style best expressing the American way of life is found in the middle class.

> Since the middle-class way of life in our society carries with it so many rewards, it seems likely that the very poor would benefit from child-rearing and family life patterns that are more like those of the middle-class and less like the ones that a number now use.[15]

If all families express the life style of the middle class, including the poor, the family and individuals will have feelings of adequacy restored to them, they will strengthen the society and live more purposeful lives. The life style held to be most creative by the field is distinctly American, will come to permeate the globe and offers the most beneficent way of life for all.

Each new societal member must be taught to function adequately with others, for man is a social being. Because sociability is a basic human need, the field has developed a large body of materials drawn from many sources and aimed at educating the individual for improved interpersonal relationships. Lacot feels that home economics "can help

---

[15]Catherine S. Chilman, "Value Orientations of a Culture of Poverty: The Southern Appalachian Case," Working with Low Income Families, p. 53; Mildred I. Morgan, "The Contributions and Needs of Home Economics Research in the Area of Family Relations," Journal, 51:361, May, 1959.

people learn to live with others."[16] By more fully understanding human development and needs, Hurt feels that individuals are maximized.[17] But, man's individuality must exist within an environment of men. Adequacy in interpersonal relationships helps each live with those about him, reduces friction between men and fosters feelings of personal well-being. Children will benefit from an education in interpersonal living. If they learn to live in many different situations, according to Chittenden, Somerville and De Vivo, they can gain greater self understanding, sensitivity to others needs and goals and more clearly comprehend and live with the inconsistencies of family members.[18] The forces of society acting upon families place many demands on the individual family member often causing him to react inconsistently. If the young are taught early to live with these demands, understand them and handle them efficiently, they will be better able as adults to competently exist in a social environment made more secure through their personal efforts.

---

[16]Muria Socorro Lacot, "The Contribution of Home Economics to the Social and Economic Life of the Family," Journal, 50:635, October, 1958.

[17]Mary Lee Hurt and Ruth J. Dales, "For Effective Teaching of Family Living," Journal, 51:350, May, 1959.

[18]Gertrude Chittendon and Flo Gould, "A Challenge to Child Development and Family Relationships," Journal, 51:98, February, 1959; Rose M. Somerville, "Imaginative Literature in Family Life Education," Journal, 55:409, June, 1963; Anita De Vivo, "Family Life: The Common Denominator," Journal, 55:259, April, 1963.

On the whole, Morgan and Chittendon point out, the field, although advocating the goal of improved interpersonal relationships in families, has done little research in the area. Using materials from other sources, however, may prove to be to the field's advantage for it promotes an interdisciplinary approach. Such an approach uses a wide number of resources which could eventually assist home economics in contributing to healthier, more rounded personalities.[19] The field may provide a more realistic view of family relationships than if it stayed exclusively within its own research.

Improving the family's environment provides another outlet for accomplishing home economics' general goal of service to families. In the affluent society surrounding modern families, home economics, Gross submits, can balance the interrelationship of things with people.[20] Never are people to be subordinated to technological developments. By creating a home and community environment in accordance with those values held by individuals, Downer and Smith suggest that family needs at various life cycle stages can be met.[21] Society could overpower and force the family to

---

[19]Morgan, op. cit., p. 358; Chittendon, op. cit., p. 99.

[20]Irma H. Gross, "Impact of Certain Basic Disciplines on Home Management in Family Living," Journal, 58: 448, June, 1966.

[21]Donna Beth Downer, Ruth Smith, and Mildred T. Lynch, "Values and Housing--A New Dimension," Journal,

submit to its desires, for it is more powerful than the family. However, if the field works as a balancing mechanism, both the culture and the family are able to achieve their goals with reduced friction between the two. Every family, Hodge stresses, is entitled to a decent home.[22] Home economics can endeavor to see that all families have this provision met, for in a satisfactory environment (satisfactory to the family) the ideals of man, family and society can be accomplished.

Finally, family life research can, by concentrating on "perceptions, attitudes, interests, values, family adjustment, family life patterns, home management and family economics, aging and methodology," suggests Morgan, determine the field's direction in service to families.[23] The field's research, posits Tate, can "contribute directly to the provision of good homes," the maintenance of family members' physical and mental health and the constructive development of "pleasant human relationships."[24] And, by studying family development and concentrating a large

---

60:176, March, 1968; Ruth H. Smith, "Job Analysis as a Basis for House Arrangement," Journal, 54:458, June, 1962.

[22]Madeline Hodge, "Serving the Needs of Families in Public Housing Developments," Journal, 55:627, October, 1963.

[23]Morgan, loc. cit.

[24]Mildred Thurow Tate, "Family Life Research," Journal, 51:210, March, 1959.

portion of the field's efforts on child growth and development, Morgan and Bezant maintain that human behavior and family development are better understood.[25]

The field's research, Dawe posits, can serve to "offer constructive advice."[26] If home economics has resolutions for better living, it is obligated to disseminate the information to those desiring and needing it. Successful living at all stages of the life cycle is a possibility toward which the field directs its research. In this way, feels Christopherson, the individual (women in particular) and society will be afforded the greatest measure of fulfillment.[27] Home economics, along with other areas interested in the family can assist, point out Burk, Le Baron, Morgan and Hettler, in clarifying family reality, synthesize and develop new theories for family research and foster general principles applicable to world-wide efforts toward peace and understanding among all peoples.[28]

---

[25]Morgan, op. cit., p. 361; Rozelle K. Bezant, "Marriage and Family Living in the Homemaking Curriculum," Journal, 57:14, January, 1965.

[26]Helen C. Dawe, "Teaching Child Development--Runs, Hits, and Errors," Journal, 50:83, February, 1958.

[27]Victor A. Christopherson, "Women in Modern Society," Journal, 57:102, February, 1965.

[28]Margurite C. Burk, "Consumer Behavior," Journal, 59:156, March, 1967; Helen R. Le Baron, "Professional Interaction," Journal, 59:500, September, 1967; Morgan, op. cit., p. 359; Frances M. Hettler, et al., "Learning About Families Through Professional Travel Experiences," Journal, 60:260, April, 1968.

Family research will define the standards, set the course, develop a framework of principles, and foster a better life for individuals and families.

Finally, the field's major concern centers on service to strengthen families. It offers its services by promoting the family's economic progress, restoring feelings of adequacy to it, providing education for improved interpersonal relationships which promotes individual security, esteem and uniqueness, improving the family's living conditions and promoting research which seeks to better family life. These five channels serve families--securing them in society and strengthening them.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (What is the family's relation to the social order?) Home economics' conception of the family's relation to the social order encompasses three elements. These include: (1) its position as a social institution; (2) its adaptability; and (3) its problems which warrant society's concern. Families are approved social institutions having designated cultural tasks. The Association (American Home Economics Association) is, submits Marshall, concerned with the family as a social institution and with the forces having impact on it.[29] Families have social aims and goals. They are organized and impressed with the

---

[29]William H. Marshall, "Home Economists and Legislation Affecting Families," Journal, 59:642, October, 1967.

need to achieve culturally defined ends. "Families must choose values and aims," says Knoll, "that are economically, socially, and psychologically justifiable and acceptable to society."[30] Additional desires which might be unique to a particular family are of secondary importance and to be achieved in the wake of socially defined ends. The family's course is delineated by society; by following the defined course, individuals can achieve satisfactory family lives for themselves.

Families are also related to society through their adaptability. Modern cultures are rapidly changing due to vast technological advancements. By submitting to social change, the family best serves society's ends. Mockmore and Reid have suggested some family changes resulting from concomitant social change. These include: (1) a trend towards fewer children--society demands that children be nurtured over an extended period, a costly process in modern societies; (2) a reduction in family functions--society has become increasingly specialized prodding the family toward a similar direction; (3) both adult family members provide economic support for the family--society has reduced family functions so that individuals are freer to participate in the social order apart from the protective family.[31]

---

[30]Marjorie Knoll, "Toward a Conceptual Framework in Home Management," Journal, 55:336, May, 1963.

[31]Buena Maris Mockmore, "Lasting Values in a Changing World," Journal, 50:752, November, 1958; Margaret Reid,

Society's influence causes families to yield to its desires.

Finally, the family is enmeshed with society because many of society's changes have created family and social problems. Smith, for example, says: "Residential mobility of the population is a factor which may be causative of and related to many socioeconomic problems of families, communities, and society."[32] Since social change has created a number of problems, it behooves society to seek remedies for these problems in order to achieve its ends. Stewart and Reagan make one suggestion:

> It is the responsibility of public welfare agencies to work toward making possible a standard of living for all people adequate to preserve health and family life, and sufficiently adequate to promote participation in community activities.

By increasing family resources, government programs contribute to the national goal of a rising standard of living and assist in upward mobility of the population in general.[33] If society wants active, participating members capable of achieving socially valued goals, it must support the family. Economic support appears to be the most efficient mode for

---

"Families in a Changing Economy," Journal, 51:569, June, 1959.

[32]Ruth H. Smith, "Housing Choices as Evidenced by Residential Mobility," Journal, 57:39, January, 1965.

[33]Stewart, op. cit., p. 389; Barbara B. Reagan, "The Effect of Government Agricultural Programs on Family Living," Journal, 52:441, June, 1960.

accomplishing these ends. Families, therefore, relate to society through their institutional status (with supportive mores, norms and laws), adaptability and problems warranting social services.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (Is the family still a strong part of society?) The field's replies to the question of family strength are encased in three frameworks. Each maintains that it represents the family's actual condition at this time. The frames argue that either the family is in need of help, is balanced with the society or is changing. Those home economists maintaining the first position base their assumption on certain family characteristics indicative of weakness. Rutledge and Fulcomer point out that today's families are overwhelmed by feelings of inadequacy. They want to feel they are a valued and necessary part of the culture. "There is considerable evidence that a search for identity and significance in family relationships is an outstanding characteristic of families today."[34] Families are weakened externally and internally. Externally they seek a significant place in the social structure. Internally, Klemer suggests, they are experiencing a loss of determination among married partners to stay together. Individuals enter marriage having fanciful and/or confused

---

[34]Rutledge, op. cit., p. 15; Fulcomer, op. cit., p. 697.

expectations brought on by a society and families who have perpetuated a cycle of unrealistic family life goals.[35] Their members grope toward meaningful relations among themselves. So that each family is strengthened internally and externally, educated individuals are needed who can live with themselves, their families and members of the wider society; moreover, Lacot feels that families must be helped to "shoulder the responsibility of developing the type of men and women who will build strong nations."[36]

Finally, today's families are deeply conservative--lacking a toleration for diversity. They ignore the extremes demanded by the concentration on idealistic goals needed, Ingersoll submits, "for the creation of a richer life for mankind."[37] Feelings of inadequacy, internal and external structural weaknesses, the need for reeducation for family life, and the lack of unique objectives centered on mankind's betterment characterize the weak, characterless families of today.

Another perspective on family strength asserted by home economics concluded that families are far from weak. In reality, Le Baron suggests that they are interdependent

---

[35]Klemer, op. cit., p. 621.

[36]Lacot, op. cit., p. 635.

[37]Hazel L. Ingersoll, "Family Values in a Consumer Age," Journal, 53:544, September, 1961.

with society.[38] Society cannot function without families nor families without society. Supporters of this view base their postulates primarily on the influence that families exert on society excluding the reciprocity of the relationship. Each family unit is highly variable, Schvarreveldt posits, affecting society in diverse ways.[39] Its influence is registered primarily through society's economy. Families are consuming and producing agents. Their highly variable desires stimulate product production which creates jobs for individuals. So, Murell submits, "the distance between what a family has and what it would like to have can stimulate production or lead to social unrest according to its magnitude." In selecting from the consumer market to satisfy the desires of its memberships, the family becomes a producer. The housing, furnishings, food and other materials selected gratify individual needs.[40] Families, then, are maintained in balance with the social order via economic support which in turn releases each individual to found his own family knowing that society will support and maintain it in order to perpetuate social goals.

---

[38]Le Baron, op. cit., p. 501.

[39]Jay D. Schvarreveldt, "Reference Groups and Family Functioning in the Community," Journal, 60:717, November, 1968.

[40]Jose Marull, "The Family as an Economic Unit," Journal, 58:256-257, April, 1966.

A third position concerning family strength is based on its quality of changeableness. Adherents of this position suggest that in reality families are neither weak nor strong--all that can be said is that they are altering. Morgan, Schorr and Dixon uphold this position.[41] Culture and man adapt to one another through the family ultimately affecting both. Social change causes family change in a self perpetuating cycle. Families serve to ease the forces of change with their accompanying effects on individuals. Were man to exist apart from family support, the effects of change would debilitate and reduce his functioning in the wider society. Thus, no conclusion as to family strength or weakness can be determined--all that can be said is that families are perpetually changing. Any other conclusion is erroneous or unjustifiable at present. Families, then, can be conceptualized within three positions. Either they are weak and in need of help, are balanced or interdependent with society or they are neither, but instead are changing towards no readily determinable direction.

What does the field conceive as desirable in the family? The desirable in families, as identified by home economists, includes the following qualities: (1) economic

---

[41]Winona Morgan, "Implications of the White House Conference for Home Economists," Journal, 52:507, September, 1960; Alvin L. Schorr, "Filial Responsibility and the Aging," Journal, 54:272, April, 1962; Dixon, op. cit., p. 500.

security; (2) stability and unity; (3) a complementary environment; (4) altruism and maturity; (5) creativity; and (6) physical and mental health, among others. Premising these qualities is the field's commitment to the fact that a successful family life can be enjoyed and achieved. Walters, Samenfink and Moore's opinions converge here: Successful family life is ill-defined by society but worthy of achievement. It is a joyful responsibility that can be realized only through the concerted efforts of its membership.[42] Families are worthwhile social units. Placing group goals above personal goals, Samenfink adds, can help families achieve their social ends; achieving social ends leads to a successful and enjoyable family life.[43] The family working as a complete unit, then, can pave the way for attaining those qualities desired in the family life of modern or Western cultures. The qualities, except for economic security, appear in no particular order of importance. Indications present in the literature infer that without economic security the other attributes are unachievable. The field has yet to define a hierarchical ordering or priority of any one quality exclusive of economic security.

---

[42]Walters, op. cit., p. 644; F. Anthony Samenfink and Ruth Kranzler, "Goals and Techniques of a Family-Centered Laboratory Nursery School, Journal, 52:265, April, 1960; Floride Moore, "A Look Ahead," Journal, 52:521, September, 1960.

[43]Samenfink, op. cit., p. 264.

Until a family achieves economic security, it cannot provide for those additional qualities identified as desirable by the field. Staab, Bonde and Goldberg assert that economic security is the family's foundation or sustaining structure. Moreover, individuals who enter family life should have a sound background of economic principles enabling them to function in an economic environment. "A California judge has said that money troubles produce more family breakups than any other single cause. . . . No family or individual who cannot control finances is secure."[44] Economic security is also essential for mental health. Eisendrath and Bonde said:

> The success of a family-oriented society depends on a healthy, free functioning family unit, and good mental health cannot exist for children and parents in a family that is always living on the brink of financial disaster.
>
> [To have] a balanced, rational system of money management which shows clearly the interrelationship of earning, spending, borrowing, and saving is essential if families are to escape being trapped in an illusion of affluence without purpose.[45]

Mental health, normal growth and development and a sense of purpose in family life are the products of competent management within an economic environment. Lacking this substructure, all other desirable qualities in family life

---

[44]Josephine Staab, et al., "Improving Economic Literacy Through Family Economics," Journal, 54:90, February, 1963; Ruth L. Bonde, "Means and Ends," Consumer Credit, p. 145; Goldberg, op. cit., p. 90.

[45]Jack N. Eisendrath, "The Primrose Path from Easy Credit to Bankruptcy," Consumer Credit, p. 97; Bonde, op. cit., p. 148.

are unattainable or realized at a level far below what society deems adequate.

Family stability and unity are the precursors of successful generational continuity and the social order's perpetuation. It is important that youth understand the components of these qualities and learn their significance, feels Walters, so that mankind can progress.[46] Increasingly, Baker and Klemer point out, family stability depends on personal interaction. Not the interaction of stereotyped roles of mother, father, child but the individuality of each person's commitment to and effect on others. In fact, the individual's happiness may have replaced stability as the highest marital value.[47] Stability, however, is imperative if people are to live well balanced lives. Jewson says:

> People prepared for living reasonably well-adjusted lives in adequately organized and stable families have a better chance for survival when they face crisis, especially since most people have to rely on their own inner resources as they face problems.[48]

Individuals from organized environments are instilled with the capacity to cope with problems of personal and social import.

---

[46]Walters, op. cit., p. 641.

[47]Luther G. Baker, Jr., "The Enigma of Men in Home Economics," Journal, 61:371, May, 1969; Klemer, op. cit., p. 621.

[48]Ruth H. Jewson, "Relation of Handicapping Conditions to Family Relationships," Journal, 55:624, October, 1963.

Responsibility, another facet of stability and unity, is imperative, agree Rutledge and Nichols, if adults are to assume their social commitments and further social goals. Responsibility must be instilled at an early age. Children endowed with a sense of responsibility value family values and can contribute meaningfully to their primary social group.[49] If children are held accountable for their actions while young, they are better able to function in an adult society based on the responsible actions of individuals.

Finally, family rituals provide a sense of oneness which, says Hall, "contribute[s] to the stability and unity of families."[50] Not only do rituals emphasize the importance of family life, but they endow man with a sense of purpose and meaning. Through individuals imbued with the goals of effective interaction, a sense of responsibility to the family and society and commitment to family unity through rituals, families can furnish an arena of stability and unity which contributes to the child's welfare--the family's ultimate achievement. Stability and unity, submit Dawe and Durrett, ensure the child's security, elevate his self concept and reduce his anxiety and fear of the larger

---

[49]Rutledge, op. cit., p. 16; Nichols, op. cit., p. 726.

[50]Ruth C. Hall, Family Holidays Around the World (Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1964), p. 3.

world order.[51] Without these two elements, children are faced with a hostile environment with which they are unable to cope at their immature life-stage.

A family's life style and behavior is positively affected by a complimentary surrounding environment. Downer and Vars maintain:

> As the locus of family life, the house provides the physical setting for man's introduction to socialization.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The house, as well as being a physical structure, seemingly has emotional, social, and psychological implications.
>
> The house, his [the individual's] home, influences his activities, his social relationships, and oftentimes the satisfactions in family living.[52]

The encircling environment encasing families reflects the ideals of the social order. Inadequate environments hinder the individual's progress and can reduce his capacity for becoming a socially responsible person.

Altruism and maturity enhance family life for each member has his personal as well as shared sphere of activity in the group. Marriage and the family involves close interpersonal relationships. Positive relations enhancing the group have the following characteristics, says Carter:

---

[51] Dawe, op. cit., p. 82; Mary Ellen Durrett, "Relation Between Anxiety and Self Concept Among Marathi-Speaking Indian Children," Journal, 57:717, 719, November, 1965.

[52] Donna Beth Downer, "The House and Adult Social Activity," Journal, 61:21, January, 1969; Freda Teitzel Vars, "Factors Related to Housing Satisfaction," Journal, 61:164, March, 1969.

> Warmth, love, closeness, involvement and commitment to each other, while at the same time preserving those qualities of self which enable us individually, to be and remain a person, each in his own unique way.[53]

The goal of such a relationship, suggests Lucky, is a mature individual "able to feel genuinely concerned for the welfare of others, eager and capable of establishing an intimate and permanent relationship with others, is desirous of creating and rearing children."[54] Each person, then, must reconcile the conflict between his own and his group's goals. He must maintain his own integrity and self worth while accomplishing socially assigned tasks. He must be able to give yet retain a part of himself. His giving builds maturity, fosters altruism and enhances personal integrity and self worth. Thus, by furthering the group, certain individual needs are met.

The family is not dedicated solely to the achievement of social ends. If it was, creativity, another desired family quality, would be stifled. Lucky and Liston feel that one of the family's principle tasks is to reproduce and nurture individual development--individuals capable of dealing with social problems. They must be alternative minded and "able to choose from the relevant alternatives in a problem situation that one which gives

---

[53]Don Carter, "Love and Integrity in Marriage," Journal, 59:427, June, 1967.

[54]Eleanore Braun Luckey, "Sex Education," Journal, 61:31, January, 1969.

promise of being most productive in yielding the outcome sought."[55] This kind of person is not fostered in families whose life style reflects only an inflexible adherence to social goals. Hurd says: "In short, creativity seems to thrive in a challenging atmosphere, far removed from the 'dead hand of the past' and 'smother-love' and 'father-brother.'"[56] It is a phenomenon resulting from the individual's interpretation of socially defined role positions. These change and alter with the needs of the time and reflect a constantly fluctuating analysis of the family's purpose. Creativity can be stifled not only by a strict adherence to societal goals, but by a commitment to a singleness of purpose so pervasive as to cause the absorption of one partner by another. Individuals adhering to such a purpose, Carter suggests, intend to seek an intimacy so excessive that one or both partners loses identity; this is not maturity--each must recognize the other's uniqueness.[57] Each family and family member must set aside arenas of activity in which to foster the

---

[55]Lucky, in Journal, 57:687; Margaret I. Liston, "Management in the Family as Social Process," Conceptual Frameworks: Process of Home Management, Proceedings of a Home Management Conference, June 17-20, 1964 (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1964), p. 66.

[56]Helen G. Hurd, "The Square Tomato, Or a Look to the Future," Consumer Credit, p. 156.

[57]Carter, op. cit., p. 426.

individual and unique goals of its members and the group as a whole.

Although the field has been concerned that creativity be an integral quality of each member's family life, its proposals for action have particularly concerned women and youth. Its attempts, according to Rutledge, have been directed toward educating youth to become capable of thinking and deciding for themselves, and educating women to foster individualism by promoting self sufficiency and self determination in their own children.[58] White adds that with the increasing equalization of women's opportunities in society, wives and mothers are now better able to offer their families a creative atmosphere within which to foster individual development and personal inventiveness.[59]

The physical and mental health of families is another desired quality. Families, Apgar feels, want healthy, normal children who are able to function in society.[60] This goal is achievable, according to Dixon, Schaik and Hunter, through adequate shelter and security, nutrition which meets both the social and psychological as well as physical needs and the adequate management of

---

[58]Rutledge, op. cit., p. 15.

[59]Ruth Bennett White, "The Turkish Woman and Her Family," Journal, 55:241, April, 1963.

[60]Virginia Apgar, M.D., "Birth Defects: A National Concern," Journal, 56:21, January, 1964.

resources. Then individual abilities are maximized and channeled from mere survival to contribution and personal satisfaction and peace of mind result.[61] Dependents must be adequately cared for by the family. By ensuring the physical and mental health of all its members, from the youngest to the oldest, the family frees individuals to accomplish their own as well as social ends. Finally, according to Marshall and Ingersoll, the democratic ideals of the culture and the individual capabilities of intelligence (using technology's knowledge and skills to enrich family life), conscience (hindering exploitation) and reverence (worshipping the trancendent above the material) serve to set the direction for a family life style serving both society and man.[62]

What questions have been raised by the field relative to the family? Questions concerning families have been raised in ten interest areas by the field.[63] Technically all areas of study included under the title--home economics--might be construed as indirectly affecting,

---

[61]Dixon, op. cit., p. 499; Theodora Schaik, F.S.M., "Food and Nutrition Relative to Family Life," Journal, 56: 228, April, 1964; Stanley M. Hunter, "Homemakers Name Their Home Problems," Journal, 53:427, June, 1961.

[62]Helen R. Marshall, et al., "Modification of Student Attitudes on Guidance-of-Children Scales Through Classroom Teaching," Journal, 52:185, March, 1960; Ingersoll, op. cit., pp. 543, 546.

[63]Refer to Appendix F.

assisting and contributing to the field's body of theory pertinent to families. But, since the study dealt only with those topics which were labeled by the profession as directly concerning families, all others were omitted. Topics within which questions were raised included: (1) families in society; (2) family economics; (3) family health, welfare and services; (4) family environment; (5) family values, (6) child development, (7) family life education; (8) interpersonal relationships; (9) the profession of home economics; and (10) family research. Several of these concerns appear to be directly related and integral parts of one another. The first three, for example, result from the fact that families exist in a social environment. Their relationship to society poses questions and problems for the field to study.

Families exist in social environments and are modified by them. Their purpose is service and adaptability to societal change. As more and more cultures become technologically sophisticated, the need for adaptable families will be ever present. Change is cumulative and increasingly rapid. Families with a high degree of flexibility will be a cultural prerequisite. The field attempts, through international and national understanding of the family's present reality, to determine how families can best incorporate and adapt to change. This question has led to the development of a body of materials concerned with

creativity and resourcefulness in decision making, management and the setting of goals commensurate with man's and society's needs. For Liston says:

> Whether they are aware of it or not, the ways and kinds of decisions made by families have impact for better or worse on their functioning in society--on the degree to which they carry out their responsibilities for reproduction and physical protection, for affection and status, for economic tasks . . . , and socialization.[64]

The pressures of social modification could disintegrate the family. To prevent such an occurrence, society furnishes economic support and expresses concern for the family's health and welfare. If families have society's assistance in terms of their economic and protective requirements, they will be better able to socialize individuals to contribute constructively to the surrounding environment. The outlook for families will considerably brighten once they are freed from performing those functions concerned solely with physical survival. How society can best sustain families, then, is a question meriting the field's study.

Directly related to home economics' concern that society adequately maintain and secure the family's position, is the question of what is the most conducive environment for that family life style desired by the culture? From the question a body of theory has evolved related to housing and home management. The arrangement of living

---

[64]Liston, op. cit., pp. 65-66.

space with regard to the needs of the family and each of its members, along with the effective use of resources within a planned environment have received the field's considered efforts. Family environments can be devised on the basis of sound reasoning and research to suit the needs of each unit. Adequate planning will reduce the insecurity, tensions and/or frustrations accompanying the effects of poor housing (crowded conditions, lack of privacy, poor location of equipment, or few safety precautions) and create an atmosphere conducive to the well-being of all families.

Another cluster of concerns within which questions have been raised includes family values, child development, family life education, and interpersonal relationships. These four areas are seemingly governed by the following questioning pattern and premises: Families preserve social orders by promoting cultural values. What values do modern or Western cultures advance? How can these best be promoted in families? What avenues for promoting these values are available besides the family? Two outlets appear to be education and social service: these outlets can train and assist families and their children to function in a social environment. The field is concerned for the social order's preservation through adequate individual functioning. It seeks to define those values supported by the total culture which preserve its desired way of life.

Through the channels of education and social service, home economics strives towards incorporating them within all families. From these efforts, cultural unity is promoted and continuity enhanced. Changing values are also of concern to home economics. Should a value no longer merit societal support or be replaced by a more relevant value, the field readjusts its body of knowledge to assume and promote the new ideal: Similarly, the field adjusts to society as does the family. Family life can be improved, but only if families will promote societal values and individuals will strive to foster those interpersonal relationships that are conducive to the mental and physical growth and development of each member and the family as a unit.

Interpersonal relationships have social and psychological qualities. Awareness of the results of interaction by family members can help each person guide his relationships into the most successful channels in turn ensuring personal security and feelings of adequacy. How to secure those family relations which cultivate happy well adjusted family members and the unit itself has occupied the field's interest. Functional socialization can provide the best means for assisting the individual's satisfactory operation in the small social system called family and in the larger social environment. Education and service, then, overarch all the field's attempts to answer those questions concerning the clarification of cultural values, the functional

socialization of the child and the promotion of adequate interpersonal relationships within and outside the family.

The efforts of the field's professionals, in practice as well as in research, are of special interest to home economics for they sustain the field. The education of the professional for teaching and social service along with the body of theory needed to accomplish the field's goals has been a locus of concern. Since home economics' professionals are small in number and primarily women, home economics has attempted to open its doors to growing numbers of persons who can assist in accomplishing the field's tasks. The use of para-professionals, trained but inactive home economists and men interested in furthering family life are three possibilities tendered that could afford the field a wider sphere of influence. Along with the need for growing numbers of home economists, the field has come to the realization that continuing to draw family research primarily from other disciplines provides a less than adequate base for accomplishing its goals. A definite need exists for professional interaction with the disciplines ensuring home economics' contribution as well as its assumption of materials. Home economics must take a more active part in contributing to the body of theory and content concerning family life. Research priorities need to be set and researchers trained if the field is to take an active part in the ever growing sectors of education,

service and research related to families. Thus, questions have been raised concerning how best to expand and accomplish the field's goals, recruit and train its professionals and para-professionals, improve its research, and set priorities. The replies received through research have defined the modes of operation used strengthening families.

In sum, the field's questions have developed from a series of concerns related to families. Those areas in which they were raised include the position of the family in society, the economic support structure, health, welfare, services and environment needed by families to maintain that life style promoted by the culture; the need for understanding the child's development and family behavior, offering family life education, improving interpersonal relationships and promoting family values that will improve the desired life style in the future. And finally, how can home economics increase the number of professionals capable of using an ever enlarging body of theory concerning all families and employed to sustain and improve family life?

How does the field differ in its conception of the family from that concept of the family held by other disciplines from which it draws its knowledge? In reply to the question, home economics reveals its position concerning the concept "family." The field borrows many materials from the respective disciplines; thus, differentiation can

determine its singularity. For home economics to slavishly borrow the research of other disciplines would negate its service and ability to strengthen families. But, distinguishing it from other selected disciplines illuminates the field's interpretations of its own and those outside sources having relevance for the field.

Families need to be examined. In choosing to study, serve and strengthen the family, the field admits to making a definite value judgment. Although home economics agrees, along with anthropology, sociology and psychology, that the family has worth because it performs necessary social services, i.e., socialization of the child and preservation of the social structure; it varies from the disciplines by placing stress on the family's ability to help individuals cope with social problems. Families exist in and are pressured by society. They serve as buffers which protect and train individuals--releasing them to function apart from the family when they are capable of productively handling and solving socially derived problems.

Anthropology, sociology in particular, and psychology have all postulated that families relate to society through their adaptability to the structure. All three of the disciplines present pro and con arguments on this point. Adaptability can have positive and/or negative effects on the family's internal and external functioning. Home economics, however, has recognized only the positive elements

of family adaptability. If families were not adaptable, their purpose in society would vanish, according to the field, for the societal serving purposes are imperative and take precedence over man's needs. With regard to the family's strength, again home economics' conceptions are highly similar to those of the disciplines. Anthropology holds that families are either weak or strong, sociology maintains that they are balanced with society, weak or strong and psychology posits that families are either weak but functioning or weak and producing mentally disturbed individuals. Home economics, similarly, finds that families are weak or balanced with society. But, it differs from the disciplines by asserting a third view--that families are neither balanced nor weak--all that can be said is: they are changing in a nondeterminable direction at present.

Home economics' particular view of the family remains unclear, to date. It has borrowed, for the most part, from sociology's institutional and developmental approaches. However, its consistent use of the latter approach in research and theory building sets it apart from others for it has contributed to this framework with long term regularity. Its efforts have been concentrated on decision making, management, the effects of change, and the use of resources to meet present and future family needs. Individual ability in these areas restores feelings of adequacy, security and competence to families.

Those qualities desired for the family and stressed particularly by the field include two prerequisites: (1) economic support; and (2) an environment fostering the family's ability to accomplish social tasks and promote the well-being of its members. In order for society to have families that produce fully functioning individuals, it must support them economically and environmentally. Only then can the family be freed to concentrate on instilling individuals with additionally desired qualities which are the outcome of an adequately supported family life: the creation of a unique family environment fostering individual security, competent decision making in a democratic society and creativity. Individual maturity is impossible without societal support. These three elements and the priority given to them (economic security and a satisfactory environment fostering individual development) sets the field apart from the disciplines.

Variation in the field's goals from those of the disciplines is incorporated within one area. Although the disciplines seek to strengthen families, home economics has chosen a channel which sets it apart: the field strives to develop subsistence standards and see that all families are provided with at least these minimum levels. Families below the levels are elevated, if possible, while those at the minimum level are encouraged to achieve beyond it. Home economics is future oriented. The decisions made by

families in the past affect their future position ultimately determining their ability to maintain and improve the quality of family life. Families are to strive ever upward. Individuals feel more secure and capable and can reap the benefits of family life if they are able to participate in and improve the life style promoted by the culture. So, the field assists all families to achieve the approved style which is: (1) distinctly of modern or Western cultural origin; (2) nuclear; (3) primarily middle class; (4) highly mobile; and (5) based on individuality, warm interpersonal relationships, companionship, and democratic ideals.

Home economics' questions have primarily concerned the family's existence in a social environment, since it must function in and serve the environment. Society cannot ride roughshod over the family if it wishes to preserve cultural continuity through individual integrity. Therefore, questions of interest to home economics include the following: (1) how to secure the most conducive environment ensuring the preservation of the desired cultural life style; and (2) what values does the culture promote ensuring this life style: To achieve these ends, additional questions have considered ways and means of enlarging and improving the profession and its research. If families are to solve problems brought on by social pressures, the field's efforts must be directed toward discovering how families can make the most competent decisions in light of

man's and society's needs. At present, all areas of family life require assistance in decision making for the most adequate use of resources promoting individual and family health and well-being. The field's questions, then, are directed within the areas of environmental control, the preservation and promotion of cultural values, problem solving, and management.

What does the field predict for the family's future? The family's future is assured, according to home economists. Its viability and vitality as a social institution guarantees its eminent position in all future cultures. Future families will not only be an intrinsic part of the culture, characterized similarly throughout the world, but, Dixon and Moore predict, they will be highly durable, changing in character, nuclear in life style (contact years between members of more than one generation will decrease) and they will continue to preserve the fundamental values of the culture.[65] Since families have capably reproduced societal replacements and provided a setting for the child's growth to adulthood, they will in the future continue to perform these vital functions. In this way their position will be assured and exemplified.

Social change greatly influences the family causing it to adapt to each new force that develops. Several social

---

[65]Dixon, op. cit., p. 497; Moore, op. cit., p. 628.

forces holding import for future families in modern or Western cultures were tendered by Moore. The predicted changes affecting the family were based on the absence of any economic or catastrophic reversals in the years to come. These include: (1) greater wealth for families due to increased economic activity; (2) greater urbanization of families due to the continued movement of the population into urban areas; (3) less time spent in the family by its members due to more women working and society's greater responsibility for socializing the child; (4) a greater number of old and young family members due to the rapid population growth and lengthening life span; and (5) family problems falling within the areas of management, relationships, use of resources, and the rearing and education of the child.[66] The latter are due to the increasing number of decisions having to be made regarding the best use of the products of affluence in meeting individual and family needs. Also, there is a growing need to prepare a child for a society radically different from that into which he was born.

Not only will the forces of social change affect the total family, but the roles of its individual members will be in ferment--particularly those of women and youth. They will gain increasing independence from the family: more women will combine the positions of homemaker-bread

---

[66]Moore, op. cit., p. 519.

winner while youth will be increasingly socialized outside the family. Consequently, both, through these role changes, will be able to live freer, more creative lives within and apart from the family. Updegraff found that since women have a longer lifespan, their influence as grandmothers on their children's families will be extensive.[67] The role positions of youth and women hold the possibility of active change in the future.

Families ensure social continuity by inculcating the young with the cultural ideals and providing orderly relationships between individuals securing the new arrivals' position in society. Because of these services, Reid and Morgan submit that the family is deemed a social necessity.[68] Society and families have a reciprocal relationship--both need each other. At present some families are less adequate than others. To bring these up to a minimum level, alined with what is defined as an adequate standard of living, society will in the future ensure the family's security by providing an economically stable base or guaranteed annual income. Consequently, any family can achieve the culture's minimum desired family life style. And, since society will in the future play an increasing role in socializing the young, in turn freeing family members to

---

[67]Sue Garner Updegraff, "Changing Roles of the Grandmother," Journal, 60:177, March, 1968.

[68]Reid, op. cit., p. 569; Morgan, op. cit., p. 507.

perform more societal services, it also will of necessity have to assume responsibility for the handicapped and the aged. All family members are to contribute to society; a demand by one member upon other members for care will subsequently be reduced.

Adequate socialization of youth ensures a fully functioning, contributing adult. Since some families have difficulty facilitating the child's transition from home to community (evidenced by an inability to function in socially acceptable ways), Miller submits that it will be necessary for society to intervene increasingly in family life--loosening its internal bonds. New devices should be attempted such as "nursery schools for the children of working mothers and public boarding schools for children from slum areas."

> It is reasonable to expect that the community of the future will assume many of the roles traditionally assigned to the family. In fact, to advocate otherwise is to speak for an agrarian ideal that is entirely unsuitable in a corporate, interdependent society.[69]

Society can socialize youth more efficiently in some cases. Each person is assured a more equal opportunity than if he were to remain in an environment that stifled personal growth. Not just the less adequate but all families will, in the future, realize the heightened advantages furnished by socialization of the child outside the family. Future

---

[69]Paul A. Miller, "Poverty Amidst Affluence: An Overall View of Poverty in Contemporary Society," Working with Low Income Families, p. 18.

social welfare legislation and education will increasingly include greater benefits for all children so that a common bond between cultural members is assured.

Finally, Hurd suggests that families of the future will be permeated by a new ideology--"one of independence and creativity."[70] Instead of copying family activities and life styles of others (e.g., bearing and rearing children, owning a home, moving to the suburbs, conspicuously consuming), future families will set their own pace. Individuals will have greater opportunity in the family to create an environment fostering the unique in human development. The greater control through socialization and the provision of an adequate economic environment by society can release the family to establish its own unique goals and purposes in the cybernetic culture of tomorrow.

Thus families of the future will remain enduring institutions shaped by social pressures forcing adaptation. Family member roles, particularly those of women and youth, will be modified affording greater independence and opportunity for individualism. Families will, through greater societal support and control, be released increasingly from the present burdens of economic support and the socialization of youth--tasks which at present occupy the largest portion of their time and efforts.

---

[70]Hurd, op. cit., p. 156.

What is the definition of the family as presented in the literature of the field? The field's attempts to define the concept "family," have met with difficulty. The term has been used in several ways, none of which has resulted in a consensus of thought characterizing a total commitment. From 1927 to 1959, according to Staab, the field ostensibly used the concept "family" as defined by the Bureau of Census: a group "related by blood . . . who live together as one household, usually sharing the same table."[71] Dixon and Schaik modified the definition for their research. One held it to be a "group of two or more persons residing together, who are related by blood, marriage or adoption"; the other used it as "a group of relatives who live together and belong to one household."[72] Although the Census definition has received continued use up to the present, Staab recognized that it would not prove to be sufficient for the field's work because of its limited scope. She preferred to define the family by the "customary usage of the term. . . . "[73] Customs illuminate the concept "family," in the latter analysis. The manner in which

---

[71]Josephine H. Staab, "Research in Family Economics," Journal, 51:257, April, 1959, citing D. Monroe, "The Family in Chicago, A Study of Selected Census Data," Journal, 19:617, November, 1927.

[72]Dixon, op. cit., p. 496; Schaik, op. cit., p. 225.

[73]Staab, loc. cit.

societies' members commonly use the term becomes the definition of the family.

How modern or Western societies define the term family is the next point of order. Those commonalities among all families provide one framework for the field's research. De Vivo, a proponent of this view said: "The players in a family drama are the same in every country, and though the ways in which scenes are played out differ, the experiencing of family roles is the same."[74] The common usage of the term, then, is widely applicable cross culturally, more quickly identifies the family in cultures, serves as a bridge between the disciplines and assists in the more realistic use of the concept. That customary usage of the concept "family" which has gained ascendancy in modern or Western cultures and become institutionalized is, suggests Smith, called the nuclear family or new location family.[75] This concept of the family is representative because, maintain Staab, Moore, Hawkes, and Updegraff, it works well in a highly specialized, technological society, is highly mobile, involves only the immediate parents and their offspring, and is divorced from kinship support minimizing intergenerational interaction.[76]

---

[74]De Vivo, op. cit., p. 260.

[75]Ramona Smith, and Victor A. Christopherson, "Migration and Family Adjustment," Journal, 58:670, October, 1966.

[76]Staab, in Journal, 54:91, February, 1963; Bernice Milburn Moore, "Interaction Among Generations," Journal,

Although the institutionalized family has received acceptance by a large sector of the field, it is not recognized as the most applicable definition by all home economists. Buchanan and Brown counter that it cannot possibly apply to all families because no two families are alike. Besides:

> In the United States, as in England, the family has the care of far more old people than all hospitals and homes for the aged put together. Yet, we have almost persuaded ourselves that our norm is the two-generation family.[77]

The nuclear concept, so widely held by large sectors concerned with family studies, is probably only partially applicable if it exists at all.

Family study investigators have, submits Fulcomer and Magrabi, settled on the conception which employs the family as an institution characterized as "a relatively closed, boundary-maintaining system, whose recurring structural features are position, role, norm, role cluster and role complex."[78] The family which functions under the auspices of society, whose members perform specific duties

---

59:623, October, 1967; Hawkes, op. cit., p. 573; Updegraff, op. cit., p. 177.

[77]Buchanan, op. cit., p. 305; Muriel Brown, "The Growth of Values in Childhood and Old Age," Journal, 52: 412, June, 1960.

[78]Fulcomer, op. cit., p. 693; Frances Magrabi, Beatrice Paolucci, and Marjorie E. Heifner, "Framework for Studying Family Activity Patterns," Journal, 59:714, November, 1967.

and whose structure receives the approval of its membership and the community as a whole characterizes the most useful definition of the term family. The conception combines several sociological approaches including the institutional, structure-function and interactionist approaches, among others.

Those postulating family types other than the popular nuclear and developmental conceptions include the following:

--Hanson theorized that two types of families exist in present day societies. These are: (1) the subsistance family which is "dramatically below any norm of adequacy in nutrition, housing, and cultural advantage . . . ;" and (2) the culturally apt family which is "well fed, well educated, and conspicuously consuming."[79]

--Brown and Martin used the socio-psychological approach (encompassing Hanson's definition within this frame) in their conception of the family. One defined it as "a dynamic system of personalities interacting in a social setting. . . . " But, even more than this, Martin felt that family interaction results in a distinct family personality or identity from the combined group's interaction. The family's individuality is defined and expressed through the goals it attempts to achieve, for says Martin: "We cannot comprehend the meaning of these [family member]

---

[79]Doris E. Hanson, "Which Family? Where Shall the Focus Be?," Journal, 58:777, December, 1966.

roles and their impact on the development of individual family members except in the context of the family life style."[80]

In sum, the concept "family," as used by the field, was governed by the Bureau of Census definition for a number of years. In 1959 awareness that this definition could no longer effectively govern the field's research was evident, although its use has continued. Instead, the family defined as a societal institution exhibiting a nuclear life style appeared to offer greater applicability. Some critics of home economics took opposition with this definition, however, for the large number of families involved in extended kinship relations and living within a wide variation of economic capabilities brought out the realization that no two families are alike. They vary in the goals they choose, the interactional sphere they create over time and they may develop distinct family personalities. To date, these concepts have been forwarded only, little discussion of their meaning has occurred among the field's professionals. Thus, home economics defines the family according to several approaches (which have been drawn from the disciplines) and although devising frameworks for conceptualizing families appears as a problem, few research efforts have been channeled in this direction.

---

[80]Brown, op. cit., p. 409; William E. Martin, "Interpersonal Relations in Family Life," Journal, 52:657, October, 1960.

CHAPTER VI

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE ASSOCIATION'S CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE "FAMILY" AND THE IMPLICATIONS FROM THE CONCEPTUALIZATION

Introduction

A consistent lack of philosophical analysis is apparent in the American Home Economics Association's literature published between the years 1958 to 1969 and was evident prior to this time period.[1] The limited number of studies identifying significant foundational prerequisites lending support to the field has hobbled and limited home economics to cloudy or ill-defined suppositions. Clear statements of meaning, direction and purpose accompanied by proposals for action are lacking. In fact, the field might be accused of resorting to ritualism or word magic in what it puts forward as "philosophical statements."

If home economics is to define a clear, progressive course delineating patterns of action, a critical investigation of its foundations is imperative. Since the field's

---

[1]Chadderdon, op. cit., p. 1, made this clear when she said: "Relatively few studies of this [philosophical] nature have been carried on previous to or since 1960."

existence rests upon the concept "family," it was chosen as the initiating point for the study.

Hopefully conceptual analysis can serve as a point from which richer, more profitable analyses of home economics' foundations will be derived. Thus the field can finally determine the relevance of its suppositions for today and tomorrow. Further, philosophical examination must be stimulated for the field: without it, home economics will progressively weaken for philosophy gives meaning to action. One restriction must be kept in mind when conducting an analysis of concepts. In any analysis there is, Wilson suggests, "no 'complete answer,' but only a number of logical sketches of greater or less merit."[2] Studies of conceptual meaning do not seek right answers. Their merit lies in the realm of clarity and analysis serving to characterize the field's distinctive thoughts, meanings, goals, actions, and their significance. A lack of clarification and analysis mires the field's efforts in ineffectual verbal pomposity leading to stagnation instead of purposive action.

To critically analyze home economics' use of the concept "family," an analytical framework was devised[3] facilitating and ordering the investigation. Further

---

[2]Wilson, Thinking with Concepts, p. 48.

[3]Refer to page 15.

elaboration of the framework appears in Appendix G. It outlines the direction followed for each question except one: the difference between the field's conception of the family as opposed to that concept held by the disciplines from which home economics draws its knowledge.[4] This question selected out and listed the points of difference found between home economics and the disciplines in the remaining questions and simply summarizes those differences. Those points noted can, then, be found within each of the other questions; therefore, the reader is asked to refer to each question specifically mentioned in Chapters V and VI for the detailed analysis and criticism of the selected differences.

Is the family viewed as an appropriate area of study for the field? Few outside resource personnel furnished home economics with replies to this question. Respondents not classified as home economists represent educational and governmental establishments. Questions regarding the need to study families were raised in the late 1950's and reappear in the mid and late 1960's. Concerns of the late fifties centered around the psychological characteristics of the family. Queries were directed into four areas of interest: (1) the field recognized a lack of family theory lending support towards understanding

---

[4]Refer to pages 13 and 171.

man's essential nature; (2) some home economists felt that the family was not uniting the total field; (3) modern societies present a definite need for individuals who are self sufficient and self determinative. The field was particularly interested in furthering individuals exhibiting such characteristics; and (4) families need feelings of adequacy restored to them.

In the mid to late sixties social change, the need for a realistic conception of the family in society, the desire to live adequately and happily in families, the need to value family values and contribute to the family group, the desire to improve the family's economic position nationally and internationally, and promote wise, happily married individuals who stay together, perform parental roles lovingly and work toward achieving a successful family life, even though the goal is nebulous, were additional areas of concern identified by the Association. Do these more recently identified areas conflict with the previous emphasis on individualistic families? Apparently they do, for sociological theory dominates the literature of the sixties. Families with restored feelings of adequacy and which function capably take precedence over individualistic family goals and achievements. Adequate, capable families achieve socioculturally defined ends. A number of reasons may be forwarded to justify the field's neglect of psychological theories to attain its ends. Perhaps the gaps identified in the late fifties were too

nebulous, the field's professionals lacked the resources to eliminate them, they were erased by sufficient research and no longer presented a problem, they became less important, or could even have been forgotten. The latter assumption seems highly unlikely for if the professionals voiced these needs to the Association, one assumes that they were general and significantly obvious problems warranting an increased interest. The first two views in combination (the gaps were too nebulous to eliminate without intensive research) appear as the more likely reasons for a shift in emphasis. Individual determinism and particularistic families are difficult to identify because the commonalities are not evident.

So, sociology's views of group unity and purpose were assumed by the field since they presented more concrete evidence defining the capable family. Sociology verified family worth by suggesting that it performs necessary social functions (socialization of the child, provision of economic support and an acceptable means for ensuring the responsible reproduction of individuals). If all who enter family life would remain together for extended time periods so that everyone is confined within stable, enduring family environments and would perform parental roles lovingly, they will have strengthened the family. Thus, although individualistic families are desirable, the field illustrates its points with sociology's

emphasis on similarity within and between families as reflected in their parallel actions, values and goals within the culture. Alternatives to the socially desired pattern are lacking: One way alone appears open for families to be adequate.

Society needs individuals capable of coping with socially derived problems. Today no family is strong enough to progress through the culture without social assistance. Capable families result from capable individuals who can function because they have been trained proficiently. Clearly home economics feels it can offer such training. Trained individuals will foster and preserve social ends and values. Society's definition of effective functioning is the path most productive for all individuals.

The field's conception of the family's worth is founded on the socialization process performed by families for the culture and the values, goals and services they uphold and provide. Home economics justifies its interest in and accumulation of knowledge pertinent to families on these two features. Socialization and service within one particular culture takes precedence over individual serving family functions and cross cultural theories. Yet, in the late fifties the need to clarify the components of man's essential humanness was the field's primary concern. Even though psychology and anthropology have lagged behind in presenting significant family studies, it seems

that home economics clings to sociology's tenents as though they represented the final truth. From its inception home economics was closely allied with sociology and it maintains this closeness even though sixty-two years of burgeoning knowledge have intervened.

In choosing the family to focus upon, home economics has made a value judgment. Like sociology, it agrees that families have intrinsic worth. Individuals achieve the highest of cultural goals when they marry; families achieve the highest of cultural aims when they support socially defined values. They are most creative when they produce children.[5] The act of marriage, cultural value achievement and reproduction all maintain society and assure its continuity over time. These three acts are the crux of individual achievement and assured success in society and the family. But, what if men failed to perform any one or all three of these acts? Would they have achieved less and/or be judged as less capable individuals; would society accord them less merit; do the acts constitute the family; do they present a realistic picture of the family? Until home economics is prepared to answer these questions, its adherence to and promotion of these actions will be a blind directive for the field.

---

[5]See Efferson, Klemer and Rutledge, page 139.

Sociology's theories for supporting families dominate the Association's literature. Individuals can overcome social problems if they support the ends clarified by the field in the mid and late 1960's. If men are aware of social ends and taught to function and achieve them, they will live more satisfied, adequate lives alone and in families. Families unable to cope with social problems are failures. Man adapts to society not society to man. Man is nothing apart from society which frees his potential.

Home economics agrees with anthropology, sociology and psychology that families have worth because of their man and societal serving ends based on the functions they perform, the support society renders to the family, the transmission of the morals and ethics of the culture, its provision for continuity and order, and its ability to meet individual needs. The latter point has been neglected by home economics. This is true of the disciplines as well since studying the individual in his primary group (the family) has only recently concerned psychologists. Therefore, until psychology develops more relevant materials, anthropology, sociology and home economics will have limited theories supporting the individual serving ends of families. Sociology's and anthropology's views are highly similar. These two in combination appear to be the primary influencers of home economics' thought concerning its desire to study the family. Also, sociology's theories provide the support and strength to guide home economics' actions

in restoring feelings of adequacy to families. Social concerns identified in the mid to late 1960's took precedence over those gaps identified earlier relevant to individual functioning.

In sum, the family's worth is characterized in:

--Its intrinsic worth for society

--Its socio-cultural committedness

--Its ability to function as a positive societal force

--Its accomplishment of socially defined values (achieved by family members who stay together and who perform parental roles lovingly)

--Its reproduction of individuals who marry, support cultural values and bear children

--Its capacity to cope with socially derived problems

Philosophical Implication(s)

Societal support and concern for families justifies home economics' concern. Families merit support because they are subscribed to by all men. Thus, individuals submit to small group ends which in turn submit to ever enlarging groups. It is the group which defines worth, not the elements apart from the group. So, mass consensus reveals family worth.

What goals are to be achieved by the field in working with and through the family? Besides home economists, nutrition and community development experts along with social science analysts have donated resources serving to clarify the field's goals concerning families. Objectives never seem to be far from the thoughts of home economists. Throughout the decade the question of goals received consistent mention in the literature falling within three selected areas which include: (1) seeking the professional resources to strengthen family life; (2) strengthening families as groups; and (3) strengthening individuals to contribute to families. The profession seeks to strengthen family life by:

--Assuring that all families have an economic base sufficient to preserve health, family life and promote community participation

--Defining the reasons for poverty, easing the discomforts of daily life, expanding resources to improve daily life, and rehabilitating families in poverty to function adequately and independently

--Serving all families

--Balancing things with people (creating an environment which meets human needs)

--Promoting interdisciplinary research for family problems which cross many areas

--Conducting research that will contribute towards providing good homes, maintain family member's physical and mental health and promote pleasant, constructive human relationships

--Offering constructive advice and planning for all stages of the life cycle

--Assisting in the creation of more stable marriages

--Understanding families in other cultures in order to build a general base of theory concerning family life

The profession promotes families who together can:

--Create a happy marriage consisting of individuals who stay together, perform parental roles lovingly and work toward achieving a successful family life

--Develop men and women who will build strong nations, preserve family life in our time and adjust to scientific civilizations

The profession promotes individuals who:

--Are aware of their own feelings, behavior, ideals, and attitudes as a family member

--Understand their own values, learn to live in many different situations and develop the ability to live creatively with rapid change

--Develop ways of approaching, clarifying and solving problems

--Make an impact educationally and politically

The resources of economics, education and law supplied additional information clarifying conceptual frameworks concerning the field's objectives.

Home economics seeks direction for providing family services. Its research could supply the direction but to date remains uncoordinated, limited and scattered over many areas. Yet, a lack of firm theoretical foundations has not deterred the field from providing services to families. The literature of the disciplines reveals a family in need--thus justifying home economics' efforts in community service, education and international agencies. All families need the field's services to live creatively in changing environments. A creative life preserves the American way of life. The majority of families successfully accomplishing this goal are found in the middle class. It supplies a standard objective for home economics--the strongest families are those achieving the standard. Since the field supports a particular life style, it is prompted to clarify middle class characteristics. Families need to know what the standard is and how to achieve it. So, home economics has constructed a body of materials that interpret the desired model. It attempts to develop standards of and/or for living which can support families sufficiently.

Those standards that are developed apply cross-culturally, elevate all families to an equal plane and protect the child's welfare. Home economics submits that it can define the standard family life suitable for all. Its efforts are directed toward helping families achieve this end.

The field's research is believed to contribute directly toward good homes, promoting the family's physical and mental health, improving personal relationships, understanding behavior throughout the life cycle, and assisting in the child's socialization to his environment through self-other understanding. Its research outcomes have been used with individuals and families attempting to bring them to the desired standard. Criticism has been leveled at home economics suggesting that its efforts to unify families around a defined standard may be a task beyond accomplishment--forced on people who do not desire it. If this is so, then the field needs to re-examine its position and determine whether the standards it attempts to define are inflexible. Is one standard for all in opposition to its desire that all families live creatively? Not at this time: according to home economics' present definition of the creative family, it is one which achieves the standard. Creativity implies conformity to one desired goal. If the standard is applicable to all, why is it? Is the standard subject to change; if not, why not; if so, in what direction? Are there any families who might not benefit from assuming the standard--can there be exceptions

to the rule? Can the field justifiably support the direction its efforts have taken?

Families are a part of the culture: they belong to it--they serve its ends. If they fail to produce socially contributing individuals, then they become the focus of efforts to bring about a change in their life style. The field has been particularly concerned with problem families who lack the ability to produce competent members for the larger social order. Since a greater portion of home economics' efforts are concentrated here, has it neglected other family types? Is the concentration on problems the only approach suitable for home economics? If all families need assistance to live creatively, is it important to meet some family's needs before assisting others? The majority of modern families are surrounded by an affluent society requiring the field's efforts to balance things with people (man must not be overpowered by the desire to place material resources above human resources). To date, however, home economics has accented families in need (particularly economic need). Yet, the field maintains that it can serve all families most of whom are affluent. Do the needs of the affluent differ from those of the needy? The field's goals fail to distinguish any difference between the groups for they are applied generally to both. Will the minority family continue to receive home economics' major efforts in the 1970's and beyond?

Home economics, like the disciplines, places emphasis on bringing all families under the umbrella of one desired norm--the middle class. While standards regarding the family's material qualities (adequate food, shelter and sufficient resources) have been fairly well documented, standard family interrelationships are more difficult to define. For the most part, the field has stressed the calm--the serene. Friction between members is debilitating. Individuals require tranquil family relationships freeing them to creatively handle society's problems. Individual variability which could upset the balance is to be reduced to the minimum. How to get along with others becomes the watchword for family relationships. Home economics seemingly suggests that calm interrelationships will breed creative individuals who are able to handle social problems effectively. Yet, individuality appears to be born out of difference, variety, nonconformity. These features need not be negative--they can supply each man with distinct characteristics helping him achieve in particularistic situations. Anthropology points out that family forms are based on cultural needs and vary between the cultures. Sociology suggests that a wide variety of family types exist within cultures. How then can home economics suggest that uniformity builds creativity?

Criticisms leveled at the field concern its desire to set standards and a lack of research. To alleviate the latter, home economics searches beyond its boundaries to

supplement its existing meager research. The former criticism has received some notice in the literature, but has instituted little response from the field or effort directed towards relieving the situation. Home economics continues to promote a standard. The field's view of service to families is consolidated around preserving and ensuring that all approach a desired standard. According to the literature, opposition to the chosen course is minimal and accepted by the profession generally.

Like the disciplines, home economics wishes to strengthen families. It does so by exemplifying the middle class and all that the term entails. Anthropology has motivated the field to seek an understanding of the family cross-culturally. Sociology's influence is found in the field's efforts to redirect dysfunctional family activities into socially useful channels; psychology's emphasis on the adaptability of individuals in and outside their families has had some effect on the field. Deviation from the disciplines is noted particularly in home economics' desire to set subsistence standards for all families. Special emphasis is placed on economic security and the family's environment (home) as it meets the needs of the individual and group. The accent in the literature is placed on what needs to be accomplished and what actions should be taken. Although home economics attempts to build strong families, little evidence is presented to the reader indicating what propositions support and verify the field's

direction. Stress is placed at the initiating stages seldom going beyond them. If assessment is ignored, how can the field determine its accomplishments as well as needs? Direction for the future is based on the past, the present and the hoped for future.

Home economics professes that once it has defined the standard family life it will apply cross-culturally, whereas anthropology posits that what occurs in one culture cannot be applied to another without adjustment--it is relative to the particular culture. Also, home economics fails to recognize, as does sociology, that wide variations in family life styles occur within a culture and unlike psychology, stresses the interaction of the family with the wider environment rather than its internal relationships. The field has used the theories of the disciplines to meet its particularistic ends (seeking professional resources to strengthen family life, strengthening families as groups and strengthening individuals to contribute to families).

Home economics' goals concerning the family:

--Fall within three areas: (1) seeking the professional means to strengthen families; (2) strengthening families as a group; and (3) strengthening families through individual action

--Have been derived from interdisciplinary research

--Center around one standard--the middle class which is in the constant process of definition

--Have received minimal criticism by the profession

--Have focused on families in need

--Have been fairly concrete regarding material qualities but nebulous concerning the family's internal structure

--Stress initiating services to families rather than evaluating the field's achievements

Philosophical Implication(s)

Home economics, through individuals and families, attempts to help all families reach a socially desired life style (the middle class). It envisions then, a classless society consisting of family groups wedded to society's dreams via similarity in life style, goals, values, and actions.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (What is the family's relation to the social order?) For the most part, the Association sought replies to the question among its membership. Responses occurred throughout the whole of the decade possibly indicating that either the question needed to be substantiated regularly, the field sought justification for its sustained interest in the family, the question was answered inadequately throughout the decade, or it recurred

in other areas of society concerned with the family and home economics reflected the concern of those interested sectors. Home economics asked the question because: (1) it wanted to clarify values giving meaning and direction to life; (2) assist families to live in changing environments; (3) understand the purposes of governmental programs directed toward families; (4) strengthen families by influencing legislation on their behalf; (5) promote interdisciplinary research to gain knowledge in helping families cope with their environment; (6) assure that all families have an adequate economic base preserving health, family life, and promoting community participation; and (7) it wanted to learn how society affects families.

Comprehending society reveals its values, reasons for family support and defines actions which lead to accomplishing socially desired ends. If home economics can reveal what societal directives families need to meet, the knowledge will contribute towards strengthening families. Since the questions concerned the family's relation to society, the field turned to sociology--using its responses to supply knowledge and theory verifying the question's replies. Those psychological materials and theories used by the field reflect sociology's influence or repeat its theories concerning individual functioning in the family and social group. The field does not expect to undertake the task of strengthening the family alone.

Its intentions are directed toward contribution to programs of assistance and influencing legislation on behalf of families. The bulk of the work will be done via public welfare agencies, additional governmental programs and other social institutions or large collectivities. Ultimately, these cultural agencies will strengthen the family through economic support, provide for an adequate living standard, ensure family health, and promote upward mobility. Fundamentally, if economic security is provided to all families, the other qualities (health and upward mobility) will follow.

Marshall posits[6] that the Association is concerned with the family as a social institution and with the forces having impact on it. The institutional approach, as delineated by sociology, the field's source for the theory, is primarily concerned with individual and cultural values. The latter, however, has received the most intensive study by sociologists to date. Whether the approach is accepted by the field, in toto, remains unclear. Seemingly few questions have been asked with regard to the conceptualization among home economics' professionals. Either it is a tacitly accepted assumption meriting little attention, is verbally accepted or is verbally accepted but has illicited no reaction. Verbal acceptance of the assumption is

---

[6]Refer to page 150.

apparent. Presently the institutional approach acts as one of the guiding forces influencing home economics' literature.

Family aims and goals must be justifiable and acceptable to society economically, sociologically and psychologically because families exist in social environments. Economically they ensure the survival of new arrivals. Socially--they exist for societal ends, psychologically--individuals have the greatest feelings of self worth when they perform, accept and achieve socially defined activities, values and goals. Society defines the economic, psychological and social requisites for families. Are individual needs the same as socially defined needs, however? At present home economics equates the two. The field along with the disciplines needs to separate man from the societal serving ends of the family, recognize that they could conceivably be different or present research to the contrary.

Sociology strives to understand, illuminate and explain societies. Its institutional approach influences home economics' efforts to discover family reality. The field's picture of families may be described as one that depicts: (1) that the family's course is socially defined; (2) that it must submit to society's dictates; and (3) that it is society which must find answers to family problems as they arise since society creates what problems families have. Families exist solely through their

relationship to the social order. Ultimately it will be society's collectivities that restore strength of them; individuals can do little to reinforce the family's position except live and cope with societal inconsistencies.

Home economics uses anthropology's theory that family types result from the cultural needs of the time, sociology's premise that families exist to preserve society and order it for individuals and psychology's theory that families live in negative, problematic societies. Adaptability, according to the field, is imperative for the family's survival. While the disciplines present positive and negative arguments[7] in relation to family adaptability, home economics view is exclusively positive. Any failure on the part of the family to adapt to society reduces its effectiveness and cultural importance. Further, the field gives little recognition to conceptualizations of the family other than the predominant institutional approach, nor does it furnish evidence that families are more than cultural groupings forming unified wholes. The field's view is group oriented with the cultural group predominating

---

[7]Anthropology: Disagreement exists between anthropologists as to whether the family has an independent as well as dependent character within a social framework.

Sociology: The degree of social control exerted on families is relative and dependent upon time, place and societal need.

Psychology: Families characteristically are described as highly flexible and adaptive mechanisms; yet, today's families are producing unstable, unhappy, ineffectively functioning individuals indicating a basic defect in their professed pliancy and submissiveness to society.

over the small family group. And, the larger the group the stronger its influence and more important its goals and objectives.

Home economics' conception of the family in relation to society:

--Is founded primarily upon sociology's theoretical constructs

--Finds that families exert little influence upon their culture

--Asserts that the family's main task is to submit to society's demands although the demands may be structurally or functionally damaging

--Finds that the weak families in modern or Western cultures must have their problems solved by the society which caused them

--Suggests that family aims and goals must be sociologically, economically and psychologically justifiable and accepted by society because families exist and must survive in social environments

--Finds that families exist in problematic environments

--Posits that the Association is concerned with the family as a social institution (interested primarily in individual and cultural values)

Philosophical Implication(s)

Families are meshed with society; their only recourse for survival is to ensure society's survival. Even if families were to perish while attempting to maintain society, they could accomplish no more worthwhile end than cultural perpetuation.

How relevant is the family to the social order as viewed by the field? (Is the family still a strong part of society?) Home economics along with representatives from national and international organizations contributed replies to the Association's question concerning family strength. Statements occurred in the late fifties and throughout the 1960's with the latest entry recorded in 1968. Circumstances which required the repeated verification of the question were contained in the following categories:

The profession's desire to restore feelings of adequacy to the family; procedures for action included:

--Helping families live in scientific civilizations
--Helping families provide an atmosphere promoting the individual's normal growth and development
--Making modern families aware of social change so that all can participate and adapt to it
--Providing services to those families who need help or whose overall needs are not being met

--Helping women function efficiently in the modern world by training them to save time and increase the comfort of their homes for their families

--Helping children realize their full potential by assuring that all families will have their health, safety, housing, nutritional, and economic needs adequately met

--Establishing a foundation of interdisciplinary research to accomplish and support these tasks

The desire to preserve family life in the present; procedures for action included:

--Helping families make a greater social impact politically and educationally

--Assisting in the development of men and women who can and will build strong nations

--Helping young people understand the fundamental values of the United States

--Determining relevant values for the future based on man's needs

--Accepting certain societal changes and their effects on families as inevitable while striving to make change where change can be made

--Promoting behaviors that do not weaken the family

These two categories illuminate home economics' approach to questions concerning the family's strength.

One defines the routes the field will use to exert influence on the family (education, public welfare, social service agencies, and research) and the other--how it will preserve families and afford them a position of continued strength in society. Besides the resources of the disciplines, the field's professionals sought additional background information and theory from the health professions and economics to support their replies.

Three theories of family strength were apparent in the literature: The family was either socially weak, interdependent and balanced or existed under changing conditions. The first position was based primarily on psychology's tenets. The second position stressed the man and societal serving functions of families as do the three disciplines (necessitating a coordinated effort between society and the family in order to maintain the social structure). And the third position stressed that families exist in, exert pressure on and are pressured in return by societies. Thus they are changing due to internal and external pressures. Proponents of each position postulated that their theory obligated home economics to accomplish its "desired" ends (restore feelings of adequacy to the family and preserve family life in the present). If families are weak, then the field's "desires" appear logical since its procedures for action are designed to accomplish specific ends. If families are balanced with society, again the field's actions are warranted because seemingly

any balance can be easily upset under changing social conditions. But, if the family is only changing in no readily determinable direction, then home economics' "desires" are unfounded and its designs for action--groundless. For if no direction can be determined, why has home economics designed procedures for action? A closer inspection as to when the theories were postulated reveals that the weak family guided home economics' thinking between the years 1958-1965; the changing family was postulated between 1960-1963; and the balanced family was suggested between 1967-1968. The conclusion drawn from the examination is, then, that at the present time the balanced family guides home economics' thinking and is regarded as having greater relevance for today than either of the two previously postulated theories.

In addition, the arguments presented in support of the weak family no longer appear to be readily applicable. Those supporting the position based their postulates on the family's existing societal status which suggested the following characteristics: (1) partners no longer exhibited a desire to stay together; (2) society was breeding unsuccessful families based on unrealistic family life goals; and (3) families were deeply conservative, lacked a toleration for diversity and were not dedicated to the necessary idealistic goals leading to mankind's betterment. Sociology has suggested that the increasing frequency of divorce can be viewed in two contexts (positively and

negatively). The manner in which the home economics data are phrased exhibits a distinct tendency for the reader to assume that if partners do not stay together, families are weakened. Home economics recognized no beneficial effects from divorce. Then too, the family's lack of diversity and failure to assume some idealistic goal is suggested as further evidence of weakness. Since families are institutions, can institutions be highly diverse when they are based on norms? If families are concerned with values that serve as directional foci (as home economics' assumption of the position and sociology's use of the term implies) the answer is no for what is institutionalized is held as a cultural standard.

Does the field actually strive toward achieving family diversity? No, for if it seeks to preserve family life in the present, it is striving to define the common values applicable to all families and which all individuals can subscribe too. Further, if families must develop men and women who can build strong nations, does this suggest diversity and a lack of conservatism? This is highly unlikely. What values are common to all have been established over a long term period and are not considered to be radical or demand idealistic support, nor to be diverse or significantly different. If home economics' upholds the family as an institution, it is supporting an organized pattern of behavior that is well accepted. The support negates diversity or the need to couch values in terms of

idealistic achievement. The ideal is actually a cultural norm. Thus the weak family and the changing family are supported by arguments that are in direct opposition to the field's actions.

Home economics suggests only three positions of family strength while more are apparent in the disciplines. Either the field ignores the fact that others exist, finds that no other views are as acceptable to it as the three presented or that the positions selected present the most pertinent representations of family reality in modern or Western societies. Two of the positions (the weak family and the balanced family) fail to recognize that other views exist or that the Association has presented more than one concept defining the family's strength. The third position (the changing family) recognizes that other outlooks are possible but stresses that its position is the only tenable one. Supporters of each position suggest no counter arguments that would establish a firm base justifying their stance. Each argument by itself appears to present a logical whole. In revealing that three positions do exist in the literature, however, the foundations of each argument then seem to contradict one another.

The disciplines and home economics hold that families exhibit varying degrees of strength. Anthropology finds the family to be either weak or strong; sociology suggests that the family is weak, strong or balanced with society; psychology finds that either the family is weak

but still capable of performing necessary societal functions or weak and affecting the individual negatively. Home economics selects psychology's conception of the weak but still capable family and sociology's balanced family. The third view (the changing family) lacks sufficient elaboration in the materials reviewed to indicate the source of the theory. Presumably, since sociology has been concerned with the effects of social change on institutions, it is the most likely source. Conversely, the theory could belong uniquely to home economics. Positions other than the three mentioned previously receive no recognition in the Association's literature during the time the review was conducted.

The field does not believe that families will eventually disintegrate nor does it give recognition to the possibility that the present family life style could have caused the existing modern or Western cultural organization to develop (source--anthropology). It fails to verbalize that families are the least organized and able to set their own standards (source--sociology) although the field's actions indicate that it operates on the suggested premise. What strength the family has is entailed in its functions and services. Other areas of strength remain unidentified. Dissension exists between the three approaches; each alone leads the reader to believe that it has the true representation of family strength.

Home economics' position concerning family strength:

--Evolved from the field's desire to restore feelings of adequacy to families and preserve family life in the present

--Is characterized within three positions--the weak family, the balanced family, and the changing family

--Suggests that arguments supporting the weak and changing family types contradict home economics' desires and actions

--Suggests that each position fails to clarify the others existence in the disciplines and within the Association's literature

--Suggests that the balanced family is the predominant position guiding the field at the present time

--Suggests that two positions (the changing family and the balanced family) are drawn from sociological and anthropological materials; arguments for the weak family are based on the tenets of psychology

Philosophical Implication(s)

The family's strength has been subjected to several interpretations. Home economics has not specifically evaluated the merits of any one position. Thus its

interpretations remain confused and nonspecific. Until its position is clarified, the field will be unable to obtain a concise picture of the family's reality in modern or Western cultures.

What does the field conceive as desirable in the family? Assistance contributing toward a response field defining the desirable in families was offered to home economics from sociologists, lawyers, the health professions, and governmental agencies. Professional home economists also contributed an imposing amount of material. Relevant statements recurred throughout the decade appearing in the literature almost every year since 1958. The responses fell into three distinct categories which have directed the field's efforts: (1) defining the successful family; (2) devising guidelines for professional action; and (3) clarifying individual action strengthening family life. Elements comprising each of the areas included the following:

The successful family:

--A successful family is one which is: (1) healthy mentally and physically; (2) challenging and creative in its environment; (3) competent; (4) values its role in society; (5) evolves as society evolves; and (6) expresses democratic ideals.

Guidelines directing the field's actions included:

--Composing a realistic picture of the family

--Developing adequate conceptual frameworks organizing, defining and directing the field's goals

--Taking cognizance of families throughout the world

--Serving as a balancing mechanism between the family and society

--Preserving values significant for home life

--Determining values relevant for the present and future functioning of families based on man's needs

--Considering actions of the whole family not just women and youth

--Promoting behaviors that do not weaken the family

--Providing education for family living

Individuals who strengthen family life:

--Are educated, wise, happily married, have a stable relationship, perform parental roles lovingly, and work towards achieving a successful family life

--Meet the developmental needs of their children, view their children positively and use scientific methods of child rearing

--Understand economic principles and can function within an economic environment

--Use available resources to achieve optimum family welfare

--Have a value system that will sustain and direct long term and daily goals

--Function adequately and independently

--Understand social change and can adjust to or modify trends that occur

--Are able to psychologically cope with handicapping conditions

--Are self determinative and self sufficient

--Are mature (concerned with the welfare of others, capable of establishing intimate and permanent relationships with others and unite to create and rear children)

--Are realistic in the appraisal of their family life (do not over-romanticize family life)

The field constructed its frameworks from the resources of the three disciplines plus information from literature, mental health and economics.

Society, submits home economics, needs stable, unified and responsible families. Stable families have partners who remain together over the life cycle (from marriage until death) promoting generational continuity and societal progression. Unified families place group ends above individual ends. Families react as units in a concerted effort to maintain a firm position in society

and reap the benefits therefrom. Responsible families are intermeshed with society via the contributing individuals they produce. Individuals function alone and in conjunction with their families as economic units. Home economics upholds those families who conform to this suggested norm. If they comply with the described model, society will then consist of units, each directed towards a single goal, cultural progression. If families further societal progress, is the progress in a forward direction and is the forward direction solely positive? Home economics' literature suggests that it is. But, if progress is solely positive, then empires would cease to fall since families advance society ever upward. Do families serve to repress a culture? Can the ideals they maintain weaken as well as advance societies? Are the concepts of stability, unity and responsibility to take priority over others?

Examining the family's history and contributions in other cultures could supply answers to some of these questions. The traditional Chinese aristocratic family, one example, presents the overall picture of a group oriented to upholding custom, venerating the aged and adhering to the old and tried. This family life style prevented people from assuming the advances of technology. When the traditional government was overthrown, the large family's importance was reduced: peasant families wedded to the new and desiring to assume technological innovation, if possible, became the norm. The traditional family upheld

a cultural way of life that would be stifling to modern or Western cultures with their emphasis on progress and change. Yet, home economics suggests that the family life style it presently promotes is the most desirable. Continuing to uphold this view has drawbacks. It limits home economics' flexibility when changes surge over the culture bringing trends that could oppose what it now professes to be the most desirable. The field asks that individuals be alternative minded--able to see where their choices take them--yet does not take its own advice. Should a new family life style take precedence in the culture, will the field do an about face and drop many of its former directives? An awareness of alternative directional foci could help the field present a more objective view of its professed norm.

Families produce healthy, normal individuals if their needs relative to adequate shelter and nutrition are met and they can effectively manage their resources assuring the greatest benefit to all members. Firm family foundations promoting stability, organization and unity are built from these satisfied needs. If the family's foundations are secure, the individual is free to face his environment creatively: he can begin satisfying his personal needs, he can look outward and need not cling to the group for survival, he can stand alone and solve the problems society presents to him. And he can branch out into new arenas of activity allowing the expression of his distinct personality. Home economics strives to secure

the foundation for all families. Some families may have had this need met. For example, personal happiness now appears to be taking precedence over the need to sustain a strong foundation; then too, some families are surrounded by affluence without purpose--for them the foundation exists but to what end? Neither of these trends has received extensive thought. Home economics interests are directed predominantly toward sustaining the foundation and fail to account for the possibility of variation.

The environment creates unpredictable pressures and problems which weigh in on family members. If all men are the product of a healthy, normal family life and are trained to think and decide apart from the group, strong families will result. Individuals in modern or Western societies are required to manage independently within a socially defined structure. Society, via families, trains its membership to manage with a certain degree of independence. Individuals are allowed to sustain their own particular family units provided they serve society (return individuals to it that are capable of coping with social alternatives). The field, while looking at the environment generally, has focused in on the small unit encasing families--the home. Efforts have been concentrated on helping women and youth succeed in understanding and manipulating their surroundings. With an adequate foundation provided for families (involving health and normalcy)

and the individual's ability to make competent decisions, families need be less concerned with survival.

The field's efforts are directed toward clarifying an environment that can never be known since it is always changing. It looks to women and youth in the homes of today to strengthen the homes to tomorrow by providing a socioculturally desired life style. Thus all families are assured an equal base from which to select alternative routes leading towards social mastery. Home economics neglects the male's role to the degree that he is practically nonexistent. However, this circumstance may be explained by the fact that most families in modern societies are connected to it through the husbands efforts in the economy. Thus, men are absent from the home for a greater part of the day leaving its maintenance to women and youth. Since home economics works to strengthen families who exist in units tied to yet set apart from society, it is faced with absentee males.[8] Understanding the affective factors prevalent in society gives impetus to the field's research efforts. A clear conception of all factors remains unknown and only further study will reveal an ever enlarging number of environmental characteristics maximizing or influencing families.

---

[8]Also the fact that the field has been accused of female predominance is duly noted as an additional factor for excluding males from the fields's programs for action.

Families reflect the political ideology of the surrounding culture. Home economics idealizes those families that express such ideals as the following: (1) equality in the partner's relationship; (2) empathy; (3) a committed partnership; and (4) the assumption of parental roles which frees the child to transfer successfully from his family to the wider society. Individuals from democratically oriented families are intelligent (can survive in technologically skilled environments and manipulate them for the family's benefit), they do not misuse the resources of the culture and they live for more than the accumulation of material objects. What society promotes as the standard norm, home economics elevates to a trancendent state. What all men do is held out as the highest of goals for all men. Can the real be equated with the ideal?

Knowledge and theory from a variety of sources have helped home economics construct a reply to the question of the desirable in families. The field has done little beyond recognizing that alternatives to its conceptions exist. Exacting research helping to clarify these deviations and their relevance to the field is absent, e.g., personal happiness transcending the "desired" stability, or the accumulation of things taking precedence over the socially defined "desired" family norms. These qualities may exist, but they do not preclude the field's existing emphasis on providing the family's foundation. They may have import but not enough to warrant a change in emphasis. What has

served the field in the past stands to serve it in the future. Certainly what it has accomplished within its presently defined areas of emphasis cannot be negated. But, if new foundational guidelines already exist, can the field fail to ignore them? Will it close off new emphases in order to maintain the old, the known and the secure? Will it fail to discard what may no longer be serviceable?

Conceptions of the desirable vary little between the disciplines and home economics. All suggest that families have man and societal serving functions and that the ideal family, though worth striving for, is nebulous and difficult to define. Variations arise in the field's use of the materials borrowed from the disciplines. Particular emphasis has been placed on assuring that all families are supplied with a firm foundation of sufficient resources, shelter, health, and normalcy. But, the disciplines are concerned with clarifying universals, defining the social environment and understanding the internal environment of families. The field's activities have been directed mainly toward women and youth and have stressed social functioning above individual functioning in groups. The style of family life delineated in the literature is held applicable to all. Its distinctiveness to modern or Western cultures receives no recognition. Stability and unity are stressed --divorce is negative. Yet, the disciplines present both positive and negative views concerning the subject.

A unified whole characterizes home economics' conception of the desirable in families--few conflicting points appear in the literature; those that do, receive only brief mention. The field's use of the material drawn from the disciplines falls within a consistent framework characterized by a distinct concern with decision making, management of resources and the necessity that all families be supplied with an adequate economic base.

Home economics' conception of the desirable in families suggests that:

--Desirable families are stable, unified and responsible to society
  --Stability promotes societal progression
  --Unified families reap social benefits by placing group goals above individual goals
  --Responsible families produce capably functioning individuals for the social order
--Desirable families are similar in all cultures
--Few alternatives to the desirable exist
--Desirable families produce healthy, normal individuals if their needs relative to adequate shelter, nutrition and resources are met
  --If the foundation is supplied to all families, then individuals are freed to satisfy their needs

--Individuals who are products of healthy normal families are trained to be self sufficient and self determinative

--By clarifying the effects of the environment on individuals and families, the field can train individuals to live within or alter their environments for the family's benefit

--The field looks primarily to the women and youth of today to strengthen the homes of tomorrow

--The field idealizes those families reflecting democratic ideals, equality in the marital partnership, child rearing patterns that free the child to transfer successfully from the family to the wider society, and who produce individuals able to function in technological environments and use and amass resources prudently.

Philosophical Implication(s)

Home economics' conception of the desirable in families is particularly applicable to modern or Western cultures although it has applied its tenets cross-culturally. Its theories are relatively concise and directive. They set a clear course of action for the field at this time.

What questions have been raised by the field relative to the family? Home economics exists because families exist: the field has dedicated a program of action to them. Modern and Western cultures need families and the

field's services directed at strengthening them. Maintaining society now and in the future depends on family maintenance. Thus, three lines of activity occupying the field's efforts to bridge the gap between theory and reality include: (1) broadening home economics' influence in order to reach ever increasing numbers of families. Emphasis rests on enlarging the professional ranks, furthering the field's objectives and focusing on interdisciplinary research as a means of supplying more extensive materials for the field's use; (2) sustaining societal support for families--particularly isolating that environment most conducive to family life physically, socially and psychologically; and (3) promoting family adaptability to social change.

Families provide the canvas for society's structural artisans. They are built upon cultural values--sustaining them through their interpersonal relationships. Values counter to society's retard family growth physically and mentally and may even disband the unit. The family's course is predetermined socially. Cultural values provide life's meaning. Revealing what they are becomes a clear directive for the field. For now, home economics advances the following: (1) family life is valuable, it fosters individual competence and the ability to cope with social problems; (2) families exist to achieve socially defined ends; (3) that family life style upheld in modern or Western cultures will serve as a cross-cultural standard;

(4) family life can be planned for and made purposeful and significant; (5) families require adequate economic support freeing them to seek other qualities such as creativity, security and democratic decision making. These are only a few that have been revealed in the literature of the Association. Whether all these values are promoted with equal emphasis or one has priority over another remains undetermined. Then too, do they receive similar emphasis throughout modern or Western cultures or do they vary from practitioner to practitioner--does the field function in its task of promoting societal values as a unit or a group of individuals each dedicated to a particular cause?

What consociation exists between home economics' values and social factuality--is there a discrepancy between the two? Is the field a leader or follower of social values? In reference to the latter question, undoubtedly it is a follower. Home economics looks to society to confirm the values it promotes. Consequently there is a time lag between what is socially desired and the field's advancement of those desires. Home economics is less likely to promote emerging values as opposed to those which are firmly entrenched and verbalized as cultural guides.

The field is called upon to help families become more adaptable since society is ever changing. Modern or Western societies are becoming more technologically complex. Society needs members who are trained for this

complexity. To accomplish such a task, home economics examines and reveals what social changes have taken place and are occurring at the present time. Families aware of social tendencies are more adaptable. Uniformed families become confused and less responsive to the culture. Revealing social direction helps them change. They are better able to function and manipulate social resources and are stronger than the untrained. Today's families cannot be self sufficient--they are too interconnected with society to stand apart from their surroundings; they are in and part of the social order; they cannot hold back the rising tide of technology; they must equip their members with an increasingly complex social awareness. Individuals must be oriented to others. Ultimately only the adaptable will survive.

Although some proponents of family strength stress that they may be effecters as well as affected cultural elements--home economics emphasizes the latter giving questions of change priority in the literature. Are other alternatives open to families beyond the one? Is flexibility the only route to future survival? Could the family exert its influence conceivably changing social direction? Clearly, at this point in time, the possibility has occurred to only a handful of the field's contributors. For the majority of home economists, the only recourse for strengthening families is to reduce their internal cohesion while increasing their susceptability to social modification.

Repeatedly throughout the decade the field has been called upon to participate in interdisciplinary research projects. Whether home economics has increasingly shared in such efforts remains unclear. From the field's literature, I would conclude that no significant inroads were made in this direction nor will they be in the near future. What factors have detained home economics' entrance into an area of need? Has this need been ignored to the extent that the literature indicates? The field operates on the assumption that it has much to contribute to this kind of research. But, generalities characterize the contributions it would make if given the opportunity (e.g., contribute to more stable marriages, plan for the family life cycle and promote happy, well-adjusted families). Clear directives outlining home economics' unique contributions remain to be developed. The field lacks family theory that would assist in building frameworks identifying research outcomes.

Home economics life blood is research. It reveals what is sought by the field--cultural standards giving direction for assisting families, decision making options sustaining families throughout the life cycle, environment(s) conducive to family life, and the reduction of the family's concern for survival freeing them to concentrate on developing forceful individuals. Presently home economics' efforts have been overwhelmingly directed toward providing for the material welfare of families and

fostering interrelationships that stress functional socialization--how to secure tension free family relationships.

Families can be improved:

--If they become more flexible

--If they adapt to cultural change

Culturally defined roles direct family adaptability:

--They guide actions in and outside of the family

--They assure the adequate functioning of man and society intermeshing the two

--They endow individuals with greater social and psychological security

--They give meaning to life

The above framework dominates home economics' actions. Although points opposing the framework exist (families are influencers as well as influenced by society, the field's interpretation of cultural standards may be incapable of achievement); yet, adaptability and values attain first rank in the Association's literature. The frames, according to home economics, define the family's factual condition in society.

Weak families rasp at social tissue and must be cauterized. Family disparity countering social goals requires amendment. Left to themselves, families could divert the culture into small, partial units established to satisfy diverse ends. Difference implies disunity.

Strengthening families for home economists, then, denotes unifying families with socio-cultural goals. Social ends receive home economics' unanimous approval. Points to the contrary are lacking. Anthropological and psychological points are directed toward socially defined family ends which are broad and encompass cultures universally. Individuals remain submerged within the group--directed towards satisfying group ends.

Home economics' literature gives precedence to social purposes thus reflecting a shortcoming of the disciplines. None of the areas studied has made significant inroads revealing human (individual) needs in other than ambiguous terms. Whereas the disciplines stress the wider society, home economics seeks to build a secure home which serves family ends. Anthropology has done similar research in this area but it has been minimal. Not only does home economics lack a comparative analysis of the family cross-culturally, but it has not postulated nor used theories of family history or origin to any degree within the last decade. Families are accepted as cultural givens--cultures could not exist without them. Historical and cross-cultural analysis could furnish a more concrete base for the field's support of families.

Like sociology, home economics seeks to loosen the family's internal cohesion in favor of general culturally identified priorities. The disciplines actions have been taken for the field's own and used in the bulk of its

research and writings. Its questions concern the following:

What:

--Values must families promote in order to accomplish culturally defined ends

--Social directives help families adapt to cultural change

--Social order exists helping families function effectively within modern or Western cultures

--Is the family's actual situation in society

How:

--To broaden the field's influence in order to reach ever increasing numbers of families

--To sustain societal support for families

--To conduct interdisciplinary research contributing to the field's body of family theory in decision making, standard setting, environmental improvement, and economic support

--To adapt families to societal influences

Philosophical Implication(s)

Home economics' questions seek to clarify the family's environmental reality in order to plan procedures for action. Its concerns might be characterized within psychology's stimulus-response structure. What society presents to individuals and groups can be successfully

reacted to thus preserving individual and group security and integrity.

What does the field predict for the family's future? References to the family's future are infrequent in the Association's literature. Along with a small number of home economists, representatives from two social institutions (government and education) reacted to the question. The responses were meagerly spread throughout the decade while predictions were based solely upon social change: its effects on individuals and families and the benefits derived from more socially adaptable families. The fate of individuals and their families is governed by continued economic stability. A stable economy is the family's insurance policy for the future. Based on this prerequisite, home economics predicts that social change will particularly affect individual role functioning in and outside of the family--it can add to or detract from the individual's present mode of operation, e.g., medical advances lengthen the life span and contribute to longer intergenerational linkages, thus, individuals can influence their family for extended time periods. Secondly, future families will need to be more adaptable to social change. Facilitating their adaptability will be the rapid incorporation of technological developments and the family's ability to build wider bridges of communication between the group and society, thus increasing its cultural interdependence. As

a result, families will be more in tune with social modulations. In addition to the respondents selected expertise, home economics drew materials from education, mental and physical health resources, history, and economics.

To ensure the family's future position in society, home economics has been called upon to help it transfer from an independent, self contained and self sufficient life style to an interdependent, semi-closed, socially supported way of life. This life style will sustain society's best interests while ensuring the future longevity of the family. Which of these positions home economics is actually advancing or if it is advancing either remains undisclosed; the literature suggests that the latter represents home economics' desired goal. Also whether home economics accepts one life style with all its accompanying ramifications is unclear. Conceivably it could presently be postulating bits and pieces of each framework, since today's families appear to be in a transitional phase. Then too, it is difficult to discard the familiar to accept the new without fully clarifying each component's meaning and application in the environment.

Future families will retain a residue or core of functions ensuring social maintenance and continuity. These include: (1) inculcating the young with cultural ideals; (2) ordering society for new arrivals; and (3) securing the individual's position in relation to others

in society. Families will retain these functions because society finds that they perform them better than any substitute. Their economic base will be assured but they will be called upon to make increasingly complex decisions for a complex environment. So, although families will lose some of their former functions, others will be retained and any gaps will be filled by newly emerging cultural needs in turn affecting the individual's role. Apparently home economics is more concerned with the family's external rather than its internal changes; nor does it suggest that a more complex examination of the latter is necessary. The field wants to improve the life style of families yet the internal relations and reactions which could erect the desired form remain unidentified. Does home economics prefer to remain apart from rather than take part in the family's transition?

That life style which would promote family continuity has the following features: It is nuclear (has reduced kinship relationships), durable and fosters fundamental cultural values. These characteristics will become an international norm for family life. This unified, universal family type will be freer to seek outlets for creative expression and independence. The latter qualities will characterize the family's newly formed ideology. If families assure society that they will promote family norms, then society will free them to be more creative and

independent--better able to satisfy individual needs. The field fails to clarify, however, just how unity and universality breed creativity and independence. For example, in reference to the family's ability to foster cultural values, future families will have greater choice between child rearing and remaining childless. Yet, the bearing and rearing of children in families is a fundamental value of modern or Western cultures. If future families decide not to have children--will they counteract a fundamental cultural value, replace it with another value or will the value change along with the behavior? How will society ensure cultural replacements? Evidently creativity and independence will encompass particularistic areas (the roles of women and youth) not the total system of family action. How can two counteracting forces (creativity and independence versus unity and universality) exist in harmony--will one give way to the other, neutralize it or can they exist peacefully under one system; will home economics favor one force above another?

The family's future, as seen by home economists, is founded on: (1) similarity in life style (primarily nuclear); (2) extended kinship linkages furthering cultural continuity; (3) the performance of necessary social functions; (4) its ability to adapt to change; (5) a reduced concern with functional socialization; and (6) creativity and independence particularly in reference to the roles of

women and youth. As presented, all these changes suggest a brighter future for families; none are thought to reduce its ability to function. Moreover, the field gives little credit to the sources from which it has drawn the previous predictions while having conducted little research supporting their use. Clarification of this point could reveal the comprehensiveness of its suggestions and serve as a foundational tool for future actions. And, home economics fails to account for changes which could conflict with one another, i.e., how can future families be nuclear (an approach based on reduced kinship linkages) when extended kinship relationships will be the norm due to greater longevity? The field does not account fully for the consequences of its predictions. Instead, it gathers them from here and there while failing to concern itself with how they fit together as a workable whole guiding home economics' operations.

Future families, as typified by the three disciplines and home economics, will be assured of sound economic support, will perform necessary social functions, retain as well as lose some traditional ones, and assume new duties as society deems necessary. They will be less concerned with functional socialization, will have greater independence and creativity particularly in reference to the roles of women and youth, will maintain men in their traditional family role (they will continue to furnish

legitimacy and confer a status position upon the individual), will exhibit strengthened kinship bonds, and will be progressively more susceptible to social change. Variation from the disciplines is concentrated on the field's desire to help families cope with increasingly complex decisions, manage their resources, control their internal relationships, and deal with problems occurring in child rearing and education. The field fails to specify the social grouping to which it refers in making its predictions. Sociology is the only one of the three disciplines which qualified its forecasts clearly specifying that they applied to the middle class. Home economics' predictions would appear to apply to this subgrouping as well; yet, they fall short in identifying the reference point.

Also, both sociology and psychology predict that the family's position in the near future is likely to worsen before it improves. Sociology stresses that marital dissolution and general dissatisfaction will be apparent, while psychology suggests that families will be weakened for a long time to come. Only anthropology's views are as optimistic as home economics'. Seemingly the field has not fully considered the family's future in light of its limited predictions. According to home economics, if future families are supplied with economic security, they will be able to conquer their remaining

problems and incorporate challenging new dimensions within their structure. The field does not, however, account for the source of its predictions, the consequences several of them could have for individuals and society as well and develops no functional system serving as a guide for future activities. All the predictions will be accomplished, according to home economics, but how they will be attained and why their accomplishment is desirable exists in ambiguity.

In reference to the family's future:

--The field has not been greatly concerned with this question

--Home economics' predictions are based on assured economic support

--The field has stressed the external effects of social change which could alter the family's life style

--The field is attempting to assist families in transferring from a life style stressing independence, self containment and self sufficiency to one which fosters interdependence, is semi-closed and socially supported

--Families will retain a core of functions, lose some of their traditional services and assume new tasks based on cultural need

--Families nationally and internationally will exhibit similar characteristics (they will be nuclear, durable, foster cultural values, and be more creative and independent)

--Those changes predicted for the family will foster the welfare of individuals, families and society

Philosophical Implication(s)

Home economics' predictions concerning families are directed toward its future social functioning. Thus the field will attempt to achieve a family life style which it suggests has future merit. Its activities will be guided by these predictions and the resulting actions will produce unknown consequences.

What is the definition of the family as presented in the literature of the field? The majority of responses to the question come from home economists with the exception of one governmental representative. Moreover, few home economists have concerned themselves with questions of conceptual use throughout the decade. But, those who have responded were clearly influenced by theories drawn from the three disciplines. First, the field has been provoked to action by the following identifiable needs:

--The need for a more applicable definition of the family to facilitate determining its economic characteristics

--The need to clarify variant family types creating a more realistic picture of families, thus decreasing the possibility of fostering a non-existent life style

--The need for family theory revealing man's essential nature (the social-psychological influences involved in a familial relationship)

--The need to integrate the family within the field's total program of action since home economics exists to serve families

--The need to change what can be changed while accepting other social innovations as inevitable

Secondly, cultural, environmental and behavioral theories have pervaded the field contributing to a general conceptual framework which has served as a guide during the sixties; they are:

Cultural (anthropological) theories:

--Awareness of other families cross-culturally contributes to a broader understanding of modern or Western families

--Continuity between generations ensures cultural transmission

Environmental (sociological) theories:

--Awareness of social change and the distribution of technological benefits throughout the culture can assist the population in evolving and living within changing societies

--Environments exert pressures on families which they must live and cope with

--People trained in utilizing economic principles are better able to function in an economic environment

--Environments suited to family needs strengthen families

--Cultural values exert influence and play an important part in the lives of individuals throughout the life cycle

--Social change affects the role behavior of individuals

--Time alters individual and family activities

Behavioral (psychological) theories:

--Awareness of personality differences within families contributes towards understanding family interaction

--Relationships in families develop within identifiable patterns

--Individuals trained to make capable decisions will enhance both the individual's and his family's development

Along with the expertise of home economists and governmental representatives, the field has drawn information from economics, mental health, history, and education.

Expediency in the years prior to 1959 served as the motivating force behind home economics' use of the concept "family." The Bureau of Census definition[9] appears to have been selected by the field because it was an already accepted and respected definition. It was easily assumed for research purposes since its use required little justification. After 1959, however, the preferred definition seemed to lose some of its relevance for home economics' research purposes. A substitute was sought and a selection made. The definition advanced was based on the "customary usage of the term" family. "Customary usage" implies the cultural acceptance of a specific, visible norm. The norm may be desired but nonexistent. Although all in the culture strive to achieve it, attainment may never be complete. The norm may be ever changing as society changes. There could be a noticeable lag between the cultural usage of the term and existence of the norm in society. "Customary usage" would also indicate that within the culture there is an accepted family form. Will

---

[9]Refer to page 181.

the form be valid when applied cross-culturally, however? The field wants to understand families in other cultures--does "customary usage" serve to identify families in other contexts? At present home economics' research indicates that it will apply cross-culturally. Yet, anthropology evinces a struggle to find more universally applicable definitions of the term. The discipline suggests that "customary usage" implies a limited application, for the term derived is based on selected rather than many instances. Consequently, "customary usage" would prevent the field from developing research based on other than modern or Western cultures. It sets up distinct boundaries limiting theoretical development. Thus, in replacing the Bureau of Census definition with "customary usage of the term," home economics has replaced one narrow definition with another--problems of inapplicability prevail affecting future research efforts.

Home economics posits that the term family, as used by the field[10] varies little between cultures. Finding the family in other cultures is facilitated because all contain the small subgroups of parents and their offspring. Separating out these subgroups reveals families in all cultures and facilitates their study. Family member roles are similar in all cultures, i.e., parents are

---

[10]Referring to the nuclear concept implying "customary usage" of the term as applied to modern or Western cultures.

expected to exhibit a certain uniformity of behavior which serves as a constant in and between cultures. Home economics ignores deviation from the norm. Operations are conducted on the basis of one world standard. Yet, the field has qualified its own use of the term noting that it works best in a particular (highly specialized, technological) cultural configuration. Home economics seems to be solving two (cultural and cross-cultural) problems via one unvarying route. In 1960 and again in 1966, Hanson, Brown and Martin[11] recognized and expressed the fact that a variety of families exist within cultures. If families vary within cultures, it stands to reason that they vary between cultures. Since that time, however, the field has failed to recognize that family variation could distinctly influence future action. It adheres to definitions based on expediency, custom or habit as opposed to applicability or defensibility.

Four definitions of the concept "family" guide home economics' actions at the present time. First, the term's use in government related research directed the field's efforts for a number of years. The Bureau of Census definition has received continued use up to 1964[12] although found to be inapplicable for some situations. Secondly, a

---

[11]Refer to pages 184-85.

[12]Its use may have continued beyond the time period specified but this fact is unreported in the literature.

suggested replacement for the Census definition was based on "customary usage," refers to modern or Western cultures, is nuclear in life style and institutionalized as the cultural norm. Third, the developmental approach has characterized the field's research and melds a number of theories within one framework. Fourth, additional definitions forwarded but receiving little emphasis in the literature included the "interaction" approach and the family life style approach. The two in combination have engaged the field's interest to a minimal degree. Conceptual use has concerned only a few home economics professionals. Instead, emphasis is marshalled at the point of outcomes rather than input--what is desired as opposed to clarifying theoretical foundations. Presently home economics applies a set of data claimed to represent reality and subject to little variation. Home economics' frameworks could conceivably be based on false assumptions or half truths.

The field's research centers on similar, institutionalized nuclear families--a norm which has received some criticism. Opponents of the definition based on "customary usage" conclude that home economics could be postulating a nonexistent, unverified tenet leading to false assumptions and inapplicable responses. But, home economists for the most part accept the definition and operate under its restrictions. The choice presents problems just as the Bureau of Census definition has, for the latter guided the field's research quite a number of

years. Seemingly the nuclear conception is doing the same. Home economics' research efforts may be confined within too narrow a set of boundaries resulting in conclusions which are inappropriate for the time period in which they are made.

The field's selected approaches have stemmed directly from sociology with emphasis on its institutional, developmental and interactionist approaches (the latter is contained within the developmental approach). Psychology's influence is felt particularly in the last approach. However, group effects are stressed above individual effects. Home economists have offered other theoretical frameworks but failed to incorporate them within an identifiable research structure. The field's sociological foundations run deep nurtured by long association; familiarity with its proposals fosters security. The resources of anthropology and psychology have not been tapped extensively. Perhaps the former disciplines will never gain the predominance accorded sociology by home economics. The field's outlook is biased in a particular direction at this point giving little evidence that its course will change in the future.

Sociology's institutional and developmental approaches (the latter encompasses the institutional, structure-function and interactionist approaches) dominate home economics' literature with some recognition given to family variation. Although sociology has distinguished a

large number of family types, home economics stresses two: the culturally apt family and the subsistence family. Others are suspected but remain unspecified. The influence of anthropology and psychology are evident in the theories professed by the field; but, their use has been slight in its research. Home economics offers little justification for its frameworks and concepts. It furnishes scant evidence indicating that its selection of conceptual approaches actually coincides with the goals it attempts to achieve or that discriminate thought has accompanied the selections. It continues to function within frameworks that were defined in the past and have been traditionally used. And the field has done little to determine whether the frameworks will be relevant for its future research.

Home economics' use of the concept "family" encompasses the following generalizations:

--Theories of the three disciplines have been included in the field's literature concerning the concept "family"

--The definition of the term family as used by the field establishes boundaries and sets limits on its research directions

--Home economics applies its definitions of the family cross-culturally giving little recognition to family deviation between and within cultures

--Several definitions of the term have been suggested for the field's examination and use but the developmental and institutional approaches are dominant

--To date, four uses of the concept "family" guide the field:

  --The Bureau of Census definition (recognized as inapplicable for all the field's research purposes though still in use)

  --"Customary usage of the term" (refers to modern or Western cultures, is nuclear in life style and institutionalized as a cultural norm)

  --The developmental approach (dominates the field's research)

  --The "interaction" and family life style approach (the former is based on role interaction and is beginning to encompass a theory of family identity; the latter is based on two existing family types: the culturally apt and the subsistence family, neither of which has received extensive verification)

--Sociology's research has served as the principle contributor for the conceptual frameworks used by the field

Philosophical Implication(s)

Home economics has used the concept "family" within four identifiable frameworks. Its approaches have not accounted for the consequences which accompany their use. The field therefore is functioning with a vaguely defined concept which sets limits and remains unverified at the present time.

Overall implications drawn from the field's conceptualization of the family.

--Conceptual analysis opens new avenues for clarifying home economics' philosophical statements in turn leading to consensus among its professionals

--By responding to questions of concept, home economics can clarify its own philosophical position based on logic and sound reasoning. Then it can set about building philosophical frameworks based on conceptual agreement

--Home economics' theoretical foundations will remain incomplete until meaning is given priority by the field. Until then, its philosophy will remain couched in ambiguities

--Home economics has skeleton conceptual frameworks. These could be amplified if the field would examine its theoretical foundations and determine their development, components, deficiencies, value premises, and relevance for the field

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Home economics' philosophy has been limited from the field's establishment as an organized profession in 1909. Guidance comes from statements developed during the Lake Placid Conferences, a few scattered theses concerning influences on home economics' thought,[1] the publication of New Directions in 1959, selected universities concerned with training the professional (Cornell, Michigan State University and Pennsylvania State University, among others). Guidance has also come from the periodic re-examination of theoretical foundations by a small number of concerned professionals.[2] These few voices calling for consistent

---

[1]Two examples are: Caroline F. Budewig's "Origin and Development of the Home Economics Idea" (previously cited in Chapter I, p. 9), and Helen L. McConnell's "A Critical Analysis of the Implications of Selected Philosophies of Education for Home Economics Education" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, 1965).

[2]Marjorie M. Brown, "Values in Home Economics," Journal, 59:769-775, December, 1967. Her article considered the problem of goals for the field which would serve as directional guides for establishing a coherent home economics' philosophy. Anna M. Creekmore, "The Concept Basic

philosophical development are cries in the wilderness falling upon ears geared to present priorities (the needy family, the disrupted family). Home economics has been so busy "doing," it has not found time to reflect fully upon its accomplishments. Its philosophy has been one of action rather than contemplation. Its statements have been broad and encompassing rather than specific or directive. Broad statements are subject to a large number of interpretations. Observations made in the past cannot be evaluated for their relevance in the present unless their use is accounted for. The family is one of home economics' fundamental concepts. It furnishes a nucleus for the field's orbiting services; consequently, the term provided a starting point for conducting a conceptual analysis to determine its present status. As used in 1909, the concept "family" may have been incased in a completely different theoretical structure, for the general term may be used in a variety of contexts. Because home economics today is in need of relevant philosophical statements, it was the purpose of the study to examine recent rather than historical literature. Conceptual analysis illuminates philosophical foundations clarifying their use, value and directional tendencies.

---

to Home Economics," Journal, 60:93-99, February, 1968. The author was concerned with differentiating between the definition and purposes of the field, its purpose in educating for the profession, and its relevance to society.

Home economics draws its concepts from a variety of disciplines. Three which were recognized as major contributors to the field from its inception were anthropology, sociology and psychology. By examining the disciplines' use of the construct family, the field's influencers are revealed and the directional tendencies of home economics' thought made evident. Questions concerning families raised consistently by the disciplines were singled out and studied for their responses. Then home economics' replies to the general questions were examined. The study clarified how the field has used the term family in its writings and research. By answering questions of concern to the disciplines, home economics can build its own systematic set of answers to basic philosophical questions. The questions' replies become the field's philosophy. A concrete set of responses signifying agreement between professionals moves home economics from vague or unclear suppositions to concrete postulates which guide instead of confuse. Investigations of this kind can build "an inventory of research propositions" for home economics--which Hill and Hanson posit as the purpose of conceptual analysis.[3]

Books labeled by the three disciplines as of concern to families and written between the years 1958 and 1969 were examined and summarized for their responses to the

---

[3]Hill and Hanson, Sourcebook, p. 497.

general questions. Books were used since they presented a more concise summary of the disciplines' status relative to the construct "family." Then home economics' responses were studied through an examination of the American Home Economics Association's journal and literature. Since the Association is the official voice for the home economics profession, represents the total field and provides continuity of thought through its journal, it was the most applicable source for recent home economics' thought. Then too, home economics professionals look to the Association for direction, ideas, theories, research summaries and the field's general status. After summarizing how home economics has responded to general questions of concern to the disciplines, the responses were subjected to a critical analysis. An analytical framework was devised which attempted to clarify: (1) the field's use of the concept "family"; (2) the status of the profession with regard to the term's use; (3) the identification of gaps and areas of depth concerning the concept; and (4) directions for further study. All serve to lend clarity, meaning, substance, contribute to the field's body of theory, and reveal home economics present status concerning families.

The meaning and/or use the field ascribes to fundamental constructs reveals whether its philosophy is relevant for the present or only an emotional call to arms. Its statements are made explicit rather than implicit. By identifying use, the gaps, consistencies, values, and

development inherent in its foundations are clarified. Then home economics can inform instead of sermonize, postulate instead of admonish and reason instead of idealize. As the field enters the 1970's, it can reveal concrete directional tendencies and needs for the time, chart a course of action that is grounded in realism, based on logic and founded upon principles that can serve as practical guides. Thus the field's outlook becomes more flexible, comprehensive and perceptive.

An examination of the concept "family" as used by home economics revealed these general characteristics:

Context: Home economics' present use of the construct "family" has had the greatest impetus from sociology, although the resources of a variety of disciplines were involved in developing conceptual frameworks. An alliance which began from the field's onset has continued up to the present. Psychology and anthropology, to a limited degree, have provided additional contributions. Although home economics claims to incorporate resources from all three disciplines, it is governed principally by sociological constructs.

Reality: Home economics maintains that its view of families is realistic. But, if its conceptions are drawn primarily from sociological materials, they are then verified via one means rather than a system of means. The field appears to be unaware that its conceptions limit action placing them within specified boundaries. The

Association implies that all of home economics holds similar conceptions of the family. The literature has raised few questions of disagreement between professionals. Consequently, although home economics maintains that it draws knowledge and theory from a variety of resources, in actuality what it has drawn is limited to selected instances which are narrow instead of comprehensive, restrictive instead of all-inclusive. Its selections may have excluded conceptions of family reality which could prove to be highly relevant for research and theory building.

Home economics is particularly concerned that all families be provided with a strong foundation of health, normalcy and human and material resources. For example, the field along with a number of governmental organizations strives to secure a guaranteed annual income for needy families so that none are deprived of their necessary economic foundation. Yet, once all families have an assured base of economic resources, what will the field's next point of interest be? True the need to effectively manage resources will always be with us but will it continue to be a dominant concern? Home economics was founded to strengthen families by improving and easing man's life. Today millions of families have a life style which is more convenient or less burdensome than in the past--what has the field to offer them? Has its use of the concept been consonant with the present status of the culture? Stevens

summed up the condition of modern societies in which home economics must function when he said:

> In spite of our affluence there is general discontent--youths are disillusioned, the poor are dissatisfied; the wealthy are bored; the blacks are angry; the middle class is frustrated and bewildered by rapidly changing values and mores, and ever increasing violence occurs. It seems obvious that we must develop a new approach to life. . . . [4]

Is home economics serving the families of all these groups or the family--a nonexistent entity? Are its approaches to the concept realistic--are they operative in a changing world? Are they serviceable in today's frenetic culture fraught with rapid transition and dysjunction? Is home economics going to center on man--the receiver, manipulator, user or is it going to center on man--the interactor, reciprocator, contributor? Home economics along with psychology can build a humanistic foundation for family analysis and with anthropology--a realistic concept of the family cross-culturally. The field has much to accomplish if it is to align its encompassing philosophy with cultural actions. To date its perceptiveness, flexibility and comprehensiveness are circumscribed.

Adaptability: One of home economics' goals revolves around helping families move from a life style characterized as independent, self contained and self sufficient to one which is interdependent, more open to cultural influence and socially supported. These latter

---

[4]Roger L. Stevens, "America's Stake in the Arts," Saturday Review, LIII (February 29, 1970), p. 18.

families can best serve society now. The field seeks total awareness of all social influences, studies them and those that can strengthen family life are adapted and incorporated into families. Both families and home economics must be aware of and prepare for social change. Presently the field attempts to strengthen them by strengthening and/or training individuals for family life. There are definite ways of behaving which can lead to individual success in both society and the family. The field's method has involved intervention rather than explication. If all families act in these ways, all will be successful. So, home economics has stressed health (physical and mental), normalcy, the use of resources (both human and economic) and a life style susceptible to cultural need. Why certain behaviors are more successful, the type of success the field is promoting and the degree of variation that is tolerable are all questions which have not been fully answered. For now, its conception is weighted heavily toward the family as a group--subject to society and justified as a social organization so long as it serves society. Influence goes from the largest to the smallest unit. Individual serving functions are secondary. This deficiency may result from psychology's paucity of materials concerning the individual's relationship to his primary group (the family). The picture families present to society is of more concern to home economics than its internal

functioning. Can the field continue to support the directional emphasis its philosophy has taken?

Alternatives: Home economics endeavors to maintain families which have the following characteristics: They are middle class, stable, unified, and responsible to society, they are healthy and normal, their needs relative to food, clothing and shelter are adequately met, and they promote the culture's political ideology. New characteristics may be emerging to replace those mentioned, but their relevance for home economics' thought and action has received notice from only a few of the field's critics. Limited alternatives have been offered for the field's conception. Home economics may be promoting a concept that is unrealistic for the culture. It could even be harmful to the individual dependent upon the field's interpretation and actions taken in attempting to generally apply the conception.

The Association is a strong influencer of home economics' thought--the university setting is another. The former emphasizes the institutionalized family with little variation. Presumably the university, with its advanced degree programs, emphasizes research centered on families and uses the developmental approach which is broader and more encompassing than the Association's materials. Are these two large organizations working at cross purposes or together toward a generally defined end? Is the philosophy of the Association coincidental with

various university philosophies which train the professional? The field's unifying focus is the family. Its efforts have been directed toward this social agency and its relation to the culture and the individual. Is the Association's philosophy concerning families the one which all of home economics wants to subscribe to or are other views applicable for the present and the future? Where is the Association's focus leading? How relevant is home economics' philosophy concerning families? Can the field reach an agreement on conceptual meaning that will build a united theoretical structure. More questions have been raised than answered in this study. The findings are particularly concerned with the Association's philosophical status in reference to the concept "family." Home economics philosophy has reached an evolutionary point where it must consolidate knowledge and theory for the sake of clarity. The statements made in 1958 cannot serve for perpetuity.

Educational Implications: Home economics is a field in service to families. Education is one route chosen by the field for providing its services. So, home economics has a vested interest in the educational process--it strives to educate individuals for family living. Philosophy can be the guiding force behind home economics' contribution to educational development. A critical examination of its theoretical resources can vivify and unravel the interrelationships and contributions of the disciplines.

Home economics' broad and encompassing nature cries for organization that will provide a systematic approach to the concept "family." It must clarify directional focus and differentiate its contributions from those of the disciplines, for to repeat their purposes results in duplication not service. In continuing to function with undefined concepts and neglecting to penetratingly examine its foundations, the field may contribute to its own self destruction. Home economics must be aware of its expressions; they can determine future contributions to educational development, for as Aiken says:

> If all meaning either is or involves expression, and if the meaning of all expressions and all modes of expression must somehow be learned, then, plainly what learning, and hence educational development covers is everything that essentially involves the use and application of expressions or what I sometimes call 'meaning carriers.' This means that the limits of educational development are set only by the limits of our powers of learning in regard to the use of expressions or meaning carriers.[5]

The absence of critical analysis is all too evident in home economics' thought and ideas. Favoring action over reflection can be self defeating. Knowledge must be coherent if it is to be useful; theory must be examined for the actions it produces and evaluated, for only evaluation can reveal worth. Action which neglects meaning may be likened to a pantomime, a great deal of activity is apparent, but its direction stands mute. Home economics

---

[5]Henry David Aiken, "Analytical Philosophy and Educational Development," Philosophy and Educational Development, p. 20.

needs continuing philosophical discourse concerned with meaning, use or functionalism. If meaning is neglected, action becomes accidental. As Shakespeare said:

> Refrain tonight,
> And that shall lend a kind of easiness
> To the next abstinence: the next
> more easy
> For use almost can change the
> Stamp of nature
> -Hamlet-III.iv.

Directions for Further Study

--Further study and research are needed to build more comprehensive, wholistic frameworks supporting home economics' concern for families. The development of additional questions is indicated.

--Further study and research are needed to determine the influences and contributions which other disciplines (economics, art, history, et al.) have made to home economics' conception of the family.

--Further study and research are needed to determine additional contributions anthropology and psychology could make to home economics. For now, the field stresses sociological constructs primarily. Yet, home economics maintains that it draws resources from all three disciplines.

--Further study and research are needed to reveal what conceptual approaches have relevance for the field. The Association's literature suggested that three that are in use at this time. Are others relevant?

--Further study and research are needed to determine if home economics as a field presents a unified approach to the concept family or if a variety of diverse viewpoints exist. Since the study concerned only the Association's outlook, research may need to examine other sources of home economics' thought.

--Further study and research are needed to determine alternatives to the field's conception of families. For the present, home economics' use of the concept is narrow and restrictive. The field needs to assess the applicability of its present conceptions.

--Further study and research are needed to determine what home economics means when it endeavors to strengthen all families. Present findings would indicate that the field's emphasis has been placed on families in need. Are there other families that can be served?

--Further study and research are needed to determine the family's reaction to its environment. At present home economics stresses society's affect on the family. There is a need, then, to examine the family's affect on society.

--Further study and research are needed to construct a framework of predictions concerning families that can serve as a systematic scheme for planning home economics future actions.

--Further study and research are needed in examining questions of concept. This study dealt with one--the family; do others have relevance for the field?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Booklets

American Home Economics Association Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics. "Tentative Statement of the Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics," Washington, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

_____. New Directions. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1959.

Ackerman, Nathan W. The Psychodynamics of Family Life. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

_____. "Emotional Impact of In-Laws and Relatives." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

Aiken, Henry David. "Analytical Philosophy and Educational Development." Philosophy and Educational Development. Edited by George Barnett. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Anshen, Ruth Nanda, ed. The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

_____. "The Conservation of Family Values." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Austin, J.L. "The Meaning of a Word." Philosophy and Ordinary Language. Edited by Charles E. Caton. Urbana: Univeristy of Michigan Press, 1966.

Barnett, George, ed. Philosophy and Educational Development. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Bee, Laurence S. Marriage and Family Relations. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Bell, Robert. Marriage and Family Interaction. Homewood: The Dorsey Press, Inc., 1963.

Benedek, Therese. "The Emotional Structure of the Family." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Benedict, Ruth. "The Family: Genus Americanum." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Berman, Sidney. "The Role of Children in the Family." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

Black, Max. The Labyrinth of Language. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.

Blenkner, Margaret. "Social Work and Family Relationships in Later Life with Some Thoughts on Filial Maturity." Social Structure and the Family. Edited by Ethel Shanas and Gardon F. Streib. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Blisten, Dorothy R. The World of the Family. New York: Random House, 1963.

Boalt, Gunnar. Family and Marriage. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965.

Brown, Marjorie. "The Need for Philosophical Study of Home Economics," East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1967. (Mimeographed.)

Budewig, Caroline F. "Origin and Development of the Home Economics Idea." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1957.

Burgess, Ernest W. and Locke, Harvey. The Family: From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1960.

_____, Harvey Locke, and Mary Thomas. "The Companionship Family." Marriage, Family and Society. Edited by Hyman Rodman. New York: Random House, 1965.

Caton, Charles E., ed. Philosophy and Ordinary Language. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Chadderdon, Hester and Fanslow, Alyce M. Review and Synthesis of Research in Home Economics Education. Columbus: The Center for Research and Development in Vocational and Technical Education. The Ohio State University, August, 1966.

Cogswell, Betty. "Socialization into the Family: An Essay on Some Structural Properties of Roles." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Cottrell, Leonard S., Jr. "New Directions for the American Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Davis, Kingsley. "The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Dennis, Norman. "Modern Society and the Popularity of Marriage." Comparative Perspectives on Marriage and the Family. Edited by H. Kent Geiger. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1968.

De Rougemont, Denis. "The Crisis of the Modern Couple." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Dressel, Paul L. "The Role of Concepts in Planning the Home Economics Curriculum." Home Economics Seminar. French Lick, Indiana, July 24-28, 1961.

Elder, Glen H., Jr. "Role Relations, Sociocultural Environments, and Autocratic Family Ideology." Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Ellis, Albert. "The Folklore of Sex." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Farber, Bernard, ed. "Kinship Laterality and the Emotionally Disturbed Child." Kinship and Family Organization. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

_____. "Family and Kinship." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Farber, Seymour, Piero Mustacchi, and Roger H.L. Wilson, eds. The Family's Search for Survival. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Fitzpatrick, Joseph P. "Values, Ethics, and Family Life." Helping the Family in Urban Society. Edited by Fred Delliquadri. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Frankel, Charles. "The Family in Context." Helping the Family in Urban Society. Edited by Fred Delliquadri. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Goldfarb, Alvin I. "Psychodynamics of the Three-Generation Family." Social Structure and the Family. Edited by Ethel Shanas and Gordon F. Streib. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Goode, William J. World Revolution and Family Patterns. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

_____. "The Theoretical Importance of Love." The Family: Its Structure and Functions. Edited by Rose Laub Coser. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

_____. "Steady Dating, Imminent Marriage and Remarriage." Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Goodman, Paul. "Growing up Absurd." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Greenfield, Sidney M. "Industrialization and the Family in Sociological Theory." Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Guttmacher, Alan F. "Rx for Birth Control." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Handel, Gerald. "Psychological Study of Whole Families." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Hansen, Donald A. "Personal and Positional Influence in Formal Groups: Propositions and Theory for Research on Family Vulnerability to Stress." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Havighurst, Robert J. "The School and the Family--From the Viewpoint of the Educator." Helping the Family in Urban Society. Edited by Fred Delliquadri. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Heer, David M. "Negro-White Marriage in the United States." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Henle, Paul, ed. Language Thought Culture. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Hill, Reuban and Walter, Willard. "Habit Systems in Married Life." Marriage, Family and Society. Edited by Hyman Rodman. New York: Random House, 1965.

_____. "Social Stresses on the Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

_____, Hansen, Donald A. "The Identification of Conceptual Frameworks Utilized in Family Study." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Horkheimer, Max. "Authoritarianism and the Family." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Kenkel, William F. The Family in Perspective. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Kirkendall, Lester A. "Sex Education, and Family Stability." The Family's Search for Survival. Edited by Seymour Farber, Piero Mustacchi, and Roger H.L. Wilson. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Kirkpatrick, Clifford. The Family as Process and Institution. New York: The Ronald Press, 1963.

_____. "A Statistical Investigation of the Psychoanalytic Theory of Mate Selection." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Kohn, Melvin L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation." Marriage, Family and Society. Edited by Hyman Rodman. New York: Random House, 1965.

Komarovsky, Mirra. "Functional Analysis of Sex Roles." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Kubie, Lawrence S. "The Disintegrating Impact of 'Modern' Life on the Family in America." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

Laurie, Norman V. "Public Welfare Services and Family Life." Helping the Family in Urban Society. Edited by Fred Delliquadri. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Lawrie, Samuel H. "Early and Late Dating: Some Conditions Associated with Them." Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Leslie, Gerald R. The Family in Social Context. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Levy, Marion J. and Fallers, Lloyd A. "The Family: Some Comparative Considerations." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Lewis, Oscar. "Poverty as a Source of Lower-Class Subculture." Comparative Perspectives on Marriage and the Family. Edited by H. Kent Geiger. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1968.

Lidz, Theodore. The Family and Human Adaptation. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1963.

Liebman, Samual, ed. Emotional Forces in the Family. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, Company, 1959.

Linton, Ralph. "The Natural History of the Family." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Llewellyn, Karl N. "Education and the Family." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Lundberg, Ferdinand and Farnham, Marynia. "Women: The Lost Sex." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. Sex, Culture, and Myth. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Incorporated, 1962.

_____. "Marriage: Past and Present." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Marmor, Judd. "The Individual, the Family, and the Community." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

McConnel, Helen L. "A Critical Analysis of the Implications of Selected Philosophies of Education for Home Economics Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.

McGrath, Earl J. and Johnson, Jack T. The Changing Mission of Home Economics. Columbia University: Teachers College Press, 1968.

Mead, Margaret and Heyman, Ken. Family. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.

Meerloo, Joost. "The Development of the Family in the Technical Age." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

Moore, G.E. Principia Ethica. Cambridge: The University Press, 1959.

Moore, Wilbert E. "The Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Moss, J. Joel. "Teenage Marriage: Cross National Trends and Sociological Factors in the Decision of When to Marry." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Naess, Arne. Communication and Argument. London: Allen and Univin Ltd., 1966.

Ness, Claire M. "The Role of the Father in the Family." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

Nimkoff, M.F. Comparative Family Systems. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Nye, F. Ivan. "Child Adjustment in Broken and Unhappy Unbroken Homes." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

_____, Bernardo, Felix M. Emerging Conceptual Frameworks in Family Analysis. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1967.

Parke, Robert, Jr. and Glick, Paul C. "Prospective Changes in Marriage and the Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Superego and the Theory of Social Systems." The Family: Its Structure and Functions. Edited by Rose Laub Coser. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

_____. "The Incest Taboo in Relation to Social Structure." The Family: Its Structure and Functions. Edited by Rose Laub Coser. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

_____. "The Normal American Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Peterson, James A. "Catastrophes in Partnership: Separation, Divorce and Widowhood." The Family's Search for Survival. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Pollak, Otto. "The Outlook for the American Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Population Bulletin. "'Boom Babies' Come of Age: The American Family at the Crossroads." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Pribram, Karl H. "Committment to Dreams." The Family's Search for Survival. Edited by Seymour Farber, Piero Mustacchi, and Roger H.L. Wilson. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Queen, Stuart A., Robert W. Hubenstein, John B. Adams. The Family in Various Cultures. Chicago: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1961.

Randall, John Herman and Buchler, Justus. Philosophy: An Introduction. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1966.

Rapoport, Robert and Rapoport, Rhona. "Work and Family in Contemporary Society." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Rodman, Hyman, ed. "Talcott Parson's View of the Changing American Family." Marriage, Family and Society. New York: Random House, 1965.

_____. "Mate Selection: Incest Taboos, Homogamy, and Mixed Marriages." Marriage, Family and Society. New York: Random House, 1965.

_____. "On Understanding Lower-Class Behavior." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Ryle, Gilbert. "The Theory of Meaning." Philosophy and Ordinary Language. Edited by Charles E. Caton. Urbana: University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Schaffner, Bertram. "The Individual, the Family and the Boss." Emotional Forces in the Family. Edited by Samual Liebman. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1959.

Schorr, Alvin L. "Filial Responsibility and the Aging." Marriage, Family and Society. New York: Random House, 1965.

Schrecker, Paul. "The Family: Conveyance of Tradition." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Schur, Edwin M., ed. The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

_____. "Abortion and the Social System." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Sewell, William H. "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Sirjamaki, John. "Cultural Configurations in the American Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Slater, Philip. "Social Limitations on Libidinal Withdrawal." The Family: Its Structure and Functions. Edited by Rose Laub Coser. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

Smith, Philip G. Philosophy of Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Sorokin, Piterim. "The American Sex Revolution." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Spitz, Rene A. "Hospitalism." The Family: Its Structure and Functions. Edited by Rose Laub Coser. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

Stokes, Walter R. "Our Changing Sex Ethics." The Family and the Sexual Revolution. Edited by Edwin M. Schur. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Streib, Gordon F. "Family Patterns in Retirement." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Suckow, Miriam P. and Cuttrell, Florence E. Families in New York City. New York: Community Council of Greater New York, May, 1966.

Sullenger, Thomas Earl. Neglected Areas in Family Living. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1960.

Sussman, Marvin B. and Burchinal, Lee. "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

_____. "Parental Aid to Married Children: Implications for Family Functioning." Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Tomasson, Richard F. "Why Has American Fertility Been so High?" Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Torres-Rioseco, Arturo. "The Family in Latin America." The Family: Its Function and Destiny. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Van Den Haag, Ernest. "Love or Marriage." The Family: Its Structure and Functions. Edited by Rose Laub Coser. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1964.

Vincent, Clark E. "Mental Health and the Family." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Waismann, Friedrich. "The Creative Capacities of Language." Value and Man. Edited by Louis Z. Hammer. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Walsh, John Patrick and Selden, William. "Vocational Education in the Curriculum of the Common School." Vocational Education. Edited by Herman G. Richey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Wilson, John. Language and the Pursuit of Truth. Cambridge: The University Press, 1967.

_____. Thinking with Concepts. Cambridge: The University Press, 1967.

Winch, Robert F. The Modern Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

_____. "Rearing by the Book." Sourcebook in Marriage and the Family. Edited by Marvin B. Sussman. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Woods, Sister Frances Jerome. The American Family System. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1959.

Zimmerman, Carle C. and Frampton, Merle. "Theories of Frederic LePlay." Kinship and Family Organization. Edited by Bernard Farber. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966.

Periodicals

American Home Economics Association. "Work with Low-Income Families." Journal of Home Economics, 57:782-783, December, 1965.

Apgar, Virginia. "Birth Defects: A National Concern." Journal of Home Economics, 56:18-21, January, 1964.

Baker, Luther G., Jr. "The Enigma of Men in Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 61:371-373, May, 1969.

Bezant, Rozelle K. "Marriage and Family Living in the Homemaking Curriculum." Journal of Home Economics, 57:11-16, January, 1965.

Bonde, Ruth L. "Means and Ends." Consumer Credit. Report to a Financial Management Conference, October 9-12, 1967. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967.

Brown, Marjorie M. "Values in Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 59:769-775, December, 1967.

Brown, Muriel. "The Growth of Values in Childhood and Old Age." Journal of Home Economics, 52:407-413, June, 1960.

Buchanan, Helen E. "Teaching Family Relationships." Journal of Home Economics, 56:305-308, May, 1964.

Burk, Margurite C. "Consumer Behavior." Journal of Home Economics, 59:155-162, March, 1967.

Carter, Don. "Love and Integrity in Marriage." Journal of Home Economics, 59:425-427, June, 1967.

Chilman, Catherine S. "Value Orientations of a Culture of Poverty: The Southern Appalachian Case." Working with Low Income Families. Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, March 15-19, 1965. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1965.

Chittendon, Gertrude and Gould, Flo. "A Challenge to Child Development and Family Relationships." Journal of Home Economics, 51:97-99, February, 1959.

Christopherson, Victor A. "Women in Modern Society." Journal of Home Economics, 57:99-102, February, 1965.

Dawe, Helen C. "Teaching Child Development-Runs, Hits, and Errors." Journal of Home Economics, 50:81-86, February, 1965.

De Vivo, Anita. "Family Life: The Common Denominator." Journal of Home Economics, 55:258-260, April, 1963.

Dixon, James P. "Our Changing Society: Impact on Families." Journal of Home Economics, 55:495-550, September, 1963.

Downer, Donna Beth. "The House and Adult Social Activity." Journal of Home Economics, 61:17-21, January, 1969.

_____, Ruth Smith, and Mildred T. Lynch. "Values and Housing--A New Dimension." Journal of Home Economics, 60:173-176, March, 1968.

Durrett, Mary Ellen. "Relation Between Anxiety and Self Concept Among Marathi-Speaking Indian Children." Journal of Home Economics, 57:717-719, November, 1965.

Efferson, Norman J. "An International Perspective for Family Economics." Issues in Family Economics. Report to the Family Economics Conference, June 21-23, 1967. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967.

Eisendrath, Jack N. "The Primrose Path from Easy Credit to Bankruptcy." Consumer Credit. Report to a Financial Management Conference, October 9-12, 1967. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967.

Fulcomer, David M. "What are Today's Families Like?" Journal of Home Economics, 55:693-698, November, 1963.

Goldberg, Faith S. "Problem Users of Consumer Credit as Seen by a Caseworker." Consumer Credit. Report to a Financial Management Conference, October 9-12, 1967. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967.

Gross, Irma H. "Impact of Certain Basic Disciplines on Home Management in Family Living." Journal of Home Economics, 58:448-452, June, 1966.

Hall, Ruth C. Family Holidays Around the World. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1964.

Hanson, Doris E. "Which Family? Where Shall the Focus Be?" Journal of Home Economics, 58:777-779, December, 1966.

Hawkes, Glenn R. "In Family Relationships and Child Development." Journal of Home Economics, 51:573-576, September, 1959.

Hettler, Frances M., et al. "Learning about Families Through Professional Travel Experiences." Journal of Home Economics, 60:257-260, April, 1968.

Hodge, Madeline. "Serving the Needs of Families in Public Housing." Journal of Home Economics, 55:627-628, October, 1963.

Hunter, Stanley M. "Homemakers Name their Home Problems." Journal of Home Economics, 53:425-427, June, 1961.

Hurd, Helen G. "The Square Tomato, or a Look to the Future." Consumer Credit. Report to a Financial Management Conference, October 9-12, 1967. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1967.

Hurt, Mary Lee and Dales, Ruth J. "For Effective Teaching of Family Living." Journal of Home Economics, 51: 349-351, May, 1959.

Ingersoll, Hazel L. "Family Values in a Consumer Age." Journal of Home Economics, 53:543-546, September, 1961.

Jewson, Ruth H. "Relation of Handicapping Conditions to Family Relationships." Journal of Home Economics, 55:620-624, October, 1963.

Keenan, Dorothy. "Exploring Value Patterns." Journal of Home Economics, 59:776-778, December, 1967.

Klemer, Richard H. "The Empathic Approach to Teaching Family Relations." Journal of Home Economics, 57: 619-625, October, 1965.

Knoll, Marjorie. "Toward a Conceptual Framework in Home Management." Journal of Home Economics, 55:335-339, May, 1963.

Koch, William H., Jr. "The North Carolina Fund." Working With Low Income Families. Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, March 15-19, 1965. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1965.

Lacot, Muria Socorro. "The Contribution of Home Economics to the Social and Economic Life of the Family." Journal of Home Economics, 50:635-636, October, 1958.

LeBaron, Helen R. "Professional Interaction." Journal of Home Economics, 59:499-502, September, 1967.

Liston, Margaret I. "Management in the Family as a Social Process." Conceptual Frameworks: Process of Home Management. Proceedings of a Home Management Conference, June 17-20, 1964. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1964.

Luckey, Eleanore Braun. "Education for Family Living in the Twentieth Century." Journal of Home Economics, 57:685-690, November, 1965.

_____. "Sex Education." Journal of Home Economics, 61:31-34, January, 1969.

Magrabi, Frances, Beatrice Paolucci, and Marjorie Hiefner. "Framework for Studying Family Activity Patterns." Journal of Home Economics, 59:714-719, November, 1967.

Marshall, Helen R., et al. "Modification of Student Attitudes on Guidance-of-Children Scales Through Classroom Teaching." Journal of Home Economics, 52:185-190, March, 1960.

Marshall, William H. "Home Economists and Legislation Affecting Families." Journal of Home Economics, 59:641-643, October, 1967.

Martin, William E. "Interpersonal Relations in Family Life." Journal of Home Economics, 52:655-658, October, 1960.

Marull, Jose. "The Family as an Economic Unit." Journal of Home Economics, 58:256-259, April, 1966.

Massey, Lelia. "Home Economics Faces Change." Illinois Teacher, XI (Winter 1967-68), 201-237.

Miller, Paul A. "Poverty Amidst Affluence: An Overall View of Poverty in Contemporary American Society." Working with Low Income Families. Proceedings of the AHEA Workshop, March 15-19, 1965. Washington: American Home Economics Association, 1965.

Mockmore, Buena Maria. "Lasting Values in a Changing World." Journal of Home Economics, 50:751-754, November, 1958.

Moore, Bernice Milburn. "Interaction Among Generations." Journal of Home Economics, 59:621-628, October, 1967.

Moore, Floride. "A Look Ahead." Journal of Home Economics, 52:518-522, September, 1960.

Morgan, Mildred I. "The Contributions and Needs of Home Economics Research in the Area of Family Relations." Journal of Home Economics, 51:358-361, May, 1959.

Morgan, Winona. "Implications of the White House Conference for Home Economists." Journal of Home Economics, 52:504-507, September, 1960.

Morse, Richard L.D. "Haves and the Have-Nots." Journal of Home Economics, 59:636-640, October, 1967.

Nichols, Addreen. "Organizational Processes Eliciting Help." Journal of Home Economics, 58:726-728, November, 1966.

Reagan, Barbara B. "The Effect of Government Agricultural Programs on Family Living." Journal of Home Economics, 52:441-442, June, 1960.

Reid, Margaret. "Families in a Changing Economy." Journal of Home Economics, 51:569-572, June, 1959.

Rutledge, Aaron L. "Counseling for Competence in Family Living." Journal of Home Economics, 50:15-18, January, 1958.

Samenfink, Anthony and Kranzler, Ruth. "Goals and Techniques of a Family-Centered Laboratory Nursery School." Journal of Home Economics, 52:263-266, April, 1960.

Sen, B.R. "Rural Families and FAO." Journal of Home Economics, 50:507-508, September, 1958.

Schaik, Theodora F.S.M. "Food and Nutrition Relative to Family Life." Journal of Home Economics, 56:225-231, April, 1964.

Schorr, Alvin L. "Filial Responsibility and the Aging." Journal of Home Economics, 54:271-276, April, 1962.

Schvarreveldt, Jay D. "Reference Groups and Family Functioning in the Community." Journal of Home Economics, 60:717-720, November, 1968.

Simpson, Elizabeth J. "Curriculum Development Challenges in Home Economics." The Education Digest, XXXIV (April 1969), 49-51.

Smith, Ramona and Christopherson, Victor A. "Migration and Family Adjustment." Journal of Home Economics, 58:670-671, October, 1966.

Smith, Ruth H. "Job Analysis as a Basis for House Arrangement." Journal of Home Economics, 54:450-459, June, 1962.

_____. "Housing Choices as Evidenced by Residential Mobility." Journal of Home Economics, 57:39-41, January, 1965.

Somerville, Rose M. "Imaginative Literature in Family Life Education." Journal of Home Economics, 55:409-412, June, 1963.

Staab, Josephine H. "Research in Family Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 51:257-260, April, 1959.

_____, et al. "Improving Economic Literacy through Family Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 54:90-93, February, 1963.

Stevens, Roger L. "America's Stake in the Arts." Saturday Review, LIII (February 29, 1970), 18-21.

Stewart, Alice M. "The Home Economist in Public Welfare." Journal of Home Economics, 56:389-391, June, 1964.

Tate, Mildred Thurow. "Family Life Research." Journal of Home Economics, 51:210-211, March, 1959.

Updegraff, Sue Garner. "Changing Roles of the Grandmother." Journal of Home Economics, 60:177-180, March, 1968.

Vars, Freda Teitzel. "Factors Related to Housing Satisfaction." Journal of Home Economics, 61:164-166, March, 1969.

Walter, James and Stinnett, Nick. "Should Family Life Education be Required." Journal of Home Economics, 60:641-644, October, 1968.

White, Ruth Bennett. "The Turkish Woman and Her Family." Journal of Home Economics, 56:241-246, April, 1963.

Williams, Dorothy G. "The Value of Studies of Family Expenditures in Setting up Budgets for Use by Social Agencies." Journal of Home Economics, 50:765-766, December, 1958.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Lelia Massey, "Home Economics Faces Change," Illinois Teacher, XI (Winter 1967-68), 208:

> Although home economics makes no claim to being the only school subject concerned with family living, it is the only field that has as its primary objective strengthening family life.

Earl J. McGrath and Jack T. Johnson, The Changing Mission of Home Economics (Columbia University: Teachers College Press, 1968), p. 84:

> From its beginnings, the preoccupation of the field has centered in the family as the milieu in which individuals grow and gain their basic learning in preparation for a productive, rewarding, and satisfying life.

Elizabeth J. Simpson, "Curriculum Development Challenges in Home Economics," The Education Digest, April, 1969, p. 50:

> Home economics as a field of study draws its content from most, or perhaps all of the disciplines. [Knowledge from these disciplines is applied to] the conduct of family life.

John Patrick Walsh and William Selden, "Vocational Education in the Curriculum of the Common School," in Vocational Education, ed. Herman G. Richey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 97:

> Basic to all that is taught in home economics is belief in the importance of family life.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Since the idea of home economics was born in the United States at the opening of the twentieth century, its particular focus has been uniquely American. This study, then, was concerned with the Western or American family and how home economics interpreted such a concept. Of the three disciplines viewed as contributing knowledge about the family, anthropology presents the most global or world-wide approach in that many studies have been done relative to small, closed social systems. In these latter studies, little contribution to cultural universals was evidenced. Hence, Malinowski's theoretical framework was more applicable to the study's purpose than the general term anthropology. Malinowski developed the concepts "comparative anthropology, functional anthropology or social anthropology." These terms point out that the purpose of anthropology is to illustrate selected elements that vary in societies yet sort out the fundamentals that are universal and stable; it studies facts with empirical and sociological interest. Functional anthropology attempts to lay

the foundations of sociology. In the last analysis, anthropology is to be a comparative science of cultures.[1]

Thus, those anthropological references using the terms postulated by Malinowski were selected on the basis that the term(s) appeared in the stated purpose of the reference. The general term anthropology continues to be used in the study but the reader needs to be aware of its boundaries.

---

[1]Bronislaw Malinowski, Sex, Culture, and Myth (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Incorporated, 1962), pp. 44, 167, 187.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

TOPICS DISCUSSED IN THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL LITERATURE[1]

The Purposes of Anthropology

Comparative studies of cultures
Determining cultural universals
Documentation of cultural variability
Family origins and purposes in cultures

Theories of Family Origin

The origin of American families
Former family types
A natural history of the family
Historical development of Western Marriage
Parent and child in primitive mythology

Family Universals

Comparative considerations of the family
World theories of the family
Comparative research studies
Cross-cultural family perspectives

---

[1]The organization is the writer's own. The sub-titles were paraphrased from the various author's works. Topics are grouped under the headings in no particular order of importance. The list does not include all titles found in the literature for similar topics were grouped and appear as one title in the listing. This also applies to Appendices D, E and F.

Families in Varying Cultures

The family in China
Permissive dependency in Japan
Cross-national variations in marital eagerness
Patterns of divorce in Australia
Latin American families
American Indian cultures
American families
American fertility
Family trends
Conjugal family types
Divorce
Children in the family
Family members

Social Structure and the Family

Society's concern for the family
Modern societies and marriage popularity
The family and the community
Industrialization and the family in sociological theory
Social structure and deviancy
Social structure and the family
Social change
Societal influences on the family
Societal conditions for family functioning
Social groupings and the family
The contributions of the family to the social order
Religion and the family
Education and the family
The family's purpose

Social and Emotional Features in the Family

The father-son relationship
Family housing
Kinship relations
Group structure and interpersonal creativity
Cultural and personal dilemmas in family experiences
Variations in child rearing
Equalitarianism, society and the family
Friends
Theories of marital selection
Social class affects on the family
Leading crowds
Family trends
The transfer of family functions
Sexual life and interpersonal intimacy
The family as an independent variable
The emotional structure and the family

Approaches to the Family

Universal family functions
The structural approach
The interactional approach
Role relations in the family
Family patterns
The nature of family organization
Family types
Family terminology
The family life cycle approach

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

TOPICS DISCUSSED IN THE SOCIOLOGICAL LITERATURE

The Family as a Universal

- History of the family
- Purpose of the family
- Need for the family
- Cultural universals
- Characteristics of the family
- Family unity
- The ideal family

Family Forms

- American family types
  - American attitudes
  - Composition of American families
  - The normal United States' family
  - Work and the family in contemporary society
  - The cultural configuration of the American family
  - Outlook for the United States' family
- Families in other countries (Soviet, French, Chinese, and Israeli families)
- Marital forms (polygny, polyandry)
- Family types
  - The companionship family
  - Extended family groups
    - Rules of residence
    - Family customs
    - Types of lineage
    - Family traditions
    - Filial responsibility and aging
    - Social participation of the aged in other cultures
    - Naming children in the middle class
    - Kinship networks
  - The isolated nuclear family
  - Family patterns and retirement

The Family and the Surrounding Society

- The effects of other social systems on the family (economic, scientific, legal, religious, educational, community, industrial, age, sex)
- Social class structure affects on the family
  - Child bearing and rearing in social classes
  - Conjugal role relations and social class
  - Class differences and family stability
  - Social class variations in marriage and the family
- Social class and premarital sexual permissiveness
- Recreation and family needs
- Values, ethics and family life
- Social class and fertility
- Social stress and the family

Family Stability and Disruption

- Family catastrophes (separation, dovorce, widowhood)
- Tension in Marriage
- Parent-child conflict
- Types of family crisis
- Family disruption
- The social nature of divorce
- Remarriage
- Changing sex ethics
- War and the family
- Emotional disturbance and the family
- The child's adjustment to broken and unhappy unbroken homes
- Parenthood as crisis
- Weakening of the family
- Helping the family
  - Natural planning, nutrition and health
  - Family counseling
  - Public welfare and the family
- Mobility and the family
- Demographic trends
- The family in transition
- Changing family functions
- Accommodating conflict
- Marital cohesion and dissolution
- Positions in formal groups
- Functions of the home (housing design, and plan for family life)
- Care of dependents
- Fusing the adolescent to parental functions
- Family personalization of society

Mate Selection

- Mating variations
  - Love and courtship
  - Mate selection
  - Romantic love
- Theories of mate selection
- Cultural factors in selecting marriageable mates
- Incest taboos and social structure
- Criteria for marital success
  - Predicting success
  - Marital adjustment
  - Kinds of relationships

Sex Education and the Family

- Premarital sexual behavior
- Sexual and marital practices
- The principle of legitimacy
- Sex role analysis
- Sex expression
- Sexual aspects of marriage
- Cultural contradictions and sex roles
- The United States' sexual revolution
- Birth control
- Abortion and the social system

Psycho-social Factors and the Family

- Theories of inner motivation
- Psychological factors in love
  - Folklore
  - Theories
  - Processes
  - Cultural influences

Selected Family Members

- Wife of the working man
- Employed mothers in the U.S.S.R.
- Learning the feminine role
- Women: the lost sex
- Women: the second sex
- The child's presence in the family
  - Isolated children
  - Collective child rearing
  - Infancy and childhood
- Adolescence and the launching years
- Affects of working mothers on the child
- The child's occupational role

Family Research

- Needed research
- New directions in family research
- Approaches to the family
  - The family as a social system
  - The family and social interaction
  - The family as an institution
  - Family expectations and roles
  - Family authority and structural patterns
  - Symbolic interaction and the family
  - Conceptual frames for analyzing the family
  - Theories of family development
  - The family life cycle
  - Social theory and research development

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

TOPICS DISCUSSED IN THE PSYCHOLOGICAL LITERATURE

History of the Family

- Archeological findings on families
- The family in myths and legends
- Families in existing non-literate societies
- Origins of marriage and the family
- The family throughout history
  - Hebrew families
  - Roman families
  - Russian families
  - New England families

The Family and Human Potential

- Family and man's needs
- Family functions
  - The child bearing function
  - The socialization function
  - Functions of family members
- The ethical and moral development of the individual
- Achieving security and maturity
- Homeostatic behavior
- Stability and breakdown

Mate Selection and Marriage

- Mate selection practices
- The regulation of sexual behavior
- Coming of age in the United States
  - Dating, courtship, engagement
  - Adolescence, mate selection and marriage
- Criteria for marital happiness
  - Why we marry as we do
  - Prescriptions for a happy marriage
  - Role conflicts related to marital happiness

Mate Selection and Marriage (continued)

- Men who marry older women
- School age marriages
- When to marry
- Problems of early marriage
- Faulty and productive marital patterns

Personality and marriage

- The theory of basic personality
- Psycho-sexual development of the personality
- Sex and personality
- Sexual orientations in the United States
- Emotional maturity
- The meaning of love

Growing together in marriage

Relatives and the Family

The emotional impact of relatives and in-laws
The psychodynamics of a three generation family
Motivation of intergenerational behavior through norms and law

Parenthood

Pets as substitutes for children
The emotional problems of pregnancy
Child development in the family
Parents
Shared responsibility for child rearing
Children and death

Family Crises

Family disorganization and reconstruction
Causes of present family problems
Modern life and its disintegrating influence on United States' families
Behavioral disturbances of contemporary families

- Parental disturbances
- Childhood disturbances
- Adolescent disturbances

Conflict and family relations
Changes affecting the family

Family Services

Social welfare and implications for family living

Approaches to Family Research

- The family developmental approach
  - The developmental tasks of childrearing
  - The family life cycle
  - Decision making and the family life cycle
- Nuclear and extended family relationships
- The family as an institution
- Role relations of the individual family member (mother, father, child)
- Social role and personality
- Family role relations
- Psychology of whole families
  - Psychopathic conduct and family disturbance
  - The psychological identity of the family
  - Healthy family characteristics
  - Principles of family psycho-dynamics
  - Diagnosing the family
  - Reactions in family crisis
  - Growth in familiasm
  - The Freudian psychoanalytic view of the family
  - Counseling for family competence
  - The individual, family, and community
  - The boss, individual and family
  - The interaction of family personalities
  - Family experiences and psycho-social development
  - Individual identity and the family
  - Interdependency of individuals
  - Family rituals

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

TOPICS DISCUSSED IN THE HOME ECONOMICS'

LITERATURE

Families in Society

The Homemakers food, family, and world
Family configurations
Family mobility
Migrant families
The impact of change on families
Problems of the home in Puerto Rico and the United States
Turkish and American women
Family life abroad
Oriental family life in transition
Interracial understanding
Predictions for the family's future
Which family to focus on

Family Economics

Appliance ownership in families
Economics of family life and worldwide social progress
Changing expenditures of urban and rural families
Financial practices of young families
Families in a changing economy
Socioeconomic values and family welfare
Cultural variations in family economics
The aged and family economics
Improving family economic literacy
Perceptions of financial security
Employed and unemployed wives' financial management
Family finances in the middle years
The family as an economic unit
Family economic behavior
Teenage consuming and expenditures
Consumer behavior and credit

Family Health, Welfare and Services

- Family marketing practices
- Food habits in the Virgin Islands
- Urban family dessert choice
- Explications versus intervention in the family
- Low income families
  - Working with low income families
  - A minimum adequate level of living
  - Parent-peer orientation in low income families
  - Decision making and the disadvantaged
  - Publications for families of limited reading ability
  - Inner city experiences
  - Low income Negro mothers
  - Factors in job performance in low income families
  - Reaching low income families
- Home economics and public welfare
- Legislation affecting families
- Effect of government programs on family living
- Rural families and the FAO

The Family's Environment

- Job analysis and housing arrangement
- Needs of families in public housing
- Mobility and housing choice
- Aesthetic housing values and sensitivity
- Family activity patterns
- Housing values
- The home and social activities
- Housing satisfaction factors
- Environmental temperature control
- Living space and patterned relationships
- Housekeeping standards
- Housing and foreign families

Family Values

- Art and home economics
- College student values
- Lasting values in a changing world
- Values in childhood and old age
- Family, community, and individual values and attitudes
- Changing attitudes
- Value patterns

Child Development

- Personality and the ability to judge the child's social acceptance
- Family relations and child development
- Goals and techniques of a family centered nursery school
- Maternal acceptance of childhood competition

Child Development (continued)

Birth defects
Physical status and non-continuous mothering
Acceptance of handicapped and nonhandicapped children
Day care centers
Parents' life goals for children
Rural mother's child rearing techniques

Family Life Education

Student needs and teacher perceptions
Curriculum in home economics
Curriculum workshops
Financing home economics programs
College family life programs
Interest in family life education
Family life education literature
Family life education teaching methods
The concept approach to teaching family relations
Requiring family life education
Concepts in teaching family finance
The family focus in college foods courses
Home economics education in Africa
The foreign study of families
Teaching parents to teach children
Education for low income families
A conceptual framework for home management
Sex education
Affect and effect of the dropout on families

Interpersonal Relationships

Attitudes of college students toward families
Mental health experiences of home economics students
Motivation in girls
Women in modern society
Student attitudes and dating
Love and integrity in marriage
Communication in marriage
Meeting family needs
Handicapping conditions in family relations
Interaction among generations
The changing role of grandmothers
Socio-psychological factors in high school marriage
Characteristics of young families
The empathic approach to family relations
Counseling for family competence
The handicapped and homemaking
Marital satisfaction measures

The Profession of Home Economics

Pre-school teacher certification
Married home economists
Undergraduate professional home economics education
Professional interaction
Homemaker aides
Men in home economics

Family Research

Family economic research
Case histories of interaction and research
Impact of some basic disciplines on home economics
Family research in Indonesia
Research in cooperation with other countries
Research methods in home management

APPENDIX G

APPENDIX G

CLARIFICATION AND ELABORATION OF THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK DESIGNED FOR STUDYING SELECTED HOME ECONOMICS' MATERIALS[1]

The context within which the points about families were made:

The social circumstances which gave impetus to the statements

-Who said them:	What were the authors' specializations which served to qualify them to speak about the family, e.g., were they home economists, sociologists, psychologists, others?
-When were they said:	The time span within which articles were published.
-Why were they said:	The reasons, purposes, or motives which gave impetus to the statements made about families
-What was the contextual source (home economics, sociology, anthropology, or psychology):	The primary influencers of the authors' statements or the bibliography references used, if given. Either one or both serve to indicate the motivators behind the statements.

---

[1]In some cases, portions of the framework may be inapplicable, e.g., a question may be answered without resorting to statements exhorting to action, or the statements made may not be classifiable within the framework. These were excluded from the analysis.

The direction given to the material (type of statements made):

The use or intention of the authors' statements--what are they trying to do to and/or with their audience

-Exhorting to action:	Expression of the speakers' feelings or desires accompanied by a plan of action indicating what should be done.
-Presentation of theory:	Statements or conclusions were derived from facts which aid in predicting about reality and/or life's activities.
-Collection of data for interpretation by the field:	Statements of fact were unaccompanied by the authors' evaluations
-Presentation of imperatives or attitudes:	Presents what the speakers' desire to have done but giving no plan of action supporting the statements.

The continuity of the material:

The durability of the ideas presented by the field reflecting uniformity and constancy of thought

-Comprehensiveness of the areas dealt with relative to the family:	Were the materials supported by a wide variety of thoughts as opposed to presenting a one-sided view, i.e., use of the literature or theory of one discipline to the exclusion of others.
-Variety of viewpoints held in a particular area of examination:	The authors present points and counterpoints relevant to a discussion of the family.
-Consistency, agreement and disagreement of the material dealing with the family:	The statements made by the various authors present a logical whole both within and/or between the articles or each author presents his view as the only correct one.

Similarities and differences:

--Home economics draws views from the disciplines with little variation or presents its own distinctive interpretations.

Gaps in the literature:

--Home economics takes full cognizance of the ideas drawn from the disciplines or excludes ideas which would have significance for the field.

Consistency and inconsistencies and where they exist:

--The ideas home economics has drawn from the disciplines present a coherent whole and/or are not haphazardly used in inapplicable situations.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293103468561