GENERATIONAL RELATIONS AND SUCCESSION:

A STUDY OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN FAMILIES

GENERATIONAL RELATIONS AND SUCCESSION:

A STUDY OF AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN FAMILIES

by

CAROLYN J. ROSENTHAL, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

December, 1981

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1981)   McMASTER UNIVERSITY

(Sociology)   Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Generational Relations and Succession:
           A Study of Authority and Responsibility in
           Families

AUTHOR: Carolyn J. Rosenthal, B.A. (University of
           Toronto), M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Victor W. Marshall

NUMBER OF PAGES: xvi, 470

ABSTRACT

This study develops two novel concepts in the
study of family life: the familial division of labour and
family headship. Together, these concepts allow for a
characterization of family life which is at the same time
somewhat novel and supportive of or contributory to a
broader understanding of many phenomena of family life
which have been observed and reported. The study of the
division of labour directs attention to aspects of family
structure which have not been systematically investigated
elsewhere and which I show to be socially real.

The data for this study were collected through
interviews with a stratified random sample of 464 men
and women aged 40 and over living in Hamilton and Stoney
Creek, Ontario. All had lived in Canada for at least ten
years. Interviews averaged one and one-half hours and were
conducted in English.

The division of labour is investigated through
task-specific positions which involve responsibilities
and activities enacted on behalf of the extended family
and which contribute to family solidarity and continuity.
Specifically, the positions of kinkeeper, comforter, place-
ment officer, financial advisor, and ambassador are shown
to exist in a division of labour in contemporary families.
While the division of labour is a widespread aspect

of family structure, there is great variability among families as to its shape and extensiveness.

The concept of headship is developed through an exploration of a central leadership position, the head of the family. The term refers to the person who is understood by others to possess authority and exercise the most leadership in the family. Most families in the study had such a person.

The concept of familial succession brings together interests in structure and process, and the ways in which the meaning and experiences of family life change for individuals as they grow older. Succession refers to the passing of family responsibility and authority from one generation to the next, a process which is investigated through an examination of patterns of occupancy in headship and the familial division of labour, and the ways in which these change through time. The study argues that changes in the locus of responsibility in headship and the division of labour are tied to significant family life course events as well as to aging and mortality.

When the concepts of the familial division of labour and headship are used as a basis for analysing the family as a type of work organization, the organizational structure of families is shown to follow the same principles as any work organization. An ideal typology of families -- bureaucratic, democratic, autocratic and anarchic -- is

developed, based on their organizational structure.

The study shows that the familial division of labour and headship are widespread phenomena which were meaningful to study participants. People were able to discuss aspects of the various positions in detail. These positions persist over time, and in many families they are passed on from one generation to the next in socially meaningful ways. Findings indicate that generational succession does occur, with each new generation coming to see itself as taking up family responsibility. However, elderly individuals, as their generational peers die, are less likely than younger family members to perceive the wider family as being an active, supportive group. This suggests a tempered view of the positive picture of intergenerational relationships conveyed by extant literature on families in later life.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Victor Marshall, and committee members Frank Jones, Ewan Macintyre, and Jane Synge for their advice, critical comments, co-operation in the face of time pressures, and supportiveness.

To Victor Marshall I owe an immense debt of gratitude. From the time I first began writing this dissertation, he managed to convey to me a sense of his confidence in and enthusiasm for what the eventual product would be, while simultaneously offering abundant, useful criticism on the current state of the work. On many occasions, he rekindled my enthusiasm by extending my vision beyond the immediate problems and frustrations. His intellectual guidance over the years has contributed beyond measure to my academic growth, and his confidence in me and overall support have been unwavering. I extend to him my deepest thanks.

I owe special thanks as well to Frank Jones who had the difficult task of joining the committee at the last moment, replacing Jane Synge. His criticism and helpfulness have been invaluable.

My thanks go as well to Ralph Matthews for his interest and support.

Brenda Nussey provided valued assistance and companionship, as did Margaret Denton and Christine Davis, of Social Data Research. I am grateful to them for their technical assistance and advice, and wish especially to acknowledge the help and remarkable patience of Christine Davis who battled the computer on my behalf.

My thanks go as well to the interviewers from the Hamilton Opinion Research Center and to the 464 people who agreed to be interviewed about their families and to share so many personal aspects of their lives with the researchers.

Finally, my profound thanks go to my own family. My children, Gary, Ken and Julie, endured the process with me, shared my ups and downs, and often "mothered" me with their understanding and concern. My husband, Donny, will probably consider it thanks enough to find work space once again in the study. Beyond this, though, he has my deepest gratitude and affection; while others have guided, encouraged and advised me, he is the one who has sustained me through this endeavour.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

xi

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Few areas of social life arouse as much interest, emotion or controversy as that of the family. It is a topic about which almost everyone has intimate, first-hand knowledge and experience. We enter the social world as members of families and, for most people, the family in one form or another remains the primary group of highest significance. Yet, despite the extent to which almost everyone in contemporary urban industrial society has experienced some kind of family living, it is very difficult to find any area of family life about which people, including scholars who specialize in family studies, are able to agree. Yet, inescapably, the family is very much with us. Whether on its way to doom or new importance, whether better or worse or simply different from the historical family, it survives. Behind my decision to study the family, lay an intense respect for and curiosity about this social institution.

Research on intergenerational relations as parents grow old and children reach middle age has been vigorously pursued in the past twenty-five years. Yet for all the informal and informed speculation about the family, the focus of family research leaves me with a feeling of uneasiness. Something seems to be missing.

1

Attention has been concentrated on the structure of
the family and the availability of kin, on interaction
patterns within and between the generations, on help
patterns and on affect between generations. However,
as important as these dimensions are, they do not
capture the totality of the experience and the meaning
of family life.

In this study, I have attempted to go beyond
the commonly studied dimensions of family life and
develop two concepts in a new and somewhat original
way: the familial division of labour, and the notion
that familial authority is vested in a "head of the
family". Together, these concepts allow for a character-
ization of family life which is at the same time
somewhat novel and supportive of or contributory to
a broader understanding of many phenomena of family life
which have been much observed and reported. The study
of the division of labour and headship directs attention
to aspects of family structure which have not been
systematically investigated elsewhere and which I show
to be socially real.

My uneasiness about the rather static views of
family relationships conveyed in conventional research
has led me to focus on dynamics and process. What
brings together my interest in new approaches to family
structure and my interests in the processes of family

life over time is a conceptualization of familial succession as a way in which families achieve continuity.

I venture far beyond the confines of the nuclear family or the household. Sometimes I define family as the _lineage_, consisting of ranked generations within a family -- parents, children, grandparents and grandchildren (Bengtson and Cutler, 1976). At other times, the family grouping I examine is the _extended family_, consisting of parents, siblings, aunts, uncles, grandparents, nieces, nephews, children, grandchildren, and so on.[1] Therefore, the present study should be viewed in the context of previous research on family relationships in the lineage and extended families, especially research on intergenerational family relationships in later life. Research on the family of later life can only be understood with reference to the broader field of the sociology of the family.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Family sociology has been dominated by the functionalist theoretical perspective, especially by the work of Parsons (notably Parsons, 1942, 1943, 1954; Parsons and Bales, 1955). A recent text on the family argues that in the sociology of the family Parsons has provided the major paradigm, in Kuhn's sense (Kuhn, 1962), within which normal sociology has been carried out.

The author reviews several major texts in the field
and concludes, "In the field of the family...Parsons,
if he does not reign supreme, still dominates" (Morgan,
1975: 26). The importance of Parsons to the present
discussion is that his theorizing on the "isolated"
nuclear family stimulated a great deal of research
which showed that extended family relations continued
to be important in contemporary life. These studies,
due to the nature of their theoretical interests,
turned to an investigation of family relationships in
later life.

Several landmark studies were done in Britain
(Bott, 1957; Townsend, 1963; Young and Willmott,1962).
A major comparative study of old people, including
their family relationships, was conducted in three
countries by Shanas and her colleagues (Shanas et al.,
1968). Important research in the United States, in
addition to that of Shanas, was conducted by Adams (1968)
and more recently by Bengtson (1975) and Hill et al.
(1970). The latter study was distinctive in that
it used a sample of three linked generations of family
members.

These and other studies have amassed a convincing
body of data documenting continuing high levels of assoc-
iation between elderly parents and middle-aged children
(Adams, 1968; Kerckhoff, 1966; Litwak, 1960; Rosow,
1967; Shanas et al., 1968), continuity or similarity

of values (Bengtson, 1975; Hill et al., 1970),
and extensive and reciprocal patterns of mutual aid in
a variety of areas (Adams, 1968; Aldous and Hill,
1965; Hill et al., 1970; Rosenmayr, 1977; Sussman,
1953, 1965; Sussman and Burchinal, 1962; Troll, 1971).
A less researched area has been the affective quality
of relationships between elderly parents and adult
children (although see Aldous, 1965; Aldous and Hill,
1965; Hill et al., 1970; Streib, 1965, 1971). Bengtson
has developed measures for investigating this aspect
of intergenerational relations (Bengtson, 1975;
Bengtson et al., 1976; Bengtson and Schrader, 1981
forthcoming). One interesting finding is that older
members of generational dyads tend to perceive slightly
higher levels of affection than younger members,
reflecting different personal investments or "develop-
mental stakes" in the parent-child relationship
(Bengtson and Kuypers, 1971).

These various dimensions of family life are
important and provide ways to empirically assess inter-
generational solidarity among family members (Bengtson
et al., 1976). In this study, however, I explore two
previously neglected dimensions of family life by
developing two concepts: the familial division of
labour and headship. I postulate that task-specific
positions exist in families, comprising a familial
division of labour. These positions involve responsib-

ilities and activities enacted on behalf of the lineage
or extended family, which contribute to family soli-
darity and continuity. Specifically, I show that the
positions of kinkeeper, comforter, placement officer,
financial advisor, and ambassador exist in a division
of labour in contemporary families. While the division
of labour is a widespread aspect of family structure,
there is great variability among families as to its
shape and extensiveness.

The second concept is based on the notion that
authority and responsibility are vested in one or more
members of the family. I refer to this as headship
and postulate that it is manifested in a central
leadership position which I call the head of the family.
The term refers to the person who is understood by
others to possess authority and exercise the most
leadership in the family.

My interests extend beyond the structural
aspects of families. I am interested, too, in process,
and the ways in which the meaning and the experiences
of family life change for individuals as they grow
older. The concept of familial succession brings to-
gether these two interests in structure and process.
Succession refers to the passing of family responsibility
and authority from one generation to the next, a
process which may be understood through examining

patterns of occupancy in headship and the familial
division of labour and the ways in which these
change through time.

The succession of generations has been a central
theme in sociological theory (for example, Eisenstadt,
1956; Mannheim, 1952; Moore, 1967). This concern
stems from the paradox that societies are, in a fig-
urative sense, immortal, while individuals, through whom
the social heritage is transmitted, created or recreated,
are mortal (Moore, 1967). The flow of generations,
as a theoretical problem, focuses on the ways in which
the continuity of society is maintained, through social
behaviour and cultural transmission (see for example,
Faris, 1947; Mannheim, 1952; Spiro, 1951). The flow
of generations is viewed as posing problems centering
on the preservation of traditional culture from one
generation to the next, on the one hand, and the impact
of innovation caused by the incorporation of new
members into the society, on the other. The family,
in this sense, can be viewed as a major arena in which
continuity and change are realized over the course of
time. Within families, as successive generations are
born, grow older and die, there is a passing down or
succession, from one generation to the next, of auth-
ority, power, responsibility and leadership. This
succession may be studied through the study of head-

ship and the familial division of labour. I argue
that change in the locus of responsibility in these
positions is tied to significant family life course
events as well as to aging and mortality.

The study of family relationships between the
generations, and the way in which these change as
families and individuals age, is not only of sociolo-
gical interest but of practical importance as well.
This importance is related to demographic changes in
the population. In Canada, there are many more old
people than there were only a few decades ago. In
1901 less than 5.5 million people lived in Canada, and
5.2% of them were 65 years old or more. Today the
Canadian population numbers over 23 million people,
almost 10% of whom are over the age of 65 (Marshall,
1981). The number of Canadians over the age of 65 is
expected to grow by more than three-quarters over the
next twenty years, and to double again in the first
half of the next century. A rise in the median age
of Canadians has been predicted from the present 29.7
years to 37.2 by the year 2001 (Denton and Spencer,
1979). Canada can expect an increase, then, in both the
numbers of people who are old and in the proportion
of the population that is old. The segment of the
population that is over 85 years of age is expected
to show even more dramatic increases. Finally, because

women can expect to live longer than men, most old people, and especially very old people, are and will be women.

These demographic changes have profound effects on family life. The typical family life course is changing in the direction of increased stability and continuity, compared to previous historical periods, because the ravages of infant mortality and infectious disease have been contained (Gagan, 1975-76; Kett, 1971; Uhlenberg, 1969). In a classic paper, Glick (1947) set out a notion of "family cycle", viewing a family as passing through typical stages. Beginning with family formation at marriage, the family gains in size with the birth of children. The children grow up, marry, and leave home and the parents enter the "empty nest" stage of life. Upon the death of one parent, widowhood becomes the final stage in the family life cycle. It is little appreciated that in North America, such a "typical family life cycle" was not in fact experienced by greater than half the population until the cohort of people born between 1890 and 1910 (Marshall, 1980: 19-21; Uhlenberg, 1969; Wells, 1973).

The fact that most people now living will experience or have experienced most of these family life stages has profound implications for relations between the generations in families. For one thing, families now

typically have several generations alive. About 75%
of people over the age of 65 have grandchildren and
40% have great-grandchildren (Shanas, 1967, 1973,
1981; Shanas et al., 1968). Living in three- or
four-generation families has become a common, even
taken-for-granted experience. In the future, it will
be increasingly common for there to be two generations
in the retirement years (Abu-Laban, 1978; Marcus,
1978; Wigdor, 1978).

Thus, Hareven (1977) argues that by comparison
to the nineteenth century pattern:

> ...the major transitions in
> family roles have been char-
> acterized by greater stability
> and conformity, because of the
> greater opportunity for genera-
> tional continuities. The oppor-
> tunity for a meaningful period
> of overlap in the lives of
> grandparents and grandchildren
> is a twentieth-century pheno-
> menon, a surprising fact that
> runs counter to the popular
> myth of a family solidarity in
> the past that was based on three-
> generational ties (Hareven,1977:63).

These demographic changes create both new possib-
ilities for and new challenges to family continuity
and intergenerational relations.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

My theoretical perspective is somewhat eclectic.
Generally, I remain within the symbolic interactionist
perspective, but I recognize the importance of objective

aspects of social structure. I take the view that
individuals are dialectically related to their
societies, both constrained by society and participat-
ing in its creation (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). I
begin with the assumption that individual human beings
act in such a way as to strive to control their rela-
tionships and situations. There is order in the social
world, but it is a precarious order, negotiated as
actors interact in social situations. Much sociology,
including that used in gerontology, reflects a normative
bias. Through socialization processes, individuals are
held to internalize roles, the expectations for
behaviour or complexes of norms appropriate for the
incumbent of a given status or position.[2] I take the
view that individuals do not simply play roles.
Expectations are seldom as clear as conventional role
theorists maintain. Rather, "individuals negotiate
with one another to work out some sense and semblance
of order" (Marshall, 1978-79: 348; see also Marshall,
1980: 2-5). In such negotiations they seek to obtain
their own ends and to impose at least a minimal level
of control on their situation. The concepts of nego-
tiated order and the pursuit of control are articulated
in Dawe (1970) and Strauss and Associates (1963), and
rest more generally on conceptions of such inter-
actional tactics as presentation of self (Goffman,
1959), altercasting (Weinstein and Deutschberger, 1963),

role-distancing behaviour (Goffman, 1961; Stebbins, 1967) and strategic interaction (Goffman, 1970). My own previous use of the perspective appears in Rosenthal et al. (1980).

In addition, in this study, I draw on exchange theory, especially as recently developed by Dowd (1980) who argues its relevance in terms of the decrease, with advancing age, in resources to be exchanged and the increase in the need for resources from others. Power resources are relevant in negotiation processes. But despite this decrease in resources, and within the constraints of social structure, old people seek to negotiate a "viable existence within the structure" (Dowd, 1980: 19).

These age-related losses in resources such as withdrawal from the labour force, reductions in income, declines in health, loss of parents, spouse, friends, and other changes in the structure of their families are only minimally under personal control, and they place the individual within what may be called an opportunity structure. The opportunity structure consists of those conditions and relations in which the individual is embedded and which both provide and restrict resources, goals, and lines of action. Additional dimensions of the opportunity structure, that are salient to family life and generational

succession include the number and sex of children, their age, and proximity.

I make frequent use of the concept of solidarity in this dissertation. The use of this concept, as it applies to families, is drawn from the work of Bengtson and colleagues who developed a model for studying intergenerational solidarity (Bengtson et al., 1976). However, my use of the concept is less precise than theirs; I use solidarity as an orienting concept, to direct attention to a general quality of families, including both intergenerational and intragenerational relationships.

I view family continuity as inherently problematic. Families face the disruptive effects of death, geographical mobility and immigration, competing demands for time and attention from other sectors of life, and sometimes a general tendency to drift. That is, the social bonds may weaken because of lack of use, as well as external pressures. Continuity is, to my mind, an achievement, attained through the efforts of group members, and especially through the efforts of workers in the familial division of labour. Often these efforts are made at a routine level. However, this study demonstrates that people are frequently quite aware of the threats to family continuity and make conscious efforts to meet these threats.

OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE DISSERTATION

There are nine chapters in this dissertation.
In this chapter, I have discussed the theoretical
importance of the study and placed it in the context
of relevant literature. Chapter Two describes the
methodology. Chapters Three through Five form a unit,
describing five major positions in the familial
division of labour. Chapter Six compares the five
positions and synthesizes the data from preceding
chapters into a more general view of the familial
division of labour. Chapters Seven and Eight form a
unit with their investigation of a position quite
different from the others, the position of head of the
family. Finally, in Chapter Nine, I combine data on
the horizontal differentiation of labour (as represented
by the five positions investigated in Chapters Three
through Five) with data on vertical differentiation
as represented by the position of head. The family is
viewed as an organization whose type of administrative
apparatus follows similar patterns to those found in
any organization.

I now give a summary of the dissertation,
chapter by chapter, noting major findings and conclusions.
By placing this summary and conclusion section at
the beginning of the dissertation, I enable the reader
to maintain a clear picture of the task and its import

as I develop the analysis in the following chapters.

In Chapter Three, I investigate the first of
five familial positions, that of the family kinkeeper.
The kinkeeper is defined as the person who takes a
leadership role in the family in an effort to keep
family members in touch with one another. Over half
the families in the study were said to have such a
person, and three-quarters of those named were women,
many of them respondents' sisters. Kinkeeping
activities included letters, phone calls, visits,
arranging family gatherings, organizing ritual cele-
brations, acting as communication links or information
centers for family members, and urging family members
to keep in touch with one another. Respondents were
asked how long the person had held this position in
the family; the median length of time was twenty years.
Kinkeepers were said to have assumed this family
position for a number of different reasons, but one
important reason was a desire to keep the family together.
Often this desire grew out of a specific event leading
to a perception that family continuity or solidarity
was threatened. In this chapter, implications of kin-
keeping for the "caught generation" are considered,
since there are indications that the onus of kinkeeping
does fall on the middle or caught generation. It is
noteworthy that the age boundaries of the burdened
generation in this study are somewhat older than those

described in the early formulations of the caught
generation problem by Neugarten and others. Finally,
the data indicate that kinkeeping as a family position
is passed down from mothers to daughters in families.

Five major findings emerge in Chapter Three.
The first concerns the duration of occupancy of the
position. The median length of time the kinkeeper was
said to have been occupying the position was twenty
years, and one-quarter of the kinkeepers had been
acting in this capacity for between thirty and seventy-
five years. This finding strengthens the conception
of position. Kinkeeping is not simply an activity
performed once or twice, but exists as a quite permanent
feature of family structure and organization.

The second finding concerns the importance
of siblings in kinkeeping and the implied importance
of sibling relationships. There is a strong suggestion
in the data that for many respondents the problem of
keeping in touch with family members was, to them,
the problem of keeping in touch with siblings and
perhaps with siblings' children.

The third finding is that these ties appear
to become problematic in many families as individuals
age and parents die. There comes a time, often but
not always following the death of a parent, when there
is a realization that something must be done if the
family is not to drift apart. In other words, family

members become cognizant of a threat to continuity.
In many families, someone rises to the task of
assuming responsibility for meeting the threat of
drift, and others in the family recognize that this
responsibility has been taken on. When solidarity
becomes problematic, individuals who may previously
have left such family worries up to others come to
realize it is now up to them to either keep the family
together or allow it to drift apart. The data reveal
that people have a sense of the family's fragility and
assume responsibility for trying to keep a sense of
"the family" alive in family members -- to maintain
the social bonds. People weigh the importance of these
bonds and relationships, and make choices about
priorities and commitments. Family continuity does
not simply "happen"; individual family members work
at achieving it, if they so choose. In this sense,
family solidarity and continuity may be viewed as being
very much a members' achievement.

A fourth finding of Chapter Three is that most
kinkeepers were people in the same generation as the
respondent. The preference for same-generation indiv-
iduals when naming position occupants appears repeat-
edly in the investigation of the different positions.
This finding is interesting when viewed against the
finding that these positions persist in families, as
evidenced by the fact that respondents could name the

person who occupied a position prior to its present
occupant. Clearly, these positions persist and
responsibility succeeds from one generation to the
next. People quite readily perceive responsibility
and authority as having passed from the older generation
to their own; this is clear from the fact that respon-
dents in all generations name a far greater proportion
of generational peers as position occupants than
persons from older generations. The data quite clearly
suggest, though, that people do not readily perceive
familial responsibility as having passed out of the
hands of their generation to a younger generation.

This reluctance to name a younger generation
position occupant is related to a fifth important
finding which appears first in Chapter Three but occurs
consistently throughout this study: respondents show
a decline in position identification with age. The
positions persist in families, but perception of this
structure changes as members age. Family realities
are quite different for elderly members and middle-aged
members. As their own generation grows older, and as
its ranks thin through death, elderly members feel
less involved in the familial division of labour, as
analysis of self-designations shows, and are less likely
to say that the various positions exist in their families.
We may infer that in many cases, the person who used

to occupy the position, in the respondent's eyes, either
is no longer alive or is no longer able to perform this
task. Rather than perceive personal authority as
waning, or become involved in dependent relationships,
these elderly people view the family as a more barren
place, without the positions and activities perceived
to exist by younger members. And, in truth, the family
is more barren for these older members, as the kin
group with which they have moved through life disappears,
member by member.

In Chapter Four, I investigate a second family
position, the comforter -- the person in the family
with whom other family members like to talk over their
troubles or from whom they seek advice and comfort.
Close to two-fifths of the families in the study had
such a position. The majority of comforters were women.
Affective qualities such as being sympathetic, compas-
sionate and understanding were typical of comforters,
especially if they were female. Male comforters were
more likely than females to be described as intelligent,
educated or experienced and to be involved in advice-
giving rather than providing comfort.

Findings in this chapter reflect those of the
previous chapter. Duration of occupancy in this position
averaged twenty years; it is striking not only that
the occupancy in these positions is of such long duration

but that family members are able to view their family
life with such a long time perspective.

Half the respondents who named a present
comforter could also say who had been the comforter
before the present occupant. This is a most striking
aspect of family memory, and demonstrates that people
perceive their family as having a history of this type
of family activity. In addition, this finding strengthens
the conception of the division of labour as a structure
that has a permanence of its own, despite the fact
that its existence can only be manifested through the
actions of individuals.

Interestingly, succession in this position occurs
along same-sex lines, usually from female to female,
but also from male to male.

As was true of the kinkeeper position, identifi-
cation of this position declined with age. And, again
reflecting the findings in Chapter Three, there was a
strong tendency for generational peers to be named as
occupants in the comforter position. The importance
of sibling relationships appears in this chapter as
well, with about half the comforters named being
respondents' siblings.

In Chapter Five, I investigate three more
family positions: the placement officer (the person
who helps family members find jobs), the financial
advisor (the person to whom other family members turn

for business or financial advice), and the ambassador
(the person who represents the family at funerals of
more distant family members or old family friends).

One out of six families in the study had a
placement officer. This person, almost always a man,
had originally assumed the position in response to a
need for a job by a family member. Once in the position,
however, placement officers usually helped more than
one person and provided such help over a period of a
number of years. It was interesting that despite the
theoretical importance of universalism in modern life,
the respondents in this study were more than willing
to talk about particularism with some pride when they
discussed this traditional form of occupational place-
ment.

The placement officer position was the only
position in which more than a small percent of children
were named as occupants. Here again, though, siblings
were the most frequently named occupants. Most of the
help was given to members of a generation younger than
that of the placement officer, usually going from res-
pondents and their brothers to sons and nephews.

In a now-familiar pattern, identification of
this position declined with age.

The position of financial advisor existed in
about one in five families in the study. Most financial
advisors were men, and generational peers were favoured

as occupants. Identification of this position by men
did not decline with age, but women's identification
showed the usual decline.

The ambassador was a common family position,
being identified in more than four out of ten families
in the study. Identification declined with age for
both men and women. People again showed a preference
for naming a generational peer as a position occupant.
Ambassadors tended to be women of middle age, pointing
once again to the family burdens on middle-aged women.

Finally in Chapter Five, I note that these
positions represent only a few of many that may exist
in the familial division of labour. Other potential
positions are briefly discussed.

In Chapter Six, I weave analyses and findings
from previous chapters concerning the five positions
into a more general analysis of the familial division
of labour. I investigate the number of positions that
exist in families, and find that fully three-quarters
of the families in the study had at least one position
and half had two or more. Certain positions tend to
cluster in families; the kinkeeper and ambassador
positions tend to occur together, as do the comforter
and financial advisor positions. Most families have
two, and sometimes three people, sharing in the familial
division of labour. However, there are some positions

which tend to be occupied by the same person. In the
data, the same person is often both comforter and
financial advisor, comforter and kinkeeper, and finan-
cial advisor and placement officer.

Men and women identify these family positions
in about equal numbers. However, the factors
related to position identification are different for
men and women.

Changes in patterns of identification with
age follow similar patterns for men and women who
are at the same family life stage, suggesting that
events in the family life course exert influence on
people's perceptions of the familial division of labour.

In Chapters Seven and Eight I turn to a con-
sideration of the position of head of the family.
This position was defined to respondents as head of
the lineage and thus differs in boundaries from the
other positions which were investigated in an extended
family context. The position of head of the family
was very widespread, being identified in two-thirds of
the respondents' families. Another one-sixth said
their family did not have a head at present, but did
identify the person who occupied the position in the
past. Thus, a major finding is that family headship
is a social fact and a pervasive family life phenom-
enon. In fact, one-third of the respondents in the

sample could name not only the present head of the family, but the previous head and the future head as well. This demonstrates most impressively that the position exists and persists through time, as individual family members are born, age, and die.

I show in Chapter Seven that headship is not merely symbolic or honorific but involves a variety of activities and responsibilities. These include financial responsibilities, taking charge in crises, giving advice, solving problems, being responsible for aging parents, and having the final say in decision-making.

Identification of this position declined with age, and was related to changes in family structure and the family life course.

I turn to occupancy of the position in Chapter Eight. The majority of family heads were males from the respondent's own generation. Younger generation occupants were rarely named in this position. Ascriptive characteristics were commonly given as the reason for headship occupancy. Most respondents perceived headship succession as occurring upon the former head's death, but in a number of cases marriage was seen as creating new heads.

I trace out the patterns of succession and find that the main pattern of succession of family authority is through the male generations: father to

son to grandson. An alternate pattern allows women to be heads for a time, after their husbands die. I view this as an interim type of headship, much like the role of the regent in a monarchy.

The analysis shows that there are variations among families in the rules governing headship and the styles with which the head governs.

In Chapter Nine, I draw together the work of Chapter Six which analyses the division of labour consisting of the five family positions, and the analysis of the position of head of the family of Chapters Seven and Eight. I investigate how the position of head clusters with various other positions in families, and find that the financial advisor position is most likely to appear with the position of head, while the ambassador position seems least connected to the position of head. The reasons for the patterns of clustering are discussed in terms of the nature of the different positions. The next focus of interest is the clustering of position occupancy. Here, I analyse data to see whether the person who is head usually occupies any of the other positions as well. The data show that the occupant of the financial advisor position is frequently the head. The same pattern is often true of the comforter as well. The head is rarely the placement officer or the kinkeeper. I turn next to a conceptualization of

the family as an organization and to a consideration
of organizational structure. First I investigate the
relationship between the number of positions and the
number of people staffing these positions. The re-
lationship between the number of positions and headship
is then investigated. Families with more horizontal
differentiation are more likely to have vertical or
hierarchical differentiation as well. The more posi-
tions there are in a family, the more likely that family
is to have a head. The relationship between the number
of people in the division of labour and the presence
of the position of head is explored next, but con-
sistent relationships are not found. I conclude that
complexity of work, as indicated by the number of
positions, is more important in predicting headship
than the number of people involved in the division of
labour.

Finally, I develop a typology of four ideal
types of families, based on the presence or absence of
a head and a high or low division of labour. The four
types, the bureaucratic family (head and high division
of labour), the autocratic family (head and low
division of labour), the democratic family (no head
and high division of labour) and the anarchic family
(no head and low division of labour) are compared with
respect to a number of variables such as age and marital
status of members, lineage structure, availability

of proximate kin, education and occupation of members.
This typology demonstrates that the nature of family
organization is patterned by sociological factors,
and that certain kinds of families are more likely to
be highly organized than others. The strongest
contrast was between families with heads and high
divisions of labour, the bureaucratic type of family
organization, and families without heads and with very
low divisions of labour, the anarchic type. Bureau-
cratic families were characterized by multi-generational
lineages, including parents, children and grandchildren.
These families usually had large pools of proximate kin.
Respondents who belonged to these families were
comparatively young, usually married, had siblings,
were well educated, and tended to be middle to upper-
middle class, with male respondents tending to have
relatively high incomes and be in the upper occupational
levels. By contrast, people in anarchic families tended
to be unmarried, elderly, without parents or children,
and with low incomes. Lower educational and occupational
levels were characteristic of men in this family type.

Major Findings and Conclusions

The major finding of this study is that the
familial division of labour and headship, as I have
conceived of and measured them, are socially real phen-
omena. The existence of these family positions is a
social fact, one which was meaningful to respondents,

which they could discuss in detail, and which existed
in most families. Not only do these positions exist but
they persist over time, and in many families they are
passed on from generation to generation in socially
meaningful ways. They represent, then, an aspect of
family structure which is important in the achievement
and maintenance of family solidarity and continuity.
It is beyond the scope of the dissertation to pursue
at length the implications of this characterization
of families. However, it can be expected to relate to
other aspects of familial solidarity.[3]

A second finding is that while occupancy of
these positions is patterned by sex, identification is
not. That is, about equal proportions of men and women
in the sample identified the various positions. This
is important, I think, in that it counteracts a taken-
for-granted notion that women are more attuned to
family matters than are men.

Added to the discovery that these positions
exist, is the finding that generational succession may
indeed be studied through the study of the division
of labour and headship; this is the study's third major
finding. Respondents were often able to describe the
processes of succession. While I describe some aspects
of succession, a complete delineation of this phenomenon
was beyond the scope of this dissertation and awaits
future investigation.

A fourth finding is that people view their
own generation as carrying family authority and res-
ponsibility. Respondents tended to name generational
peers as occupants of all family positions. This is
related to the fifth major finding: identification
of these positions declined sharply in old age. These
findings point to two conclusions. Generational
succession does occur, with each new generation coming
to see itself as taking up the torch, so to speak.
But, while the family as an entity goes on, its meaning
changes for elderly members. As their generation
passes away, they are less likely to perceive the wider
family as being an active, supportive group.

This suggests a tempered view of the positive
picture of intergenerational family relationships
conveyed by the body of research reviewed at the begin-
ning of this chapter.[4] As people age, and family
members of one's own generation are lost, the wider
family of significant kin shrinks. Old people are not
necessarily excluded from wider family occasions, but
their presence may be ritualized rather than truly
involved, a characteristic of elderly people's family
relationships that was noted by Sarah Matthews in her
study. From the perspective of the aging family member,
the boundaries of the meaningful kinship unit become
increasingly narrow until, I infer, they are eventually
more or less restricted to children and grandchildren.

These relationships are thus increasingly important but are experienced within a context in which the older person is increasingly dependent, with ever fewer alternative sources of social and emotional support.

The findings of this study reveal that the family, through the efforts of its members, is indeed:

> A lasting fabric which time
> shall fray; Which time shall
> fray, but only to be rewoven
> by each generation (Stern, 1978).

As family members grow old, younger ones replace them as occupants of positions in the familial division of labour and as family heads. These positions exist in a structure that extends beyond the lives of individuals and point to one way in which families and indeed, through them, society achieve continuity. This structure is an aspect of familial organization that has not been systematically investigated or described in previous research. I turn now to my exploration of this phenomenon of contemporary families.

FOOTNOTES

1   The term "lineage" indicates a precisely-bounded unit of analysis, since it denotes the respondent and his or her living parents, grandparents, children and grandchildren. The term "extended family", however, is a much more ambiguous term in our society. Morgan expresses this definitional problem when he notes:

> In our society there are no clear rules as to what we mean by "relatives" or "kindred". By definition these are not bounded units since they are based on Ego's definition of the situation. Thus the picture of the kinship universe is one of increasing fuzziness at the edges and more definite, but still flexible, notions of duty, reciprocity, closeness (with the possiblities of conflict) nearer the centre. Moreover, this kinship universe is subject to change over time as a result of changes in one's own life cycle as an individual and as a member of two intersecting and changing nuclear families and changes in the individual and family life cycles of significant related others (Morgan, 1975:206-207).

In this study, the term "extended family was never presented to respondents. Rather, respondents were asked to think in terms of the categories of relatives that make up the extended family and allowed to define that grouping with whichever boundaries were meaningful to them.

2   Throughout this dissertation, I generally use the term "position" and describe associated "activities and responsibilities", and avoid using the term "role". I have chosen to do this for theoretical reasons, since I am critical of conventional role theory and wish to avoid the normative connotations of the term "role".

3	For example, analysis of the data showed that families with higher divisions of labour also had higher degrees of interaction between respondents and children, as well as between respondents and siblings. These families were also more likely to have sentimental objects or heirlooms that were passed down through the generations.

4	Sarah Matthews, in her qualitative study of old women, also expresses the opinion that previous research conveys a misleadingly positive picture of family relationships in old age (Matthews, 1979:136).

5	In its original context, this quotation referred to "love" rather than to the family.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

I begin this chapter with a description of the
Generational Relations and Succession Project, of which
the present study forms a part. I then describe sampling
procedures and the setting of the research, followed by
a description of the design of the study. A discussion
of measurement concludes the chapter.

THE GENERATIONAL RELATIONS AND SUCCESSION PROJECT

This study is part of a larger, ongoing research
project at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, entitled
"The Generational Relations and Succession Project".[1]

The main purpose of the project is to examine the
presumedly serial transmission or succession through a
lineage of multi-faceted patterns of authority, responsib-
ility and dependency. An additional major concern is to
examine such lineage transmission as it affects those in
the older levels of the lineage. To accomplish this, a
number of dimensions of intergenerational relations were
investigated: aspects of family structure, interaction,
affect and exchange. In addition, because of the relation-
ship between health and dependency, data were gathered on
the health status of respondents and members of their
families.

The project was conceived in the spring of 1979 when Victor Marshall and I, soon joined by Jane Synge, began to discuss the possibility of collaborating on such a project. We wrote the research proposal that spring and the project began officially in mid-February, 1980. Throughout the winter, we worked to develop our interview schedules and other instruments. Pre-testing was done in March, followed by revisions to the interview schedule. Fieldwork began in May, 1980 and continued through September. Data gathering from the mailed questionnaire component of the study continued until January, 1981.

I believe these data are of extremely high quality. As I show below, the data were obtained from a random sample, stratified by age and sex, of 464 persons, drawn from the population aged 40 and over, of Hamilton and Stoney Creek, Ontario. The interviews were conducted by highly trained and skilled interviewers. The measurement instruments were carefully constructed, in consultation with other scholars in the field. The coding of interview and other data, key-punching, cleaning, consistency checks, and a complex system of data management have been meticulously handled.[2] All these factors should contribute to confidence in the data.

SAMPLING

All persons aged 40 or over, living in Hamilton or Stoney Creek, Ontario were eligible to be interviewed in this study, subject to a few limitations and exclusions.

Respondents were required to be fluent enough

in English to take part in the interview, since no
translators were used, and to fill out the drop-off
questionnaire, which was printed in English only.

In addition, only persons who had lived in Canada
for ten years or more were eligible to be interviewed.

These criteria obviously minimized ethnic varia-
bility. This was fully intentional. While the researchers
recognized the importance of ethnic differences in family
life and aging within families, it was felt that with the
limited state of knowledge about the major goals of the
study a focus on ethnic variability would be premature.

In addition to language and length of residence,
respondents needed to be healthy enough to take part in
the interview.[3]

This sample was developed in conformity with
appropriate standards to ensure its suitability for
estimating population parameters. For my purposes, which
focus on the construction of an explanatory typology
rather than on estimation, the advantage of this well-
constructed sample lies in its over-sampling of older
people, especially older males. Given my purposes, which
focus on the existence of certain family types rather
than on the distribution of such types in the population,
I did not employ weighting in my analysis of the sample
data.

The population from which the sample was
drawn includes all persons aged 40 or over living

in Hamilton and Stoney Creek, Ontario subject to the above
eligibility criteria. The sample was selected as a system-
atic sample stratified by age and sex. Using the 1980
property assessment tape, a computer tape representing a
complete census of all persons living in these communities,
compiled for local tax purposes, it was possible to ascertain
exactly how many individuals were to be found in each of
six sampling cells formed by cross-classifying two gender
categories by three age categories. The three age categories
were 40-54, 55-69, and 70 and over. Every nth case within
each category was then selected so as to reach a targeted
number of 80 cases per cell. To reach a close approximation
of this target, in fact 464 cases were interviewed, consist-
ing of at least 72 and no more than 83 cases per cell.

To obtain 464 completions, attempts were made to
contact 1081 persons, drawing new cases randomly as needed.
Despite the fact that the population listing was the current
year's property assessment tape, it was not possible to
locate 117 persons, of whom 30 were known to be deceased
and 68 known to have moved. This left 964 contacted persons,
of whom 116, or 12%, were found to be ineligible for the
study because they could not speak or write English well
enough to be included. Subtracting language ineligibles
leaves a total of 848 eligible contacted persons, from
which base the following rates are calculated: 12% excluded
because their own health was too poor or they were pre-
occupied with the ill health or death of another family
member; 33% refusal; 55% completion.[4]

Hamilton is a major industrial center in Canada.
In contrast to Hamilton, Stoney Creek is characterized by
light industry and many features of a bedroom community.
It is more middle class than Hamilton, having a large number
of recent housing developments of a suburban type. In the
Generational Relations and Succession project, sampling was
done from the combined populations of both Hamilton and
Stoney Creek in order to derive the sample from a fairly
typical medium-to-large size Canadian metropolitan area.

Since the sample was stratified by age and sex,
the proportions of persons, and especially of men, in the
middle and older age groups do not reflect their actual
proportions in the general population. Thus, the findings
of the dissertation concerning the relative distribution
of social phenomena are not generalizable to a wider
population of families without taking into account the over-
sampling of certain age and sex groups. The purpose of
the dissertation is to explore and develop concepts for
use in the study of the family, and to describe certain
social processes which occur systematically in families,
rather than to test hypotheses or predict the condition of
families in Hamilton and Stoney Creek or in any universe.
Throughout the dissertation, whenever I refer to aspects
of family life as indicated by the present study, the
reader should be aware that I intend my discussion to apply
primarily to the families in this study. Only in a very tent-
ative or suggestive way might one wish to extrapolate to
families in general. The study does, however, prepare the

ground for a systematic analysis, using appropriate weighting techniques, of these data, and for additional research whose aim is theory testing as opposed to my own interest in conceptual development.

A separate note should be made about ethnicity. Hamilton itself is about average in ethnicity. 60% of its residents describe the British Isles as the place of their family origin, with the next largest groups being Italian (9.5%) and German (5.3%) (Pennock, 1977).

Hamilton has a slightly "older" population than Canada as a whole. Its age index (defined as the proportion of its population aged 65+ compared to the proportion of Canada's population aged 65+) was 117 in 1971. This is quite close, however, to the Ontario provincial age index (compared to Canada as a whole) of 113 in old age dependency (Pennock, 1977).

In summary, on many social indicators, Hamilton is reasonably typical of Canadian urban areas. This is especially so with respect to central Canada. Family life in Hamilton, therefore, may be assumed to be reasonably representative of family life elsewhere.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

While interviews were conducted with only one family member, mailed questionnaires to older and younger relatives provide data from two or three linked generations. In addition, the respondent who was interviewed was asked during the interview about all children and all living

FIGURE 2.1

Design of the Generational Relations and Succession
Project

```
┌─────────────────────┐   ┌─────────────────────┐
│ Mailed Questionnaire │   │ Mailed Questionnaire │
│ to One Parent        │───│ to One Parent-in-law │
│ (if available)       │   │ (if available)       │
└─────────────────────┘   └─────────────────────┘
             │
             │
      ┌──────────────┐  ┌────────────┐   ┌────────────┐
      │ Initial      │  │ Drop-off   │   │ Follow-up  │
      │ Interviews   │──│ Question-  │...│ Interviews │
      │ (Random      │  │ naire      │   │            │
      │  Sample,     │  └────────────┘   └────────────┘
      │  N = 464)    │
      └──────────────┘
             │
    ┌──────────────────────┐
    │ Mailed Questionnaire to │
    │ All Adult Children      │
    │ Aged 18 and Over        │
    │ (if available)          │
    └──────────────────────┘
```

parents and parents-in-law, providing a great deal of three-generation data. Figure 2.1 displays the design of the study, and shows the way in which all components are linked to the persons interviewed in the initial interview.

In this dissertation, I draw almost entirely on data from the initial interviews. I make very minor use of data from the mailed questionnaire to children, and from the follow-up interview. However, I will describe the entire study design in brief to give the reader a comprehensive picture of the study and my uses of the data.

The major study design component consisted of initial interviews with a sample of 464 men and women aged 40 and over living in Hamilton and Stoney Creek, Ontario. These interviews, averaging one and one-half hours in length, were conducted under contract to ehe Hamilton Opinion Research Center by trained and experienced interviewers. Data were collected on all major aspects of the study including extensive data on family structure, interaction, affect, exchange and health. An important component of this interview, which forms the central focus of this dissertation, dealt with the existence and nature of several family positions.

One-fourth of all respondents who were interviewed in the initial interview component were pre-selected for a second, follow-up interview, which also averaged one and one-half hours. These interviews were less structured than the initial interviews, and

gathered primarily qualitative data on such matters
as family ritual and turning points in parent-child
relationships. In addition, some of the positions
investigated in the initial interview were pursued
here in greater depth.[5]

At the conclusion of the initial interview
(or, for those who were interviewed as follow-up
cases, at the conclusion of that interview) the
interviewer left a nineteen-page, <u>self-administered</u>
<u>questionnaire</u> with the respondent to be returned
to the project office in a provided stamped envelope.
The response rate was 90%. This questionnaire
investigated such areas as contact with siblings,
morale, life satisfaction, and norms and attitudes
concerning parent-child relations.

<u>Questionnaires</u> were mailed to all adult children
aged 18+, one parent and one parent-in-law.

At the conclusion of the personal interviews,
respondents were asked to provide names and addresses
for their parents, parents-in-law, and adult children
aged 18+. Questionnaires were sent to a total of 677
adult children, 44 parents, and 33 parents-in-law whose
names were provided. The response rate for this
component was 76%.

MEASUREMENT

The major instrument in the project, and the
source of most of the data used in this dissertation,

is the 40-page Initial Interview Schedule. Auxiliary
instruments to this are the Master Listing, on which
the interviewer recorded family structure data for each
respondent, and the Parent and Child Fact Sheets.
For every living parent, parent-in-law, and adult
child of the respondent, a separate 4-page fact sheet
was used to gather data on that individual from the
respondent.

The other instruments are the Follow-up Inter-
view Schedule, the Drop-off Questionnaire, the Parent
Questionnaire, the Parent-in-law Questionnaire, and
the Child Questionnaire.

The questions from these instruments which I
have used in this study are contained in Appendix B.[6]

Since the topic of the present study had not
been explored previously, new measures had to be
developed. These are listed in full in Appendix B,
questions 86 through 97. These measures created the
following variables: the positions of kinkeeper,
comforter, placement officer, financial advisor,
ambassador and head of the family. These are the
major variables used in this study. The key questions,
and their response frequencies, are displayed in
Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1

Response Frequencies for Major Questions on Headship
and Division of Labour *

Question: Thinking about your side of the family
in the broadest terms--including your brothers,
sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents, and
so forth--Is there currently any one person among
you and your family who, in your opinion, works
harder than others at keeping the family in touch
with one another?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	51.3	48.1		.4	.2

Question: (IF NO TO THE ABOVE) Was there ever such
a person?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	15.9	31.0		.6	52.4

Question: Is there currently any one person among
you and any of the relatives on your side of the family
who helps other relatives find jobs or get started in
occupations or businesses?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	17.0	81.0		1.9	

---

* The reader is reminded that in most instances the fre-
quencies reported here for the total sample are skewed
by the stratification of the sample which gives greater
weight to older people, especially older men.

TABLE 2.1 (Cont'd)

Question: Is there currently any one person among you
and any of the relatives on your side of the family
who is often turned to by other family members for
advice about money matters?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	18.8	79.3		1.5	.4

Question: Is there currently any one person among you
and any of the relatives on your side of the family
with whom other family members particularly like to
talk over their troubles--someone they can go to for
advice and comfort?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	37.3	59.7		1.5	1.5

Question: (IF NO TO THE ABOVE) Was there ever such
a person?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	17.2	40.9		.4	41.4

TABLE 2.1 (Cont'd)

Question: Is there any one person among you and your side of the family who, more than others, makes a point of making sure that the family is represented at <u>things like the funerals</u> of more distant relatives or old family friends?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	42.9	53.9	.2	2.4	.4

Question: Thinking of your side of the family as including yourself, your spouse and children, and your parents and grandparents--whichever of these people are still alive, is there anyone who is thought of as the <u>head of the family</u> on your side of the family?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	65.5	31.5	1.9*	.4	.6

Question: (IF NO TO THE ABOVE) <u>Was there ever</u> a time when someone was thought of as the head of the family on your side of the family?

Responses:	Yes	No	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applicable
Frequencies (%):	15.1	16.4			68.5

---

* Respondents did not understand the term "head of the family".

TABLE 2.1 (Cont'd)

Question: Who was the head of your side of the family before then?

Responses	Some-one	No one	Refuse	No Answer	Not Applic-able
Frequencies (%):	71.4	10.5		19.3	

Question: Who, if anyone, will be the next head of the family?

Responses	Some-one	No one	Refuse	Don't Know	Not Applic-able
Frequencies (%):	40.3	21.8		19.2	18.8

N=464

The major dependent variables used in this study are those created by the questions in Table 2.1 and by the questions which followed each of these key questions.

The major independent variables used in analysis are age, sex, marital status, occupation, retirement status, number of children, whether or not the respondent has children, number of siblings, number of generations above and below the respondent in the lineage, and the availability of proximate kin. Income and education are used occasionally. The theoretical reasoning behind use of these independent variables appears throughout the following chapters. Ethnicity was dropped from the analysis, for reasons I discuss below. For detailed information on sample characteristics, see Appendix C.

Age:

Age is a key variable in this study. The reader will notice that in some instances I use the three age categories used in the sampling design, and in other instances I use five-year age categories. The sampling techniques stratified the sample into three broad age groups: 40-54, 55-69 and 70 and over. The cutting points for these age groups were selected primarily on practical rather than theoretical grounds, although they were considered to correspond roughly

to various family life stages, with the youngest

being the period of "launching" and empty nest,

the middle the period of retirement and loss of

spouse, and the oldest characterized by increasing

health losses and the potential for dependency

(this characterization draws on Neugarten and Hagestad,

1976). Sometimes in my analysis, particularly when I

simply wish to explore a general trend with increasing

age, I used these three age groupings. For example,

this is my strategy when I analyse generational location

of persons named as position occupants. Also, sample

characteristics are usually presented for these

three age groups. Using these three age bands is

always the most expedient strategy, since the ident-

ification number assigned to every respondent reveals

both age and sex by the first digit.[7] When finer

age distinctions are required, in order to make

theoretically based interpretations of the data, I

use 5-year age categories. This is my strategy, for

example, when investigating how position identif-

ication varies with the age of the respondent.

Sex:

Data are usually analysed separately for each

sex. Sex is a major independent variable in the study

because the meaning of family life and the experience

of, and changes that accompany, growing older are

often quite different for women than for men.

Marital Status:

Marital status is an important variable in
that it is strongly related to age, especially for
women (full sample characteristics on this and
subsequent variables are given in Appendix C).
This variable is usually dichotomized as "married/other".
Finer distinctions between married, widowed, and
never-married or divorced persons would be interesting
to pursue in further research on specific topics.
However, for the present, general study, these distinc-
tions were not highly informative; thus I have chosen
the dichotomous approach.

Income:

Whenever income is used as a variable, it is
family income to which I refer. Income is problematic
as a measure when studying the elderly and should be
used with reservations. I do, however, make occasional
use of this variable, such as when studying family
types in Chapter Nine.

Occupation:

Occupation was coded using two-digit Blishen
codes, and collapsing codes 60 to 79 due to the small
numbers of respondents in these categories.[8]

For female respondents, husband's occupation
was used as the indicator. When occupation was used
as a variable, never-married women were excluded from
the analysis.

Education:

Education was re-coded into three categories: elementary, secondary, and post-secondary. Having some education at any of these levels put the respondent into that coding category. For example, respondents with some post-secondary education were categorized together with those who had university degrees.

Retirement Status:

When retirement status was used as a variable, spouse's retirement status was used for married and widowed women. Never-married women were excluded from the analysis in such instances.

Children Yes/No:

This variable distinguished respondents who had at least one living child from those who had no living children. Respondents who had more than one living child were coded in the first category.

A number of constructed variables are employed in this study. These are described below.

NGEN 1:

This variable was constructed to include the total number of living generations in the lineage who were older than the respondent (that is, parents and/or grandparents). However, only seven respondents in

the sample had living grandparents. Furthermore, no
respondent had a living grandparent, but not a living
parent. Therefore, for all practical purposes this
variable may be understood as equated with whether or
not the respondent has at least one living parent.
This variable was constructed by giving a score of
one to three. Respondents who had no older generations
were given a score of one; those with parents only
were given a score of two; those with parents and
grandparents were given a score of three. Usually,
but not always, categories two and three were combined.

NGEN 2:

This variable denoted the number of generations
younger than the respondent in the lineage. Respondents
with no younger generations were given a score of one;
those with children were given a score of two; those
with children and grandchildren were given a score of
three, the maximum possible on this variable.

NGEN:

Occasionally, the total number of living gen-
erations in the lineage is used as a variable. In
such cases, with the respondent counting as one,
there is a maximum number of five.

Number of Children:

This variable totalled the number of living
children respondents had. Scores ranged from zero to

5+. All respondents who had more than 5 children were included in the latter category.

Number of siblings:

This variable scored the number of living siblings the respondent had, ranging from zero to 5+; respondents with more than 5 siblings were coded as belonging in the latter category.

PROXKIN:

This variable measures the total of all children 18+, parents, and siblings who lived within one and one-half hour's travel time from the respondent's home. A score was compiled by giving one point for each person in the above categories. In analysis, scores ranged from zero to 5+, with all scores over 5 collapsed into the upper category.

AVAIL:

This variable was constructed by giving one point each for having at least one parent, one child 18+, and one sibling living within one and one-half hour's travel time from the respondent's home. Scores ranged from zero to three.

Ethnicity:

Ethnicity was measured in several ways: length of residence in Canada, country of origin, language spoken in respondent's home, language spoken with parents, main ancestry of respondent

and of respondent's spouse, country of origin of
father and father's parents, and country of origin of
mother and mother's parents. Thus, although the
project design minimized ethnicity and although the study
of ethnic variations was explicitly viewed as being beyond
the scope of the research project, fairly complete data
were gathered concerning respondents' ethnicity. In the
early stages of my analysis, I included ethnicity as a
variable. However, as my analysis proceeded, I became
increasingly unhappy with the ethnicity variables. As
Appendix C, Table C.1 shows, over half the respondents were
of British ancestry. Other ethnic groups were represented
in numbers ranging from twenty to thirty-four respondents,
as well as a larger category of "other" consisting of a
variety of ethnic groups represented only in very small
numbers.

My preliminary analysis of ethnic variations
with respect to the dependent variables I investigate
in this study convinced me that the use of ethnicity
in the present study would muddy rather than clarify
the main issue. First of all, ethnic variations were
small, and rarely significant at the .05 level. This
was not surprising, given the efforts made to minimize
ethnicity in the study design. However, it is possible
that future analysis of these data might yield some
information on ethnic variations, despite the small
numbers in each group. For the present, I take the

firm view that this should be more properly viewed as a sub-study growing out of the present investigation.

The data on which I draw are both quantitative and qualitative.

My basic strategy with quantitative data is to employ crosstabulations and correlations between theoretically relevant variables. Throughout, the major independent variables are age and sex. These often serve as control variables on each other. I have analysed data separately for men and women due to the great differences by sex and age. At times, I employ a multivariate analytical strategy. However, it is my conviction that it is important to try to express these findings at a level readily understandable to the audience (and the author).

Qualitative data, emerging from open-ended questions concerning most of the positions investigated, form an important data source in this study. I believe that, especially in an exploratory study such as this, the use of qualitative data is extremely valuable and important. By asking quite general questions about the positions investigated, the data gathered reflect members' rather than observers' constructs. I make extensive use of verbatims, in the belief that they convey an immediate sense of meaning to the reader

which is lost when the researcher simply offers
summary descriptions. Also, the use of verbatims
is intended to support my assertions as to what
the data contain and the way in which I interpret
them.

Data management has involved extensive use
of the computer. A large file of quantitative data
was constructed and stored on tape. Qualitative
data from the initial interview were transcribed
verbatim onto the computer. This was an expensive
and time-consuming procedure, but proved immensely
worthwhile in the long run. An easily manageable
computer printout of verbatim responses made coding
much less cumbersome than manipulating an extensive
index card file, for example. I had planned to enter
these codes onto the computer; in fact, this was done
for the head of the family position but not for the
other positions. Given the relative ease of examining
computer-printed verbatims which, since they included
respondents' identification numbers, also conveyed
age and sex data, this has proved sufficient. In
some cases linkage would have been useful.[9] For
example, in Chapter Four, I examine the relationship
between the sex of the comforter and the type of
activity described in one of the open-ended questions.
Because the coding of the latter was not on the computer,
I did the analysis from "write cases" data. In this

sense, the computer served as a storage and transcrip-
tion facility for qualitative data, rather than an
analytical tool. Part of my decision not to enter codes
stems from my view that coding of qualitative data
is not a once-and-for-all activity but is repeated at
least several times, depending on the question at
hand. However, having the verbatim quotations stored
and retrievable from the computer greatly simplifies
the management of qualitative data.

This dissertation is not a secondary analysis,
even though it is part of a large research project.
It is not secondary because the project is one in
which I played a major part at the design and data
gathering stages, and in which I play a continuing
part in the analysis stage. However, the present
study is best seen as but one phase or one aspect of
a large, ongoing research project. As such, it is
fair to say that I might have carried many of the
analyses much further than I have done. To do so,
however, would not have accommodated the practical
realities of completing a finite piece of scholarship
for the purposes of earning a doctorate.

Despite my restricted objectives, I would make
several claims concerning the quality of the method-
ology. The sampling is unusual in being based system-
atically on a very complete and current population

listing. Measurement was developed in a systematic attempt to use indicators of known reliability, validity and practicality, and these along with the measures developed especially for the study, were rigorously pretested in two pretests. The interview data which form the bulk of data analysed in this dissertation, were gathered by an experienced survey research organization and quality controls were high. All data, both quantitative and qualitative, have been systematically managed. In summary, there are many reasons to trust the data. Ultimately, one might argue, the data become more trustworthy to the extent that the relationships which are informed by them make common sense to the reader and make theoretical sense insofar as they may be related to existing abstract theory in sociology or related disciplines. The chapters which follow are therefore the strongest test of this claim to the quality of the study design as a whole.

FOOTNOTES

1   Funded by The Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada Strategic Grants Program
in Population Aging, through grant no. 492-79-0076-R1
to Jane Synge and Victor W. Marshall, Principal
Investigators.

2   Coding of the initial interviews was done
by the Hamilton Opinion Research Center. The rest of
the data processing was done by Social Data Research
Limited. All phases were under the supervision of
the principal investigators.

3   Judgments as to whether or not persons drawn
in the sample met these eligibility criteria were
made by the survey research team in screening interviews
by telephone.

4   The study, thus, represents community-dwelling
persons, who, even if they are quite old, tend to be
in reasonably good health. Undoubtedly, it under-
represents the bedfast and the very ill elderly, a
problem in community studies of the aged. Streib
(1980) has referred to this group as the "excluded
20% " of the aged who are not represented in community
studies.

5   This was the case for the placement officer
position, for example. Thus, I make extensive use of
follow-up interview data on this position in Chapter
Five.

6   Copies of instruments in their entirety are
available on request from the author.

7   These identification numbers are noted after
quotations from respondents in the ensuing chapters.
If the first digit is an odd number, the respondent
is male; an even number indicates a female. A first
digit of 3 or 4 indicates the respondent is aged
40-54, 5 or 6 indicates age 55-69, and 7 or 8 indicates
age 70+.

8   These codes are: 20 = labourers, semi-skilled
and unskilled; 30 = service workers such as waiters
and nurses aides and some skilled labour; 40 = clerical
workers; 50 = semi-professional workers such as
nurses and social workers, and higher level sales;
60-79 = professional and high level management.

9   Greater linkage of qualitative and quantita-
tive data files, while desirable, would have delayed
completion of this dissertation by several months,
a delay not judged to be merited by the greater ease
of analysis which would have resulted.

CHAPTER THREE

KINKEEPING

INTRODUCTION

One important position in the familial division
of labour is "kinkeeping." My concern in this chapter
is to investigate this position -- its prevalence in
contemporary families, its attendant responsibilities and
activities, the family members who occupy the position and
the length of time they hold it, and the patterns of
succession of the kinkeeping task from one generation to
the next.

Kinkeeping is defined here as "keeping family
members in touch with one another." Data were derived
from a set of questions which began by asking respondents,

> Thinking about your side of the family
> in the broadest terms -- including your
> brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles,
> cousins, grandparents, and so forth --
> is there currently any one person
> among you and your family who, in your
> opinion, works harder than others at
> keeping the family in touch with one
> another?

As the above question indicates, "family" was
defined as the extended family.

While kinkeeping has been investigated in the past,
my approach is distinctive in that I view it structurally
as a family task and position, and I investigate
its various dimensions. In addition, I take a more

60

exploratory and open-ended stance than have most previous
efforts. No previous study to my knowledge has investigated
people's perceptions regarding the existence of such a
position or allowed them to talk about their understanding
of its nature and scope.

In the literature, the term "kinkeeping" crops
up quite frequently, but not invariably, in discussions
of certain types of activities. These activities include
visiting, telephoning, letter-writing, and mutual aid, and
have been researched in a number of studies (Adams, 1968;
Aldous, 1967; Bott, 1957; Shanas et al., 1968; Townsend,
1963; Young and Willmott, 1962). Whether the term "kin-
keeping" is used, or a phrase such as "maintaining kin
relations" or the like, the concept of kinkeeping is usually
inferred from investigation of specified activities such
as those mentioned above, which provide data on visiting
patterns, frequency of contact, residential patterns and
residential proximity.

A second point to be made in distinguishing the
present investigation from previous work is that I
explicitly investigate kinkeeping in the extended family,
at the same time allowing respondents to talk about whatever
segment of that broad group that is relevant to their
experience. This investigation was not focused upon parent-
adult child relationships, the grouping for which kin-
keeping activities have been most frequently investigated.

Having made the point that my study of kinkeeping

is different than previous work, I wish to present a
brief overview of the variety of research that has been
done in the area. The major message of the research is
that kinship ties are, indeed, maintained and that women
do the work of kinkeeping.

The theoretical literature in the sociology of the
family leads us to expect that the work of kinkeeping would
fall to female family members. The classic functionalist
statements by Parsons (1954) and Zelditch (1955), for
example, theorize that women, in the nuclear family, are
leaders in the expressive domain and are concerned with
group maintenance and integration. It follows that women
would be expected to be specialists in kinship affairs.

Such expectations are indeed met in the literature
where there is a general consensus that women do the work
of maintaining kinship ties. Text-books and overview
articles on the family and the family of later life
summarize the literature as revealing the salience of women
as links in kinship maintenance and relations (Abu-Laban,
1978; Lee, 1980; Morgan, 1975:66; N.I.H., 1979; Troll, 1971;
Troll et al., 1979:99; Troll and Bengtson, 1979: 153).
These conclusions are drawn from a wide variety of studies
showing, for example, the key importance of the mother-
daughter tie (Adams, 1968; Aldous, 1967; Gans, 1962; Lopata
1979: 197; Watson and Kivett, 1976), the burden carried by
daughters in caring for elderly mothers (Treas, 1979), more
visiting of parents by adult daughters than sons (Aldous,

1967), greater involvement generally of women with kin
(Adams, 1968; Aldous & Hill, 1965; Berardo, 1970; Komar-
ovsky, 1964; Sweetser, 1963), the central part women play
in orchestrating family gatherings and ritual occasions
(Bott, 1957:135), and the strength of the sister-sister
tie (Cumming and Schneider, 1961). Women are also impor-
tant as links or bridges between generations; for example,
Hill and Associates, in their study of three-generation
families, found women in the middle generation linked older
and younger generations by maintaining close relations with
their parents and their children (Hill et al., 1970: 62).
The female-dominance in kinkeeping in our kinship system,
is reflected in greater contact across female-linked gen-
erations and husbands often having more contact with
their wives' parents than their own, unless the wives them-
selves mediate contact with the husbands' parents (Komar-
ovsky, 1964; Leichter and Mitchell, 1967; Reiss, 1962).
Studies which do not support this pattern are few (for
example, Adams, 1968; Albrecht, 1962).

The findings of the present investigation are
summarized here and presented in detail in the following
sections of this chapter.

Over half the families in this study were said to
have a person who currently holds the position of kinkeeper.

Females dominate in kinkeeping activities, with
three-quarters of the people identified as kinkeepers being
women.

Kinkeeping encompasses a variety of activities. The

major type of activity involves communication in the form
of letters, phone calls, and visits from the kinkeeper to
family members. The most frequently mentioned activities
were letter-writing and telephoning; these were done by three-
quarters of the kinkeepers. However, kinkeeping is not
simply a matter of letters and phone calls; a majority
of the kinkeepers were said to do other activities as well,
often in addition to writing and phoning. Three-tenths of
the kinkeepers keep in touch by visiting other family
members, although, again, few confine themselves to this
activity.

Kinkeepers may act as communication links between
family members, receiving and disseminating family news.

> I telephone and write letters to pass
> on news of different members of the family
> to members of the family. (6150)[1]

They may urge others to keep in touch, a coaxing not
always appreciated by family members.

Kinkeepers also act as social convenors, bringing
family members together in social situations. One-third
of the kinkeepers performed this kind of activity in their
family.

> He arranges parties to keep the family
> together. (4153)

> * * * * *

> I invite them here for dinner quite
> often. (6129)

The nature of activity engaged in varies somewhat

by the sex of the kinkeeper. Women predominated in
writing, phoning, organizing and holding family gatherings,
and acting as the information or communication links.
Men are slightly more likely to visit and keep the family
together by solving problems. The descriptions of
kinkeeping activity done by women were more complex,
inasmuch as more activities were described for each
kinkeeper, than those given for men.

Kinkeeping is a long-term job; the median length
of time kinkeepers were said to have been doing this job
was 20 years.

Most kinkeepers belong to the same generation as
the respondents, especially in the middle (55-69)
age group where the tendency for respondents to name them-
selves as kinkeepers was most common.

Half the kinkeepers identified were respondents'
siblings, especially sisters. One-sixth were female
respondents, themselves. Male respondents named themselves
one-twentieth of the time, a small but interesting number
in view of the female-dominance of the position.

Over one-third of the kinkeepers were members of
the respondent's lineage, and close to two-thirds came
from the respondent's extended family. Most of these were
siblings of the respondent, but it is worthwhile noting that
over one-tenth of the kinkeepers were other extended family
members.

While data are somewhat fragmentary, there is some indication that the onus of kinkeeping may fall on the middle age group, those aged 55-69, and especially on the women in this group. These respondents were most likely to designate themselves as the family kinkeeper. In addition, these women in the middle or "caught" age group were the most likely to do kinkeeping work related to "social convenor" activity; the time, effort, and expense involved in hosting family get-togethers is unarguably greater than that involved in other types of kinkeeping activity such as writing letters, and therefore may be argued to represent more of a kinkeeping burden.

Many kinkeepers were said to have taken on the kin-keeping job out of a desire to keep the family together. Sometimes this desire grew out of a specific event leading to a perception that family continuity or solidarity was threatened. In these cases, it was almost always a female who stepped in and began kinkeeping activity in order to meet and overcome the threat.

> When Dad died the family started to
> drift a little. I felt I should do
> something to keep us together.(4003)

A few kinkeepers were said to have begun kinkeeping as an outgrowth of having cared for or made a home for a parent.

> My father used to live with her and she
> became the center for the family. (4042)

* * * * *

> Because my parents lived with me, and
> this became their home. I took on the
> role after father's death. My home was
> sort of headquarters for the family while
> my parents lived with us. (6134)

One-quarter of the kinkeepers were said to be doing

the job out of interest, concern, or other such personal

reasons.

> She seems more concerned about the family. (6064)

* * * * *

> She felt she wanted to keep the generations
> knowing each other. (4032)

Close to one-fifth of respondents said the kin-

keeper had taken over the job from a parent.

> She's the oldest. After my mother died, she
> took over the family. She kept the family
> together -- acted as a mother. (5064)

* * * * *

I took over from Mom. (4017)

Women were more likely than men to give this explan-

ation of how the present kinkeeper began the job. Almost all

those who were said to have taken over the job from a parent

were women. Although numbers were small, this suggests kin-

keeping is passed down the female line, from mother to daughter.

Ascriptive characteristics such as birth order and

sex were infrequently offered as explanations. This contrasts

sharply with how often such characteristics were cited as

reasons someone was head of the family (see Chapter Eight).

Family closeness is a theme that recurs in the data;

one-tenth of the responses explaining why the person

started kinkeeping duties refer specifically to closeness,

and the desire to retain or recapture family closeness.

> He was good to our mother and when she died
> he carried on to keep the family close. (7190)

I turn now to a detailed analysis of the position
of kinkeeper in the familial division of labour.

PREVALENCE OF THE KINKEEPER POSITION

As noted in Chapter Two (Table 2.1), it is common
for families to have a kinkeeper. Half of the respondents
in this study said someone currently acted as kinkeeper
in their families, and one-sixth said someone used to be
kinkeeper, although no one was at present. Altogether,
two-thirds of the respondents' families had someone who did
this job, either at present or in the past.

Kinkeeping, then, is a job that many people perceive
as existing in their families, and, as I will show, it
is a job people can discuss and describe in detail. First,
however, I will examine patterns of identification of this
position.

Identification: Age and Sex

Table 3.1 shows that the identification of the
kinkeeper position varies with the age and sex of the
respondent.

Identification of the position by women reaches its
peak in the 55-59 age group when fully three-quarters of
the respondents said their family had a kinkeeper. For men,
the peak occurs at ages 60-64, when three-fifths of the
respondents identified the position.

TABLE 3.1

Percent of Respondents Who Say There Is A Kinkeeper by Age and Sex

Sex of Respondent	Age of Respondent									
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	47.8	42.1	59.4	48.6	61.9	50.0	46.7	37.0	40.0	48.6
Females	65.0	60.7	45.7	74.2	53.8	42.9	67.7	40.0	32.1	53.9
All	55.8	53.2	52.2	60.6	57.4	45.9	57.4	38.5	34.9	51.4
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Pearson's r   Males = - .066, Sign. = .162

                     Females = -.141, Sign. = .013

                     All = -.105, Sign. = .019

It is important to realize that these male and female "high identifiers", while a few years apart in age, actually form the two halves of a married couple since women usually marry men slightly older than themselves. Thus, this apparent age effect is in reality a family life stage effect.[2] Most couples in these age groups are in the "empty nest" period,

which interestingly is not at all associated with a drop
in women's identification of this and other positions.
Family experiences during these years often include young
grandchildren and increased contact with adult children
(Peterson, 1979).[3] Perhaps this increased family activity
between lineage members is associated with increased
focusing on and interest in the broader extended family
as well.

Around the period of the husband's retirement,
identification of the kinkeeping position drops for both
sexes. Identification by men continues to decline with
age, but rises sharply again for women in the 70-74 age
group. This period is apparently another time in which women
perceive kinkeeping activity as part of the life of their
family. Following this period, identification by women
drops sharply.

On the whole, women identified this position only
slightly more than men. However, women show greater
fluctuations between the various age periods than do men.
The difference between the highest and lowest proportions
of respondents of various ages who identify this position
is 40 percentage points for women, but only 23 points
for men. I believe this reflects the greater involvement
and concern of women with kinkeeping activities in
particular and their greater preoccupation with family
matters in general. This, I theorize, renders them more

sensitive to changes in family life and produces both

greater heights and depths in their reactions to these

changes.[4]

RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE

KINKEEPER POSITION

Kinkeeping Is More than Just Letters and Phone Calls

The phrasing of the question asking if there was a

family kinkeeper defined the task as one of communication

-- "keeping the family in touch with one another". Under-

standably, then, when asked what the person named actually

did to keep family members in touch, most respondents said

the kinkeeper's job involved some type of communication

activity.

Telephoning, writing letters, organizing family

gatherings, visiting, and organizing special family events

were activities mentioned by almost all who named a kinkeeper.

Phoning and writing were the most frequently mentioned

activities. However, the verbatim responses about what

kinkeepers do and why they started to do the particular

activity reveal depth, variety and complexity far beyond

mere phone calls and letters. In this section, I will

explore the nature of these kinkeeping activities, with the

many nuances and themes revealed by the data. The various

activities described by respondents are summarized in

Table 3.2.

TABLE 3.2

Activities of Kinkeeper, by Sex of Kinkeeper

Kinkeeping Activity	Percent of Kinkeepers Who Do Each Activity*		
	Male Kinkeepers	Female Kinkeepers	All Kinkeepers
Telephones	39.2	49.7	47.3
Writes	37.2	45.6	43.7
Visits	35.2	26.5	28.5
Organizes or holds get-togethers	15.6	24.2	22.3
Organizes reunions, special events, holiday and birthday celebrations.	13.7	14.4	14.2
Genealogist	1.9	1.1	1.3
Information Center	1.9	6.3	5.3
Problem-solver, helper	5.8	.5	1.7
Link- in touch with everyone, or link with home, old country	5.8	4.6	4.9
Reminds others of obligations	0	4.0	3.1
Conciliatior	0	.5	.4
Other	7.8	3.4	4.4

N: male kinkeepers = 51

female kinkeepers = 173

uncodable = 15

*Categories are not mutually exclusive

Almost three-quarters of respondents who identified kinkeepers said that they kept in touch by writing or phoning, but only half of them confined their responses to these two activities. In other words, three-fifths of the respondents identifying a kinkeeper said that person kept the family in touch by activities in addition to or other than writing and phoning. Close to three-tenths of kinkeepers were said to keep the family in touch by visiting; this activity was almost always combined with something else -- most commonly writing and phoning, but also in combination with organizing family gatherings and other social events, such as reunions, birthday celebrations, picnics and anniversary parties.

A variety of other types of activities were also mentioned by respondents. These included being an information center for the family, acting as the family genealogist, acting as a problem solver, providing a link with home or country of origin, and providing a link between the various members of the family.

These activities are discussed more fully below and illustrated with verbatim quotations from respondents.

Kinkeepers Gather and Spread the Family News

Phoning, writing and visiting quite obviously involve communication between the kinkeeper himself/herself and the family member receiving the letter, phone call or visit. This in itself contributes to solidarity between

those two family members

> Gossip or information may be as
> much an important part of the
> content of a kinship relation-
> ship as the mobilization of
> actual goods and services (Morgan,1975: 78-79).

But these communication functions are often said to

accomplish more than this. For example, kinkeepers

often function as the family news medium. Information

is funneled through them to be disseminated to different

family members.

> She phones if anything happens. (3118)

> * * * * *

> She writes with all the news from
> Ireland about the family there. (4131)

> * * * * *

> I phone them all and spread the news around. (6127)

Kinkeepers Persuade, Coax, and Pester

Communication activities may be exploited as means

of encouraging family solidarity and reminding different

members of their family obligations:

> She writes or phones and reminds
> everybody of special family
> anniversaries, etc. (4151)

> * * * * *

> I phone relatives -- coax them to
> attend family get-togethers. (4156)

This encouraging of solidarity may be done fairly

gently. For example, one respondent said of the kinkeeper:

She urges us to write to each other
and she writes to all of us. (3028)

But family members are not always grateful for kin-
keepers' efforts. One woman said the kinkeeper in her family,

. . . visits and drags us to visit. (4012)

Kinkeepers Bring People Together

Kinkeepers try to bring family members together,
face-to-face. These occasions may be dinners or other
get-togethers; over one-quarter of the responses included
mention of this kind of activity. In addition, many of the
respondents said the kinkeeper organized or promoted
family reunions, and one-tenth mentioned special events
such as picnics, birthdays, anniversaries, and such.

Sometimes the kinkeeper hosts these occasions.

I have them for dinner and invite
them into my home. (4090)

* * * * *

He has get-togethers for the family --
picnics and birthday parties. (5142)

* * * * *

Every Christmas, she has a family reunion. (8223)

The kinkeeper may arrange or organize these
gatherings.

She organized parents' 50th wedding
anniversary. Arranges family gatherings. (3146)

* * * * *

She arranges family reunions. (4032)

* * * * *

> I encourage Christmas activities
> for the family. (5087)

Sometimes the kinkeeper's job involves informing others about family events and trying to encourage attendance.

> She writes letters, promotes family
> reunions. (6075)

> * * * * *

> ...phones and makes known the plans
> of a family reunion in the U.S.A. (6115)

Other Kinkeeping Activities

A few additional types of responses emerged from the data. These are interesting not because they are mentioned often, for they are not, but because they hint at other types of family roles and tasks in the overall familial division of labour. These kinds of activities might well be investigated in future studies.

A few people specifically mentioned that the kinkeeper acted as the family genealogist. For example, one respondent said,

> I am doing the family tree. (8043)

Other research has mentioned, in passing, this activity of compiling a family tree (Matthews, 1979:125). It is likely that many families have someone who takes responsibility for preparing a family tree and keeping it up-to-date. Furthermore, many families likely have someone who is considered the expert on the family tree, without having committed the knowledge to paper.

Another kinkeeping activity occasionally mentioned was acting as the family helper, problem-solver, mediator or conciliator. This kind of activity may well be widespread in families, and would be revealed through more direct questioning that did not focus so strongly on communication. Some examples of responses that identified kinkeeping with helping or mediating follow.

> He does it all. He's on the ball...Any problems, he seems to be there. (3001)

> * * * * *

> Problems get through to me through one of the family. I help by giving advice. (3114)

Someone else was said to be:

> ...the first one to offer help. (7190)

Another:

> ...gives personal advice when necessary. (5144)

One woman said she was the one to:

> ...patch things up when there are squabbles. (6007)

Another theme which comes through in a number of responses suggests kinkeepers may provide links to a home and family the respondent has left behind and thus help counteract the weakening of ties through migration.

> She writes with all the news from Ireland about the family there. (4131)

> * * * * *

> She gets the family together when I visit England. (7079)

> * * * * *

> She writes me every week. Sends me
> papers. (4051)

Kinkeeping Activity Varies by Sex

The kind of kinkeeping activity engaged in varies somewhat according to the sex of the person doing the kinkeeping (see Table 3.2) Women are more likely than men to write or phone, although men, too, engage in quite a lot of this kind of activity. Men are slightly more likely to visit than women, while women engage in more activity to do with organizing or holding family gatherings. It is also interesting to note that problem-solving activity was usually done by male kinkeepers, while acting as the information center was predominantly done by females. The importance of women in handling the flow of family information has been noted in the literature (Morgan, 1975:66).

The kinkeeping activity done by women is more extensive or complex than that done by men. When responses describing what the kinkeeper did were analysed to see the number of different activities coded for each response, two-thirds of the female kinkeepers were said to do two or more activities, compared with about half of the male kinkeepers who did only one.

Kinkeeping Is a Long-Term Job

A final point in this section on kinkeeping responsibilities is that the person who takes on the job of kinkeeper carries the responsibility for a very long time.

Respondents were asked for how many years the person named as kinkeeper had been doing this job. Answers ranged from one year to 75 years. The median was 20 years, with half the cases falling between 10 and 30 years. It is striking that one-quarter of the kinkeepers were said to have been acting in this capacity for between 30 and 75 years.

People's family memories and knowledge of family history appear to span the decades with ease. Even the youngest respondents (that is, in the 40-54 age group) displayed this characteristic: when asked about the length of time the person named had been the kinkeeper, the median length of time given by these respondents was 17 years.

It is clear that family eyes see a long way back through time.

OCCUPANTS OF THE KINKEEPER POSITION

In this section, I address the question of which family members do the work of kinkeeping.

Relationship to Respondent: Sisters Are Often the Kinkeepers

Respondents who said there is now a kinkeeper in their family most frequently named a sister (Table 3.3). Of all the kinkeepers designated, almost two-fifths were sisters. The next largest group was female respondents naming themselves, followed by brothers, who were identified as kinkeepers in about one-tenth of the cases. Male

respondents named themselves as kinkeepers in one-twentieth
of the cases. I think it is noteworthy that this many
men designate themselves in what is clearly a female-
dominated position. A parent, usually a mother, was named
one-twentieth of the time, as was a child. These account
for over four-fifths of the kinkeepers named. The remainder
consists of a smattering of a number of different kinship
categories. These data on occupants of the kinkeeper position
are displayed in Table 3.3.

TABLE 3.3

Who Is the Family Kinkeeper?

Relationship to Respondent	Percent of Kinkeepers Who Are:		
	Male	Female	Uncodable for Sex
Sibling	9.6	39.3	1.6
Respondent	5.8	17.1	.4*
Parent	.8	4.6	
Child	1.6	2.9	
Other relatives**	2.0	9.6	4.1
	19.8	73.5	6.1

N = 239
* Respondent and spouse
** Includes aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, spouse

It is interesting, too, that largely because of
the predominance of siblings in kinkeeping work, the
majority of kinkeepers, close to two-thirds, in fact,
come from the respondents' extended families, compared with
only one-third from their lineages.

Sex: Kinkeeping is Women's Work

Almost three-quarters of those identified as
kinkeepers were women. This is clearly a woman's sphere
(See Table 3.3). This finding is certainly congruent
with the literature, cited in the introduction to this
chapter, pointing to female dominance in kinkeeping. How-
ever, previous studies usually have been concerned with
mother-daughter or parent-child ties, and other dyadic
relationships in families. No study has investigated the
existence of a kinkeeper position in the family. Thus, the
present study both supports and extends previous research.
Not only do women perform the tasks of kinkeeping, but
these are perceived by both men and women to amount to an
area of work, a position in the division of labour;
furthermore, both sexes agree that this work is done by
women.

Generation: Kinkeepers are Respondents' Generational Peers

Most kinkeepers belong to the same generation as
respondents (Table 3.4); this reflects the dominance of
siblings and respondents themselves as performers of kin-
keeping tasks. This pattern holds true especially for the

TABLE 3.4

Generational Location of Kinkeeper,
by Age and Generation of Respondent

Generational Location of Kinkeeper

Age of Respondent	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+ (n=69)	17.3	79.7	2.8
55-69 (n=83)	4.8	87.9	7.2
40-54 (n=84)	0	78.5	21.4

Uncodable = 3   Chi Square=31.59, df=2, Sign.=.001
Cramer's V=.26

55-69 age group where nine-tenths of kinkeepers named belong

to the respondent's own generation, compared with eight-

tenths in the older and younger age groups. This increase

is due generally to self-designations being most common in

the middle age group (see Table 3.5).

Kinkeeping and the "Caught Generation"

In recent years, social scientists studying aging

and the family have become interested in the predicament

of a group variously referred to as the middle generation

(Neugarten, 1979), the "sandwich generation" (Schwartz, 1979),

or the "caught generation" (Neugarten, 1979). Members of
the caught generation have usually been considered to be
from 40 to 60 years of age (Schwartz, 1979). However, Shanas
has recently argued that demographic changes in the family
brought about by the increase in average length of life
have in fact extended the caught generation boundaries to
include much older persons than previous conceptions
recognized.

> The data indicate that for the majority
> of persons aged 80 and over still living
> in the community a middle-aged child in
> the 50's and 60's or even older has
> assumed responsibility either for care
> in a joint household or for the provision
> of the necessary services to nearby
> elderly parents that make life in the
> community possible for them (Shanas,1981).

As parents have come to live to advanced age, new
pressures and burdens have been placed on their middle-
aged children who are caught between the demands of
providing social, emotional and perhaps economic care
for aging parents and the demands of still-dependent
children. For example, the family purse of the middle
generation may be strained by health-related costs incurred
by parents and by educational costs incurred by children.

While men as well as women worry about their aging
parents, and report that changes in their parents' lives
produce changes in their own lives (Neugarten, 1979), the
time-consuming and energy-draining burdens of providing
social and emotional care are thought to fall most heavily

on women and especially on those women of the middle
generation.

While the issue of the caught generation is not
of central interest in the present investigation, it does
have a more general importance in the study of aging and the
family. Therefore, I wish to pause here for a brief look
at the kinkeeping data, to see what they convey concerning
the caught generation.

Unfortunately, the data do not provide age for all
kinkeepers. However, age is available for self-designations
and may be guessed at for sibling designations. Therefore,
these two groups will be analysed with respect to the
caught generation issue.

Table 3.5 displays percentages of male and
female respondents who designate themselves as kinkeepers.
Remembering that, overall, one-tenth of the respondents
said they were kinkeepers, it can be seen that the "felt
burden" of kinkeeping -- indicated by respondents saying
that they do the kinkeeping work -- appears most frequently
among women aged 55-64 and 65-69, when one-fifth and
one-third, respectively, designate themselves as
kinkeepers.

TABLE 3.5

Percent of Respondents Who Designate Themselves as
Kinkeeper, by Age and Sex

Sex of Respondent	Age of Respondent									
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	4.3	0	9.4	8.6	9.5	12.5	3.3	0	13.3	6.4
Females	20.0	10.7	14.3	19.4	19.2	33.3	16.1	8.0	10.7	16.3
N: Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245

Missing Observations = 1

It is important to note that these women are a little
older than the standard caught generation age boundaries,
supporting Shanas' arguments cited above. The 55-64 year old
women are right at the upper limit of the more standard caught
generation age boundary, while the 65-69 year olds are perhaps
beyond the usual definition. However, these women should
still be considered as part of the busy middle generation
in my opinion. Some may still have living parents. References
are often made in the literature to 65 year olds with 85
year old parents (for example, Neugarten, 1979; Treas, 1979).
In addition, women in this age group may be caring for
husbands whose health is deteriorating; while this does not
represent a "generational squeeze" in the strictest sense,
it certainly places increased and heavy demands on these women.[5]

Another indication, although less satisfactory, of the burden on caught generation women may be gleaned from the pattern of designating sisters as kinkeepers. While age of sisters is not available in the data, I will make the assumption that a sister's age is close enough to the respondent's to justify being classified as being in the same age group as the respondent's. Data based on this assumption show that sisters in the 55 to 69 age group are slightly more likely to be kinkeepers, being designated 1.2 times as often as sisters in the other two age groups (see Table 3.6).

TABLE 3.6

Sisters as Percent of Kinkeepers Named by Each Age Group

Age of Respondent	Percent of Kinkeepers Who Are Respondents' Sisters	N of Kinkeepers Named by Age Group
40-54	18.9	158
55-69	23.1	151
70+	18.0	155

In an earlier section of this chapter, I showed that kinkeeping activities varied by sex, and that female kinkeepers were more likely than their male counterparts to perform two or more activities as part of their job.

By looking at the data on self-designations, we may learn

a little more about the relationship between activity,

sex and age.

For those who designate themselves as the family

kinkeeper, the older the respondent, the more likely the

communication activities of letter-writing, telephoning

and visiting are to be mentioned as kinkeeping activites.

That is, this pattern of increasing frequency appears for

both sexes (see Table 3.7). However, with respect to the

social convenor type of activities -- organizing or hosting

family gatherings, both formal and informal--women in the

oldest age group are the least likely group of women to

do this type of activity, while women in the middle age

group are the most likely to be engaged in these time and

energy consuming kinkeeping activities.

TABLE 3.7

Type of Kinkeeping Activity by Those who Designate Themselves
as Kinkeepers

| Activity | Age of Kinkeeper | | | | | |
| | 40-54 | | 55-69 | | 70+ | |
	M	F	M	F	M	F
Write,phone,visit	66.6	75.0	85.7	77.7	100	81.8
Get-togethers, reunions, holidays special events	0	41.6	28.5	66.6	33.3	9.0
N of self-designations	3	12	7	18	3	11

In summary, not only are caught generation women more likely to be kinkeepers, but the activities they engage in are likely to be more demanding in terms of time and energy than activities engaged in by kinkeepers in other age groups.

ACCESSION AND SUCCESSION

I turn now to issues of accession and succession: how kinkeepers acquire the job, why they take over the position, whether or not it is passed from generation to generation in families, and if it is, how this succession is patterned.

Kinkeepers Want to Keep the Family Together

Respondents were asked why the kinkeeper started to make the effort to keep the family in touch with one another. The reasons given are summarized in Table 3.8.

TABLE 3.8

Accession to the Kinkeeper Position

Reason Kinkeeper Assumed this Position	Percent of Kinkeepers Who Started Kinkeeping for this Reason*
To keep family together	27.0
Interest, Motivation	26.1
Death or ill health of previous kinkeeper	18.4
Special talent, personality	13.7
Birth order, sex	12.4
Has time to do it	4.2
Financial, educational reason	3.4
Availability (geographical location, no one else)	4.5
Other	12.4

N: 239   * Categories are not mutually exclusive

The most common response was that the person worked at kinkeeping because of a specific desire to keep the family together. Over one-quarter of the responses included this reason. Often, this was stated as a general desire.

> She just wanted to find our roots and
> keep us together. (3028)

* * * * *

> So that the family would not lose
> touch with one another. (4052)

* * * * *

> To keep the family together. (6016)

Kinkeepers Respond to Threats to Continuity and Solidarity

Of those responses which said the kinkeeper took on the job to keep the family together, one-third indicated that the kinkeeper was responding to a specific event involving a realization that family continuity was somehow threatened. Often, this threat was the tendency to drift after a parent's death.

> She wanted to keep the closeness
> after my mother died. (3132)

* * * * *

> Wants to keep family together.
> Did not want it to fall apart
> when parents died. (3148)

The death of a family member always poses a threat to family continuity and "is the source of an immediate and observable disruption" (Bengtson, 1979).

Death is particularly disruptive when it happens to a
person who acted as a link between family members--in
other words, a person who acted as kinkeeper. As I
will discuss at greater length in the concluding section
of this chapter, the death of a parent can be particularly
threatening to sibling relationships; some studies have
found lowered rates of interaction between siblings
after parents, especially mothers, die (Young and Willmott,
1962; Adams, 1968; Rosenberg and Anspach, 1973). Parents
not only link adult siblings, but also provide inter-
generational links between the adult child and other kin
of the parent's generation. It is little wonder, then,
that these respondents told us that kinkeeping began
after the death of a parent.

Sometimes kinkeeping begins as a response to a
general sense that the family is drifting apart.

> My family was drifting apart and
> I didn't want that to happen.(4080)

* * * * *

> Because we were getting far apart,
> pretty well ignoring one another. (6058)

In other cases, the event is in the distant past,
but it gave the kinkeeper a sense of the importance of
maintaining family solidarity.

> The family was broken up at such an early
> age that she feels we must try to keep
> in touch now. (4109)

* * * * *

> Because we were raised by the
> Children's Aid in foster homes
> and I assumed the mother role.
> We had to have some closeness
> and a sense of family, even
> though we lived in different
> homes. My sisters always turned
> to me and still do. (6007)

Intermarriage may pose a threat to family solidarity. In the next example, the kinkeeper responded to this threat with special efforts to keep the family together.

> My younger brothers married non-
> Italian girls and they started
> drifting away and it was important
> to me to try to keep us together.
> (4156)

Geographical mobility or migration is another kind of threat, one which people perceive as such and seek to overcome.

> During the war we were all in the
> services and got separated, all going
> our own way. Later some of us came
> to Canada. She wanted to keep us
> closer together than we were, so she
> started writing us all about news of
> each other. She's a gem. (6113)

> * * * * *

> She wanted to keep in touch with
> the family since we are away. (3071)

> * * * * *

> Family moved away. He wanted to
> keep them together. (5020)

Sometimes migration does disrupt family ties, but these become revitalized by a visit home, perhaps after many years' absence.

> It started I think as a result of
> my visit back home. I was here in
> Canada about 17 years with little
> contact. (5113)

* * * * *

> When I went over in 1951. I had
> been out of touch with my family.
> She made me very welcome and has
> ever since. (7079)

Although neither of the above examples refer to

renewed contact in old age, but rather at earlier stages

of the life course, the literature indicates that renewal

of contact with family who are geographically distant

is even more common in later life. For example, Troll and

Associates observe:

> With the advent of old age, many
> older people seek to pick up old
> family loyalties and renew old
> relationships. More effort may
> be made to visit siblings, even at
> great distances, after retirement
> ...than in middle age (Troll et al., 1979: 123).

Weishaus, too, notes that more effort is made to

visit siblings in old age than in middle age (Weishaus, 1979).

Sometimes the respondent's own mortality is under-

stood to threaten the passing on of family knowledge.

In this example, the respondent who is 74 years old, and

her sister, realize that unless they do something to ensure

their family knowledge will be transmitted to the next

generation, such knowledge may die with them.

> We got talking and realized we were the
> last generation to know where we came
> from and so we should record our ances-
> try. (8018)

These two siblings were involved in a project
of compiling a family tree. The quotation above reveals
that they are motivated to do this by a wish to contribute
to family continuity--so that the next and succeeding
generations would know where they "came from".

Kinkeepers Want the Family to be Close

One-tenth of the responses included mention of
closeness as the reason the person started to act as
kinkeeper.

> She felt the family was not close
> enough and tried to keep us together.(3076)

> * * * * *

> He wants the family to be close. (4095)

> * * * * *

> My sister married into a large close
> family and I think she wants us to
> be close like them. (5155)

> * * * * *

> She started after I left for Canada.
> We were very, very close and she
> felt that someone should continue to
> keep the family together. (8223)

Parent-caring Leads to Kinkeeping

Some respondents (one-twentieth) specifically
referred to the fact that the kinkeeper had assumed
this job as a direct result of having cared for a
parent in a time of illness, having taken a parent into
their home or lived with them in the parent's home.

She had been the only one at home
taking care of my mother. After
mother died, she carried on the
mother figure. (5113)

* * * * *

My mother used to live with me and
I've always had the room so every-
one could come. (6088)

* * * * *

She quit her job and stayed at home
and looked after my mother when she
was ill and from then on she seemed
to assume that role. (6114)

* * * * *

She moved in with my father when my
mother died. She always cares
about everybody. She is a lot like
my mother was. She kept everyone
together. (6124)

* * * * *

Mother lived here for a while and
they all started coming here. (6151)

Although there were a small number of cases
of this type, it is noteworthy that male as well as
female kinkeepers had cared for a parent in this way.
Three of the ten codable examples involved a male kinkeeper.

Kinkeeping May Begin Because of Special Talent, Personality or Motivation

Over a quarter of respondents said the person named
started kinkeeping activities just because they were inter-
ested or motivated for personal reasons to do so.

She likes to do it and she is very
proud to have family. (3033)

* * * * *

> She feels it's important to keep
> in contact. (4012)

In the following example, acting as kinkeeper was said to provide a kind of occupational therapy for the person involved.

> It was an interest for her as she
> was retired and living in a small
> town and her husband was older
> and they didn't go out very much
> so it gave her something to do. (8232)

Most often, the motivation was said to be out of interest, affection and concern. Sometimes the attributed motivation was less positive.

> She felt guilty. (4024)

The activities of the woman in the above example may or may not be appreciated by the rest of the family, but one gets the message that the person is thought to be compensating for some past error or inadequacy in meeting family responsibilities or relationships.

The next example is more clear. The kinkeeper is compensating for what the respondent perceives to be loneliness. The implication is that the kinkeeper meddles.

> Loneliness on her part, I think.
> She seems to want to know every-
> one's family affairs. (8071)

Another reason for beginning kinkeeping appears in the following quotation.

> They felt we should get together
> more often than just when some-
> body dies.[6] (8125)

Special talent or personality characteristics were given as the reason the person started kinkeeping by one-seventh of the respondents. The following examples convey the flavour of this type of response.

> He seems to be more capable of
> following through on things. (3001)

* * * * *

> Her nature has always been a giving
> nature. (3018)

* * * * *

> She is friendly with everyone.
> That is just her way. (3026)

* * * * *

> Just her nature. She's a caring type. (4012)

* * * * *

> Because she is sentimental, she is
> concerned, and worries a lot. (4050)

* * * * *

> He has a good way with people - a
> good listener. (4144)

Daughters Inherit This Position From Their Mothers

Close to one-fifth of the respondents said the kinkeeper had taken over the job from a parent. Female respondents were two and one-half times as likely as male respondents to give this explanation of the origins of the kinkeeper's taking on the job. Furthermore, close to nine-tenths of the kinkeepers who took over the job from a parent were women.

This suggests that women have a stronger sense of the continuity of this position, and are more likely to perceive it as being passed from mother to daughter - that is, down the female line.

> She took over this role as my
> parents became older and were
> not able to do this. (4055)

Usually, inheritance of this position occurs when a parent, almost always the mother, dies.

> She took over the mother role in
> the family when our mother died.
> When she married, her door was
> always open. (5065)

> * * * * *

> She was the only girl still living
> at home when my parents died
> so she took over this role. (5126)

> * * * * *

> My eldest sister - she did this
> after my mother died. She even
> looks like my mother.(6056)

> * * * * *

> She was the oldest one at home
> when my mother died and she seemed
> to take over then. (6120)

> * * * * *

> My mother used to do this so after
> she died I took on the job. (6150)

> * * * * *

> I was the only girl and I felt I
> was taking mother's place. (8068)

This example clearly reveals the long line of succession:

It was just natural to her and
her mother. My grandmother was
like that too. (8227)

Birth Order and Sex Qualify Some as Kinkeepers

Ascriptive characteristics, namely birth order

and sex,were said to be the reasons the kinkeeper took

over the role in about one-eighth of the cases.

She was more the hub of the family...
the eldest girl. (3018)

* * * * *

Because Mom's gone and because
she's the oldest. (4104)

* * * * *

She was the oldest sister. For
a while everybody turned to her
for help. (4141)

* * * * *

She was the oldest and she took
on this duty. (5111)

* * * * *

After Mother died, she carried on
the mother figure. She is also
the only female in the family. (5113)

* * * * *

I was the only girl and I felt
I was taking mother's place. (8068)

* * * * *

He just felt like he should take
over after she died because he
was the eldest boy. (8090)

Opportunity Structure and Kinkeeping

Finally, factors such as time, education and economic factors affect kinkeeping. Having the time available is one reason some people were said to be kinkeepers.

> She's single and has more free
> time. (3048)

> * * * * *

> Because she has more time -
> doesn't work outside the home
> (4041)

> * * * * *

> I like everybody to be together
> and have the time to do it. (4075)

> * * * * *

> She's never had children and had
> more time than the others to do
> this. (5038)

> * * * * *

> My sister was busy teaching school
> and I was the one that was free
> to do it. (6005)

Economic or educational factors were very occasionally mentioned.

> She had more opportunities - a better
> education - makes good money and
> feels she should look after other
> members of family. (4108)

> * * * * *

> She is probably better off than the
> rest of the family and can go to
> England to see the relatives. They
> have a large place and everyone who

comes over from England, they
always stay at her home. (5061)

* * * * *

He is exceptionally comfortable
financially. (6070)

* * * * *

Financially I was better off so
I was able to do it. (8004)

Having enough space to be able to have family
gatherings is a factor that is related to financial
circumstances. The example above concerning the woman
who goes to England and has room enough for relatives who
come here to visit is one example relating space and
financial status. A second illustration follows.

I've always had the room so
everyone could come. (6088)

Occasionally the response stated that the kin-
keeper does the job because there is no one else to do it.

I could see that no one else
would do it. I'm family
oriented. (4090)

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have demonstrated, first of all,
that kinkeeping is a social fact in the families of resp-
ondents in this study. Most people identified someone
as holding this position in their families, either at the
present or in the past, and were able to describe various
aspects of this job including duration of occupancy,
reasons for taking on the job, and the nature of activities

and responsibilities attached to the position.

Fully half of the respondents in this study
said that someone in their family occupied the position
of kinkeeper.[7]

This area of family work is dominated by females.
To a great extent, women are depended upon to do the work
of keeping family members in touch with one another.

The succession of the kinkeeper job from one genera-
tion to the next, while not researched directly,[8] seems to
descend through the female line, from mother to one of her
daughters.

One of the most important features to emerge from
the data is the prevalence and importance of siblings in
kinkeeping, and the implied importance of sibling relation-
ships. It strikes me that the fact that respondents so
often mention siblings as people who perform the task of
trying to keep family members in touch reflects these respond-
ents' perceptions of just where the problem of keeping family
members in touch lies. This interpretation is bolstered
by the fact that the number of siblings the respondent had
bore the strongest relationship to whether or not the
respondent's family had a kinkeeper (see footnote 3). I
think respondents, by naming siblings, reveal that it is
these ties with siblings and their siblings' children that
become problematic as people grow older and especially
after parents die. I infer from the data that lack of

closeness with more distant, extended kin is not necessarily perceived as problematic, perhaps because closeness is not expected with these family members. With siblings, however, it is somewhat different.

When children are young, family activities naturally include parents and children -- or, from the children's point of view, parents and siblings. As families age, and children leave home, parents may still act as a center of gravity around which family activities occur. Whether or not grown sisters and brothers consider their relationships to be based on obligation or choice, the mere fact that parents are alive and organize or act as a focal point for family activities may be sufficient to ensure that siblings continue to have contact with one another in a family context.

These data suggest that, in many families, the parents do act as a bonding agent, holding siblings and perhaps other relatives in place, something like the sun and the planets. What happens, though, when the parents die? With the "sun" gone, do the "planets" fly off into space? What the data show is that in many families there comes a time, a turning point, when there is a realization that something must be done if the family (that is, the extended family) is not to drift apart. This turning point often occurs following the death of a parent. A quotation from one of the respondents illustrates this turning point, and

shows also that not only do parents act as a link between
their adult children, but that people are aware of this.

> When my mother died I felt she
> would want it carried on since we
> were always in touch with one
> another through mother. (6129)

This increased sense of responsibility for main-
taining family ties after the loss of a parent is perhaps
reinforced by a tendency in many people to place increasing
importance on family ties as the years go by.

> ...with advancing years the continuity
> of a family identity, a family tradition,
> or a family legacy often assumes
> increasing importance (Bengtson,1979).

Kinkeeping efforts also emerge in response to the
threat posed by being geographically scattered, or with a
resolve to create a different family life to what one knew
oneself as a child. And sometimes kinkeeping consciousness
or activity is triggered by an event such as a parent
moving into a child's home.

What these data reveal is that people work at family
continuity. There comes a time when they realize that it
is up to them, it's their turn to take up the torch. People
have a sense of the family's fragility and assume respon-
sibility for trying to keep a sense of "the family" alive
in its members.

As a final theoretical note to this conclusion, I
wish to consider, for a moment, some conceptual difficulties
that arise in dealing with the study of the family and

changing relationships within and between generations over
time.

It is customary to specify that one is studying
either the extended family or the nuclear family. In an
effort to capture the quality and content of family relation-
ships between relatives who live in different households,
the term "modified extended family" has arisen (Litwak,
1965:291). The term is intended to conceptually distinguish
our contemporary kinship system from the classical extended
family. Although the term is often employed in investigations
of relationships between parents and adult children or be-
tween adult siblings, it is by no means limited to these
relatives. To attain further clarity in studying inter-
generational relationships in families, the term "lineage"
has come into use (Bengtson et al., 1976; Bengtson and Cutler,
1976); the lineage concept successfully captures the
continuity of parent-child-grandchild relationships as
individuals and families travel through time.

What none of these terms or concepts successfully
deal with, in my view, is the changing nature of sibling
relationships as brothers and sisters pass out of childhood,
marry and form their own families of procreation, and
survive to late adulthood when their parents die.

Conceptually, siblings are not part of one another's
lineages, but are linked to their brothers'and sisters'
lineages through their parents. Yet, it seems clear from

the data in this chapter, that these ties to siblings
are important and become matters of care and concern,
for many people, after parents die. Something of the nature
and importance of these relationships may be lost if we
simply concentrate on lineages. Similarly, the special
importance of parent-child relationships is lost when
parents, siblings and others are categorized together as
modified extended family.

Perhaps the solution is not to add yet another term
to the already heavy baggage of social science concepts,
but to simply recognize that sibling relationships deserve
to be considered separately and that they must be viewed
in a context of change over the life course of individuals
and families.

Some researchers have recognized the special nature
and potential importance of sibling relationships, but find-
ings have been either inconclusive or contradictory. While
some studies indicate increased sibling solidarity in later
life (Shanas et al., 1968; Cumming and Schneider, 1961;
Clark and Anderson, 1967), others find decreased interaction
between siblings after parents die (Young and Willmott,
1962; Adams, 1968; Rosenberg and Anspach, 1973). Previous
research has also looked at the issue of substitution whereby
siblings may substitute for closer lineal kin in childless
elderly (Shanas et al., 1968).

I think the data discussed in this chapter may help

illuminate the nature of sibling relationships through time and help synthesize some of these apparent contradictions of previous research.

For one thing, it is always tempting but ultimately misleading to think of family development in linear terms (Orr, 1979). The question of whether or not interaction with siblings increases or decreases over the adult life course not only falls into the linearity trap, but also addresses only one out of a number of dimensions of kinship relations (others being affection and exchange, for example).

These data suggest that in many families, aging parents keep in touch with all their children, keeping the children informed about one another, and providing a family focal point. When parents die, sibling solidarity often becomes problematic. In some families, siblings do indeed drift apart, but in others conscious efforts are made to preserve family solidarity and a sense of the family as a unit. These siblings draw on their own initiative rather than leaving it up to the older generation.

This realization that it is now "up to them" is an important point. As long as there is someone else to take responsibility or do the work, people do not really have to make clear commitments to family solidarity or consciously work out their own priorities. However, when it becomes clear that either they take up the responsibility or allow the family to drift apart, many people choose the

former. This phenomenon perhaps accounts for part of what underlies observations that family relationships become more important as people grow older, and what underlies some of the increase in sibling solidarity in later life that has been found in research.

Importance of a relationship does not necessarily imply increased interaction. It is possible that in some cases older people may come to place increased value on family relationships, including those involving siblings, and make genuine efforts to preserve these relationships, yet at the same time interaction frequency may lessen.

What I am suggesting is that, paradoxically perhaps, it is possible to have decreased contact yet at the same time to have an increased sense of the importance of such contact and to be making more of an effort to sustain such contact. Such paradoxes are not new in the study of the family; nor are they new in the study of social relation-ships in general. I think the findings in this chapter point up the benefits of seeking to understand the processes of change and negotiation that may illuminate paradox, rather than insisting on proving one side right or wrong in the study of the contemporary family.

FOOTNOTES

1   The number in parentheses is the respondent's
identification number. These numbers appear throughout
the dissertation as identifiers whenever verbatim quotations
from respondents are used.

2   The age effect could also be indexing a cohort
effect. That is, differences related to age cohorts could
be causing these drops and rises in identification. However,
I would argue that such an explanation is not as plausible
as an interpretation that attributes causal significance
to a person's family life stage.

3   Two-thirds of the "high identifiers" -- men aged
60-64 and women aged 55-69 -- had grandchildren. For women,
this represents an increase of 16% over those with grand-
children in the previous 5-year age group. Of women with
children in this sample, 36% of women aged 45-49, 47% of
women aged 50-54, and 59% of women aged 55-59 were in the
"empty nest" phase of the family life course.

4   Chapter Six contains a more detailed analysis of
variables related to identification of family positions.
I wish to note here, though, that a number of variables
were investigated with respect to the kinkeeper position,
including age, sex, number of generations in the family,
number of children, proximity of kin, number of siblings,
marital status, retirement status, occupation and education.
For men, the significant factors were number of siblings
(Pearson's $r=.175$, Sign.$=.004$) and the number of living
generations above the respondent in the lineage (Pearson's
$r=.119$, Sign.$=.038$). For women, age was significant
(Pearson's $r=-.105$, Sign.$=.013$), as was marital status
(Pearson's $r=.104$, Sign.$=.050$) and number of siblings
(Pearson's $r=.232$, Sign.$=.001$). It is important to note,
I think, that social class does not seem to influence the
presence or absence of a family kinkeeper. In fact, the
variable with the strongest relationship for both sexes
is the number of siblings the respondent has.

5   In this sample, 33% of married women in their 50's
and 59% of married women in their 60's reported their
husband's health as only fair or poor. This represents
28% and 36% respectively of all women in each of these age
groups. In other words, a substantial number of women in
their 50's and 60's have husbands whose health may pose
emotional and physical demands on these women. In addition,
many women of these ages have an aging parent. In the
sample, 42% of women in their 50's, and 23% of women in
their 60's, still had at least one living parent. One

woman in the sample in the 70-74 age group still had a parent alive.

6   Funerals, of course, make their own contribution to family solidarity. See Chapter Five for a discussion of this.

7   Moreover, an examination of Table 3.1 shows that this is roughly true for all age and sex groups within the sample. Despite the skewing of the sample by stratifying it, it appears that more than half of all families of people living in Hamilton/Stoney Creek may have a kinkeeper.

8   That is, respondents were not asked who, if anyone, had done the job prior to the present kinkeeper, or who would be the next kinkeeper.

CHAPTER FOUR

COMFORTING AND PROVIDING MORAL SUPPORT

INTRODUCTION

A major characteristic of the contemporary family,
and one which is argued to distinguish it from the family
of past times, is the affective or emotional importance
of family relationships. Many scholars, from very
diverse theoretical positions, have pointed to this import-
ant aspect of the modern family and contrasted it with the
historical family. For example, the historian David Fischer
describes intergenerational relationships in early America
as being characterized by "veneration".

> Veneration was an emotion of
> great austerity, closer to awe
> than to affection. It had nothing
> to do with love (Fischer, 1978:30).

Veneration, coupled with the economic dependence of
sons upon fathers extending well into the sons' adulthood,
may have helped create "continuity, stability, permanence,
constancy, and order in the society" (Fischer, 1978:59),
but contributed little to the possibility of feelings of
closeness, sympathy, or free-flowing emotional support.

Laslett points out that hierarchy was a pervasive
feature in social relationships and institutions in the
old world, and that this was important as a way of seeking
to provide stability in a very insecure and impermanent

110

environment (Laslett, 1971:157).

Laslett notes a feature of the preindustrial English family that distinguished it sharply from the modern family--the potential for tension.

> In the traditional, patriarchal
> society of Europe, where practic-
> ally everyone lived out his whole
> life within the family, though not
> usually within one family, tension...
> must have been incessant and un-
> relieved, incapable of release except
> in a crisis (Laslett, 1971:157).

Shorter, too, emphasizes that the traditional family was not a place for emotional succour.

> ...the traditional family was much
> more a productive and reproductive
> unit. It was a mechanism for trans-
> mitting property and position from
> generation to generation. While the
> lineage was important, being to-
> gether about the dinner table was
> not (Shorter, 1977:5).

However, Shorter argues, as the ties between the family and the outside world became weakened, emotional ties between family members became stronger.

> ...sentiment flowed into a number of
> familial relationships. Affection
> and inclination, love and sympathy,
> came to take the place of 'instrumental'
> considerations in regulating the
> dealings of family members with one
> another (Shorter, 1977: 5-6).

Fischer, too, suggests that as the aged lost moral and economic authority within the family, ties of affection grew stronger.

> Relations between parents and children
> became more affectionate as they

became less authoritarian...
the new relations enlarged
the possibilities for sym-
pathy and love which had been
blocked in the rigidly hierar-
chical world...(Fischer,1978:155).

Lasch argues that the foregoing are superficial
views of what has really happened to the family. He
describes the destructive paradox of a situation in which
the family is increasingly the place in society where
people expect to fulfill their emotional needs, yet for
a variety of reasons this fulfillment becomes increasingly
improbable. The possibility that the family might truly
have provided a "haven in a heartless world" has been
destroyed by the destruction of boundaries between the
family and that world, and the removal of familial respon-
sibilities to other areas of society. Parental authority
has been eroded, the fragile walls that might have
protected the family from the cold world of the market
place have crumbled and intimate relations have been
perverted (Lasch, 1977: 166). While the old, overt tensions
are no longer visible, and the "temperature of family life"
has been lowered, this cool surface belies an under-
lying rage and turmoil (Lasch, 1977: 175-176). The
tyranny of authority that characterized the family of
yesterday has been replaced by a newer, more subtle
emotional tyranny, which results in the persistence of
generational conflict but in a "more primitive psycholog-
ical form" (Lasch, 1977:179).

> Conditions in the family thus
> mirror conditions in society
> as a whole, which have created
> an ever-present sense of menace
> and reduced social life to a
> state of warfare, often carried
> out under the guise of friendly
> cooperation (Lasch, 1977:157).

Even more bleak and depressing than Lasch's view is that of Laing and others who argue that in some families, family relationships may drive people into madness (Laing and Esterson, 1970; see also Henry, 1971: 56).

Although it is not necessary here to make a value judgment on the merits of the historical versus the contemporary family, Judith Treas places the argument in perspective when she says, "Most would agree that emotional bonds are more desirable as an intergenerational tie than economic necessity" (Treas, 1977).

Within sociology, functionalists have argued that the modern family has become that unit of society which specializes in social and emotional functions, specifically socialization of children and stabilization of adult personalities (Parsons, 1955: 17). Although this theoretical position has an overall emphasis on harmony and integration, its proponents also see the potential for conflict (Parsons and Fox, 1952).

The family as an emotional organization underlies the title of a major textbook on the family, "The Intimate Environment" (Skolnick, 1973).

The point of view that scholars from either end of
the spectrum seem to share is that the family is indeed
a resource, and the major resource for emotional life and
affective relationships. This point of view is taken
as a basic premise or assumption by adherents of both the
positive and negative schools, rather than as an empirical
question.

During the past fifteen or twenty years, students
of intergenerational relations, the family, and aging,
have taken a different approach. Moving the focus of con-
cern from parent-child relationships within the nuclear
family, to relationships within and between generations
in the family of adult life, these scholars made questions
of the extent, content, and nature of family relationships
the starting point of their research. This body of
research has focused on parent-child relations (for example,
Shanas et al., 1968; Adams, 1968; Hill et al., 1970;
Sussman, 1965), but sibling and other extended family re-
lationships have also interested these and other scholars.
Objective, quantifiable features of relationships such
as proximity and interaction frequency have been emphasized,
partly because of the difficulty in operationalizing
measures of quality. However, some work has focused on
the emotional side of family relationships. This research
may be viewed as investigating two major aspects of solid-
arity, which have been described this way:

>affect ("subjective" interaction--
>the degree of sentiment between
>members); and consensus (agreement
>in values or opinions)   (Bengtson
>and Cutler, 1976: 147).

Affect has been investigated with respect to parent-

child dyads and consensus with respect to both two-

generation and three-generation sets of lineage members

(see for example, Bengtson, 1971 and 1975; Bengtson &

Black, 1973; Troll et al, 1969; Hill et al, 1970).

Generally speaking, findings have pointed to high levels

of perceived subjective solidarity between lineage

members.

The importance of family members in providing

moral support has been revealed through research on widow-

hood and confidant relationships (Lopata, 1973; Tigges

et al., 1980; Litman, 1971; Treas, 1979; Matthews, 1979;

Lowenthal & Haven, 1968).

Thus, it is fair to generalize that, by and large,

families provide emotional support and that this is an

important way in which families serve their members.

However, this finding is quite general, and it is worth

asking just how it is within families that emotional

support is provided. With this in mind, I hypothesized

that many families might have one person who specialized

in this sort of task, and that such a position

could be investigated in its own right. To accomplish

this, respondents were asked:

> Is there currently any one person
> among you and any of the relatives
> on your side of the family with
> whom other family members particu-
> larly like to talk over their
> troubles--someone they can go to
> for advice and comfort?

Respondents who said there was currently such

a person in their families were then asked a series of

questions concerning who this person was, why the person

was sought out for advice and comfort, the length of time

the person had been holding this position in the family,

how the person came to hold this position, and who filled

the position prior to the present occupant. In addition,

respondents who said that at the present time there was

no one in their family who was sought out for comfort

and advice were asked whether there had _ever_ been such a

person. These data provide the basis for the discussion

in this chapter.

This position encompasses the giving of personal

advice, offering a shoulder to cry on, expressing care

and concern, and providing the undefined but widely

shared notion of "moral support";[1] I refer to this position

as the comforter.

The reader should remember that, as I discussed in

Chapter Two, respondents were given the freedom to focus

on whatever kin groupings seemed relevant to their

experience. For some this may have been the lineage

and for others the extended family. Thus, what this invest-

igation addresses is the existence and nature of the

comforter postion in what the respondents define as their "effective, personal kindred" (Ayoub, 1966).

In this chapter, I describe the kinds of activities and responsibilities that comprise the content of the position of family comforter and the personal qualities that position occupants are said to possess. Affective qualities, such as being sympathetic, compassionate and understanding, are typical of people who provide comfort and moral support. When the main activity involves the giving of personal advice, qualities such as intelligence, education and experience become pertinent. Content of the position tends to follow the expressive/instrumental distinction. When the family comforter is a female, the position tends to emphasize comforting; when the occupant is male, advice-giving tends to be emphasized. This position is found in close to two-fifths of the families of respondents in this study, and is identified with about equal frequency by men and women. Occupancy of the position extends over a long period of time, averaging about twenty years. This is a position often occupied by a sibling of the respondent, or by respondents themselves. Although most comforters are women, men are as likely as women to designate themselves as position occupants. Women in the 55 to 74 age range are especially likely to be comforters.

Data indicate that the comforter position passes down
the generations along same-sex lines, usually from
female to female, but also from male to male.

Identification of this position tends to
decline in later life. Since respondents usually
name someone from their own generation as comforter,
and since occupancy of the position of comforter
extends over so many years, it may be inferred that
when the comforter who was a generational peer of
the respondent dies, it is simply too difficult to
establish the same kind of confidant relationship
with someone of a younger generation. This difficulty
stems both from the fact that intimacy takes time
to develop, and that leaning on a younger person for
emotional support implies dependency.

I turn now to my investigation of the position
of comforter.

PREVALENCE OF THE POSITION OF COMFORTER

Close to two-fifths of the respondents said
there was currently someone in their families with
whom other family members liked to talk over their
troubles, a person to whom family members turned for
advice and comfort (see Table 4.1). A further
one-sixth of the respondents said that although

there was no such person in their families now, there

had been such a person in the past. Altogether, then,

over half of the respondents said that someone had held

the position of family comforter, either now or in the

past.

TABLE 4.1

Percent Saying There Is a Comforter, by Age and Sex

Age of Respondent

	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	47.8	36.8	46.9	31.4	47.6	18.8	36.7	29.6	13.3	35.8
Females	45.0	42.9	40.0	45.2	46.2	38.1	45.2	28.0	17.9	38.8
All	46.5	40.4	43.3	37.9	46.8	29.7	41.0	28.8	16.3	37.4
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Males Pearson's r = -.147, Sign.=.014

Females Pearson's r = -.129, Sign. = .021

All Pearson's r = -.136, Sign. = .001

Identification: Age and Sex

There is an overall decline in identification of this

position with age (Men: Pearson's r = -.147, Sign. = .014.

Women: Pearson's r = -.129, Sign. = .021). This decline is

even sharper for women than for men. The data in Table 4.1

show the age and sex differences in perception of this
position, and clarifies the different patterns. Women
between the ages of 55 and 74 maintain quite consistently
high levels of identification of the comforter
position. At these ages, men have lower levels of
identification, and also show greater fluctuations
between each five-year age category. Then, while both
men and women decline sharply after age 75, the decline is
even sharper for women. The other point to note in
age differences between the sexes is that men exhibit
a very sudden drop in the age 65 to 69 period, a
drop from which they recover in the next age category.

Men are less likely to identify this position
at or just following retirement (ages 65-69) than
at any other time until the years from 80 on. A
similar effect around retirement occurs with respect
to other positions as well and will be explored more
fully in Chapter Six.[2]

What is interesting is that the husband's retire-
ment does not result in a drop for their wives in the
60-64 age group (the typical pattern in all other positions[3]);
in fact, these women continue to rise in identification.
Perhaps this reflects the increase in nurturing of
husbands that occurs for wives at this life stage (Keating
and Cole, 1980). This hypothesis is strengthened by the

data in Table 4.2 showing that women in this age category
have the highest rate of self-designations.

TABLE 4.2

Percent of Self-designations In Comforter Position by Age and Sex

Age of Respondent

	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	8.7	5.3	25.0	11.4	19.0	6.3	16.7	14.8	0	13.3
Females	10.0	10.7	11.4	19.4	23.1	19.0	19.4	8.0	7.1	14.3
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245

Missing observations = 1

In other words, women in this age group not only
are most likely to identify a comforter in the family, but
also to feel that they themselves are performing the comfort-
ing task. We do not know which family members in particular
turn to these women for advice and comfort, but we may
reasonably infer that husbands may be among those who do.
Or, it may simply be that the increased burden and respon-
sibility wives perceive in helping their husbands adjust
to retirement increase an overall sense of responsibility
and activity in the comforting task, even though as Keating
and Cole point out, the husbands may not share this
perception.

I will return to the matter of self-designations
later on in this chapter.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE
COMFORTER POSITION

Before discussing the responsibilities and
activities associated with the position of family comforter,
I wish to alert the reader to a possible problem stemming
from the wording of the question about this position,
including as it did both the providing of comfort
and the giving of advice. At the time the interview
schedule was designed, these activities seemed part of
the same larger task of helping family members in time
of personal need or distress. However, as analysis
progressed, I came to wish that the question wording
had specified only the comforting component. It is
possible that the data are somewhat confounded by the
inclusion of both comforting and advising activities.
However, having pointed out this less-than-perfect situation,
I proceed with the analysis, referring to this possible
problem when it seems relevant.

Having defined the comforter to respondents as
a person to whom other family members turn for advice,
comfort and to talk over their troubles, respondents were
not asked further questions about specific activities.

However, the question which asked why the person
named was sought out for comfort and advice provided
information on the content of the position.

Comforters listen and offer sympathy, compassion,
and understanding.

> She has a sympathetic ear and
> listens to you. (7210)

* * * * *

> She's a good listener. She'll
> talk if you need it, listen if
> you need it. (3152)

* * * * *

> She's very sympathetic. She'll
> give advice and tell you what
> she's thinking. (4041)

* * * * *

> She's just a compassionate person.
> She has this way about her that
> we must stick together. (6124)

Family members find the comforter is "easy to talk to."

> ...She's more relaxed and easy
> to talk to. She's very good. (8015)

Occasionally, respondents implied that comforters are motherly.

> She is the mother image to all of
> us. (6065)

Comforters show interest in others. They are people who are concerned, caring, loving, interested or giving.

> She seems to care more about
> people. (6064)

* * * * *

> She has a big heart and helps us
> all. (6120)

Comforters are able to give good advice because they have superior judgment or intelligence.

> They trust my judgment. (3018)

* * * * *

We respect him and look up to
him. He is a good person and
a sensible person. (3038)

* * * * *

She's bright. She gets to the
point. (5095)

The ability to give advice and be emotionally

supportive may stem from the comforter's own experience

or special knowledge.

She has had a lot of experience
in her life and can help. (4115)

* * * * *

She had breast cancer a few
years ago and it has made her
look at her life differently
and I find her now very easy to
talk to about anything. She
used to be very self-centered. (6143)

* * * * *

He's a doctor so people take
problems to him. He seems
interested. (5142)

* * * * *

He is a lawyer. (7100)

Some comforters are turned to simply because

of availability, meaning either geographical proximity,

or lack of anyone else.

Because of proximity. The rest
are scattered. (3063)

* * * * *

I'm a good listener and I'm
close by. (5089)

* * * * *

> She's the only sister
> and family I have. (8024)

Of the respondents who identified a family comforter, half referred to affective activities--giving sympathy, compassion, understanding, concern and love. One-quarter of the responses suggested the comforter filled that position because of advice-giving ability stemming from natural talents, education, experience, or intelligence. The other one-quarter of the respondents either mentioned a combination of these attributes or neither of them. The main point here is that the comforting aspect of the task seemed more relevant to the experience of most respondents than the advice-giving component. This may be interpreted in two ways. One is that being able to give advice is less important in qualifying someone for this position than being a supportive and caring person. The other side of this is that people want someone to talk to more frequently than someone to give them solutions to their problems. The affective task appears to be a more vital task of the comforter, and by extension a more needed task in the family. This analysis, then, points to the conclusion that the comforter position involves more affective than instrumental responsibilities and activities in the family.

Activity in This Position Varies by Sex

In describing why their family comforters were sought out, respondents mentioned a variety of attributes.

Analysis of these attributes suggests that the comforter's

activities vary somewhat according to the comforter's

sex, and suggests, as well, a distinction between the

advising and comforting dimensions of this position.

TABLE 4.3

Attributes of Comforters, by Sex of Comforters

Attribute	Percent of Times Attribute Mentioned for:	
	Male Comforters	Female Comforters
Attributes related to advising*	60.8	39.1
Attributes related to comforting**	27.0	72.9

* These included ability to give good advice and the possession of intelligence, judgment, experience, and knowledge.

**These included being sympathetic, understanding, easy to talk to, motherly, concerned, caring, or giving.

N of cases mentioning: advising attributes = 46
comforting attributes = 37

Personal attributes to do with advice-giving,

or which enhance a person's ability to give advice

(such as experience or intelligence), were more frequently

given as descriptions of male occupants of this position.

(Table 4.3). Attributes which relate to providing comfort

or emotional support, such as being sympathetic or a good

listener, were more frequently offered as descriptions

of female occupants. This suggests that to some degree

men advise and women comfort. This finding conforms

somewhat to Parsons' instrumental/expressive dichotomy

(Parsons, 1955:51), with men tending to perform instrumental tasks and women to perform expressive tasks. On the other hand, while the overall tendency conforms to the stereotyped division of labour, it is important to note that a substantial minority does not conform.

The verbatim quotations used throughout this section on the content of the comforter position were given in response to a question probing the reasons those named as comforters were sought out by family members. In Table 4.4 I summarize these reasons, viewing them as characteristics of comforters.

TABLE 4.4

Characteristics of Comforters*

Ascriptive		Achieved	
Character-istic	% of Comforters Who Have This Characteristic	Character-istic	% of Comforters Who Have This Characteristic
Age, birth order	13.1	Talent, personality, interest, motivation	60.0
Parent	4.5		
Sister	1.7	Availability	14.7
Other	1.7	Financial, Occupational, education reason	6.2
		Other	7.4
	21.0		88.3

* Coding of responses allowed for both ascriptive and achieved categories in each case. Thus, totals exceed 100%.

N   171

Only one-fifth of the responses mentioned
an ascriptive characteristic. Over half of the
ascriptive reasons referred to age or birth-order.

I'm the older sister. (4080)

Occasionally, being younger rather than older
qualified the comforter for the position.

> He's the youngest brother
> and is easy to talk to.
> (8032)

Parental status was sometimes mentioned as
the reason the person was comforter.

> Because I am their mother.
> (6051)

However, only one-tenth of the respondents
who named a comforter gave an ascriptive character-
istic alone as the reason the person occupied the
position. The rest of the respondents gave additional
or other reasons.[2]

Three-fifths of all respondents who named
a comforter cited attributes related to personality,
talent, motivation and interest. Another small
group cited attributes related to occupation and
education. All of these may be viewed as relating
either to advice-giving or to comforting (see Table
4.3).

Duration of Occupancy

Respondents who said that there was currently someone in their family to whom other family members turned for comfort and advice were asked how long the person had been doing this. As with kinkeeping, comforting is a very long-term position, and here too the median length of occupancy was twenty years. The range was from one year to 65 years. As an indication of the long-term nature of this position, and of the depth of family memories, it is noteworthy that one-quarter of the comforters had occupied their positions for thirty years or more

OCCUPANTS OF THE COMFORTER POSITION

In this section I investigate characteristics of family comforters analysing the comforter's relationship to respondent, sex, generational location, and age as indicated by self-designations in this position.

Relationship to Respondent

Siblings and self-designations account for four-fifths of those named as comforters (see Table 4.5). One-quarter of all comforters are sisters, but a considerable number of brothers are also named. A fifth of the female respondents and only a slightly smaller proportion of male respondents designated themselves as comforter. A small number of parents were said to be comforters, with mothers outnumbering fathers by more than five to one.

TABLE 4.5

Person Named as Comforter: Relationship to Respondent

Relationship to Respondent	% of All Comforters
Sibling	41.5
Respondent*	40.3
Parent	7.6
Child	4.6
Other**	5.7
	99.7

N - 171

* In addition to self-designations, this category included 4 designations of spouses and 2 of the couple (i.e. respondent plus spouse).

** Aunts, uncle, cousin, nephew, niece.

The reader will recall that respondents who said no one currently acted as comforter in their families were asked whether there had ever been such a person in the past. Of those who said there used to be a comforter, half named a parent (Table 4.6), with mothers outnumbering fathers three to two. Almost one-fifth of former comforters were siblings, with brothers and sisters being identified with about equal frequency. A grandparent was named in less than one-tenth of the cases, but here it was almost always a grandmother who was designated.

TABLE 4.6

Person Named as Former Comforter: Relationship to Respondent

Relationship to Respondent	% of All Former Comforters
Parent	49.3
Sibling	18.0
Grandparent	8.4
Respondent or spouse	8.4
Child	2.4
Other*	13.2
	99.7

N = 83

* Aunt, uncle, cousins, nephew

Sex: Women Predominate as Comforters

When family members need comfort or advice or
want to talk over their troubles with someone, they usually
do this with a woman. About three-fifths of those named
as past or present comforters were women, while about two-
fifths were men.

The fact that these proportions were consistent
for both present and past comforters increases confidence
in the conclusion that this is a female-dominated position.
This female dominance in the task of giving emotional
support has been found in other research and, interestingly,
in this exact ratio. Tigges and colleagues studied

confidant relationships, viewed as one type of emotional
support, of a sample of 940 individuals aged sixty and
over (Tigges et al., 1980). Confidant was operational-
ized as a person with whom respondents felt they
"could talk about nearly everything." Of those confidants
who were relatives, the ratio of women to men was six to
four.

Although Lowenthal and Haven did not specifically
report on the sex of persons named as confidants in their
study, their findings suggest female dominance in the
role (Lowenthal and Haven, 1968). They found that more
women than men reported having a confidant (69% compared
with 57%). Wives were most frequently named as confidants
by men, but husbands were infrequently named as confidants
by women. Instead, women tended to name a child, friend,
or other relative of unreported sex. No doubt, many
if not most of these were female friends, sisters,
daughters or mothers.

Generation: Comforters Belong to the Respondent's Generation

Respondents generally feel that the provider of com-
fort and emotional support is someone of their own generation.
Four out of five comforters belong to the same generation
as the respondent identifying the position. These data
are displayed in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7

Generational Location of Comforter, by Age of Respondent

Age of Respondent	Generational Location of Comforter		
	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+ (N = 46)	19.5	80.4	0
55-69 (N = 58)	5.1	91.3	3.4
40=54 (N = 69)	0	76.8	23.1

Chi Square = 34.78, df = 4, Sign. = .001   Cramer's V = .32

Because of the wording of the question, asking to whom family members went   for advice and comfort, we can only speculate about the generational make-up of those family members who seek out this person. That is, knowing the generational level of the family comforters tells us nothing specific about the generational level of their clients. However, it is usually clear from respondents' answers that they include themselves among the comforter's clientele. For example, one respondent said her sister is the comforter...

> Because there are only two of
> us sisters and she's very
> supportive. (4141)

Another named her cousin as comforter and said,

We all just seem to turn to
her. She has the time and
the solutions. (4105)

We may infer, then, that the tendency to name a

generational peer as comforter also implies that people

tend to seek this comfort from members of their own

generation. In summary, these data show that people

tend to see their own generation as providing emotional

support in the family, and suggest that people turn to

generational peers when they themselves need this kind

of support. The same pattern was true of the widowed

women studied by Lopata. She notes that when they sought

a confidant, they turned to someone in their own age

range, and rarely to a child (Lopata, 1979:195).

Another strong tendency indicated in Table 4.7

is for older people to consult someone in the younger

generation if not their own, and for younger people to go

to someone in an older generation if not their own. At

one level of understanding, this is the only demograph-

ically feasible possibility; for the older generation,

there are few or no family members left in the generational

level above them, and for younger members, the generation

below them is still relatively immature. However, at

another level, this pattern demonstrates the process of

the succession of generations. Whereas the dominant

pattern is for respondents to see succession of the

comforter position as having moved to someone in the resp-

ondent's own generation, respondents in the oldest and

youngest age groups sometimes imply by the occupants
they designate that the position has already passed on
to the younger generation, or that succession from the
older to the respondent's generation has not yet occurred.
Table 4.7, then, conveys a sense of "succession in
motion", as well as portraying a strong same-generation
preference.

Age: Self-designations in the Position of Comforter

While precise data on age of comforters is not
available, the data on self-designations may be used to
give some indication of the age of occupants of this posi-
tion (see Table 4.2). Male occupants tend to be between
the ages of 50 and 64, or in their 70's. Female occupants
tend to be between the ages of 55 and 74. The
figures in Table 4.2 for women in this twenty-year
age spread represent quite dramatically what sociologists
and psychologists have been saying recently about the
caught generation. These middle-aged women are indeed a
heavily burdened group, and these data show that among these
burdens are those of providing comfort, sympathy, under-
standing--a host of affective activities I have termed
"moral support."

Not to be overlooked here is another interesting
point. Aside from self-designations, male and female
respondents agree in the overall female occupancy of this
position. However, self-designations by men are as common
as by women. This is quite interesting for it implies a

certain paradox. When men cast their thoughts across
the wider family they tend to perceive female occupants
in this position. But their own personal experience
belies this sexual stereotype. And, as I show in Chapter
Six, of the three expressive positions, men have their
highest proportion of self-designations in the comforter
position.

ACCESSION AND SUCCESSION

To investigate how people begin to occupy the
comforter position, respondents were asked how it came
about that the person named as comforter had come to be
sought out for advice and comfort. This question did not
elicit the kind of information for which I had hoped.
Most of the time, people tended to repeat the answer they
had given when asked why the person was the comforter.
Thus, for example, people repeated a listing of ascriptive
characteristics such as birth order or kinship status,
or offered reasons related to the comforter's personality.
However, limited data are available and give some inkling
of the accession/succession process with respect to the
comforter position.

The answers of some respondents suggest that the
comforter comes to occupy this position in response to a need
in the family. This need is often, but not always, related
to some kind of family or individual life course transition.

Close to one-fifth of respondents who named a

comforter said the person assumed the position because
of a reason related to family life course dynamics. This
was almost always a vacancy created by the death of the
former comforter.

> He took over when father
> died. (6015)

> * * * * *

> My mother passed away and she
> took over. (8132)

Sometimes the status passage in question concerned
a change in marital status.

> I got married and started
> raising a family and she gave
> me a lot of advice. (3138)

> * * * * *

> My brother moved to the States
> and got divorced. This bothered
> my Dad, and also his present
> living arrangements upset Dad
> so Dad talks things over with
> me. (3135)

As the above examples suggest, comforters may step
into the position because a specific need or turning point
arises. Respondents referred to such a reason in one-tenth
of the cases.

> Good at giving sound advice and
> several members needed advice.
> (7020)

> * * * * *

> One of our children has a youngster
> with health problems. (7139)

Those respondents who said someone in the family

currently acted as comforter were asked who, if anyone, had done this job prior to the present person. Over half of the respondents who named a present comforter could also name the prior comforter.

Three-fifths of those named as prior comforters were parents (see Table 4.8), with mothers outnumbering fathers at a ratio of two to one. Siblings were named in one-seventh of the cases, husbands in about one-tenth, and grandparents (usually grandmothers), a little less than this.

TABLE 4.8

Succession of Comforter Position: Person Named as Prior Comforter and Sex of Present Comforter

Prior Comforter	% of All Prior Comforters	Present Comforter	
		Male	Female
Mother	40.8	9.6	31.1
Father	19.3	12.9	6.4
Brother	8.6	5.3	2.1*
Sister	5.3	0	5.3
Grandmother	5.3	2.1	3.2
Grandfather	2.1	1.0	1.0
Female respondent	2.1	1.0	1.0
Son	1.0	1.0	0
Uncle	4.3	2.1	2.1
Husband	9.6	6.4	3.2
Wife	1.0	0	1.0
	99.4	41.4	56.4

N = 93

*1 present comforter uncodable for sex

Inheritance of this position moves down the generations along same-sex lines (see Table 4.8). The position moves most commonly from female to female; this pattern occurs about one and one-half times as frequently as from male to male. Both these patterns are far more common than transitions from male to female or vice versa.

Furthermore, the comforter task is handed down the generations, rather than moving to a new occupant within the same generation. Over three-quarters (78.4%) of the completed transitions from past to present comforter involved a move to someone in a younger generation.

The most frequent transition is mother to sister, followed by mother to female respondent. Transitions originating with mothers are far more likely to move to a female than a male. While less common than transitions originating with mothers, those originating with fathers are the second most frequent type in the data. These most commonly move to a male, either a male respondent or a brother.

Transitions from siblings move, in most cases, to other siblings or to respondents themselves. Consistent with the pattern described above, those originating with brothers usually move to males, and those with sisters to females.

CONCLUSION

I have demonstrated, in this chapter, that the
comforter is quite a common family position, one
which more than half the respondents felt existed in
their families now or in the past.

It is important to stress that this investigation
did not seek to compare the importance of family versus
friends in the giving of comfort, nor did it determine
whether or not the respondent had a particularly supportive
relationship with another family member. In other words,
my research does not imply that such and such a percent
of people do or do not receive emotional comfort from
their families. Rather, this research shows that many
families have one person who specializes in this kind
of service or activity in the familial division of labour.

It was seen that occupancy, activity, and succession
in this position are patterned by sex. Women predominate
as family comforters, but men comprise a substantial
minority. Siblings are very prominent as occupants,
and in fact about half the comforters identified
are members of the respondents' extended
families. This confirms what the previous chapter
illuminated: that the efforts of family members to
keep the family viable over time apply not only to the
lineage but to the wider family as well.

I have shown in the analysis that activity
in this position is patterned by sex. Women provide

comfort, men give advice. Again, lest the seeming

validity of the stereotype become too oppressive, it

is important to note that the exceptions to this trend

add up to a sizeable number, though still a minority.

Most people identified someone from their own

generation as the family comforter. It seems that to

some extent people wear generational blinkers, perceiving

the distribution of family responsibility in generationally

homogeneous terms.

Finally, many people were able to describe the

line of succession of the position of comforter. It was

striking that people described this process as following same-

sex lines. In most families in the study, the comforting task

is passed from mother to daughter, but in a fair number

of families the position passes from father to son.

Many respondents said that the new occupant took up the

task when the parent, the former occupant, died. The

position is sometimes explicitly passed on, as in the

case of one woman who said her sister took on the task of

comforter because...

She made a promise to mother. (5151)

And indeed, promises such as this, in numerous

deathbed scenes in literature, and perhaps more than we

realize in real life, represent the hopes and wishes of

many aging family members, wishes that their heirs will

take up the cause of the family. Providing comfort and

emotional or moral support is one key way in which family

members contribute to family solidarity and continuity through time.

In the next chapter, I investigate three more family positions, each contributing in a distinctive way to the broader effort of maintaining the family as an ongoing, supportive social group.

FOOTNOTES

1   In an earlier section of the interview, respondents were asked about areas in which they exchanged help with parents and children. In the pretest, respondents frequently referred to "moral support", making it clear to the investigators that this was a meaningful concept to most people. Sarah Matthews refers to moral support as part of the currency of exchange between generations. She too feels obliged to place the phrase in quotation marks (Matthews, 1979: 125).

2   A number of other variables were also investigated, in order to gain understanding of who identified the position and in what kinds of families it exists. Several variables were significant for men, but not for women: marital status (Pearson's $r=.123$, Sign.$=.048$), having a number of proximate kin (PROXKIN: Pearson's $r=.116$, Sign.$=.058$), having at least one proximate parent, child and sibling (AVAIL: Pearson's $r=.171$, Sign.$=.010$), having at least one child (Pearson's $r=.153$, Sign.$=.019$), having several children (Pearson's $r=.151$, Sign.$=.020$), having a large number of living generations in the lineage (NGEN: Pearson's $r=.181$, Sign.$=.007$), having generations older than the respondent in the lineage (Pearson's $r=.174$, Sign.$=.009$), being retired (Pearson's $r=.128$, Sign.$=.058$), and income (Pearson's $r=.128$, Sign.$=.043$). Age was significant for both sexes (Men: Pearson's $r=-.158$, Sign.$=.016$; Women: Pearson's $r=-.125$, Sign.$= .033$). Variables not significant for either sex were number of generations in the lineage below the respondent, number of siblings, and occupation.

3   Except the financial advisor, where there was neither a rise nor a drop.

4   Coding of responses allowed for several categories.

CHAPTER FIVE

OTHER POSITIONS IN THE FAMILIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

In the two previous chapters, I investigated two
important positions in the familial division of labour,
with detailed attention to aspects of prevalence,
identification, activities, responsibilities, occupancy,
accession and succession. For these two positions --
kinkeeper and comforter -- extensive data were gathered
in the initial interview, making detailed analysis
feasible and productive. For three additional positions,
however, data are less complete. These positions are
the placement officer (the person in the family who helps
other family members find jobs or get started in occupations
or businesses), the financial advisor (the family member
to whom others in the family turn for advice about money
matters), and the ambassador (the person who makes a point
of making sure that the family is represented at the
funerals of more distant relatives or old family friends.
For each of these positions, respondents in the initial
interview were asked only about the existence of the
position and who occupied it. Because there is less
information about these positions than about the others,[1]
I have combined the discussions about each of these three

positions into one chapter. This is based not on any
underlying connection between the three positions but
simply on expediency.

Following the analyses of these three positions,
I briefly discuss some of the other positions respondents
talked about in the course of the interviews, but which
were not investigated directly in this study.

There are, then, four rather unrelated sections to
this chapter consisting of discussions of the placement
officer, the financial advisor, the ambassador, and
other positions.

THE PLACEMENT OFFICER

Introduction

One potential leadership task in the familial
division of labour entails helping family members find
their way in the occupational world.

The theoretical and substantive relevance of a
family placement officer may be understood by reference
to four fields of sociological interest and reseach.
The first involves a theoretical framework contrasting
traditional society, in which family and kinship had an
integral and accepted role in economic placement, with
contemporary society, in which some claim that equality
of opportunity is more likely to exist and that status
attainment is a matter of individual achievement partly
unrelated to family background characteristics. A second,
related theoretical perspective views the modern nuclear

family as functionally suited or adapted to the demands
and needs of the economic system by being relatively
isolated from the broader kin group. Reaction to these
perspectives has resulted in two additional broad
areas of sociological research. One has painstakingly
constructed a body of evidence supporting a view of the
contemporary nuclear family as integrated into a broader
kin network and involving widespread contact, affection,
and exchange of goods and services, one of which is
assistance in finding jobs. This contradicts arguments
for both the isolated nuclear family and for the total
separation of the family and occupational spheres.
Finally, another reaction has been to attack the myth of
equality by investigating the extent to which inequality
of opportunity and access limits social mobility, and
documenting the crystallization of social classes especially
at the very top and bottom of the class structure. I will
briefly describe each of these fields of interest below.

Social theorists have long been concerned with
analysing the relationship between the familial and
economic institutions in societies. It is usually argued
that whereas historically these institutions were inter-
twined, in modern society the two are quite separate.
Functionalist sociologists have theorized that this
separation is paralleled by a separation of the nuclear
family from the wider family, freeing the nuclear family--
or more precisely, the breadwinner--to be geographically

and socially mobile in meeting the needs of the economic
system.

Talcott Parsons, foremost among functionalist
theorists of the family, described at length the different
male and female roles within the family, with the male
role being primarily occupational (Parsons, 1942). He
argued strongly that occupational roles and kinship
status were separate.

> Status in an occupational role
> is generally, however, specifically
> segregated from kinship status--
> a person holds a "job" as an
> individual, not by virtue of his
> status in a family (Parsons, (1943:33).

In the same article, Parsons goes on to say,

> It is quite clear that the type of
> occupational structure which is so
> essential to our society requires
> a far-reaching structural segrega-
> tion of occupational roles from the
> kinship roles of the same individuals
> (Parsons, 1943:34).

Functionalist theory, the most influential in the
sociology of the family, as well as classical social
theory, has contrasted the traditional and contemporary
relationships between family and occupational spheres by
such dichotomous characteristics as ascription/achievement
and particularism/universalism. Traditional society was
"closed": one's occupation and social status flowed from
one's family, from ascribed characteristics. Modern
society is held to be "open" in nature: places in the
occupational structure are open to all, waiting to be

filled by the best qualified persons. People thus achieve
rather than inherit social standing and economic placement.

This general theoretical perspective is summed
up rather dramatically by Bernard Barber:

> ...the individual's nuclear 'family
> of orientation'...socializes him
> and gives him a share in its resources
> equal to those of all his siblings.
> Then it cuts him loose to make his
> way in the world. He may remain in
> the same class position as his
> parents, or he may rise or fall in
> the class structure, but he has no
> institutionalized obligation to keep
> his parents or siblings abreast of
> him. Nor do they have such obliga-
> tion to him. When he is a mature
> adult, he leaves his nuclear family
> of orientation and enters as a lone
> individual into the processes of
> social mobility, which in modern indust-
> rial societies consist primarily of
> occupational achievement...Hence the
> functional congruence between the
> isolated nuclear type of family and
> individual occupational achievement
> with its accompanying geographical
> and social mobility (Barber, 1957: 364).

The extent to which this ideal type distorts
reality has long been a focus of investigation in the
social sciences.

Some studies have focused on the ways in which elite
structures crystallize at the top of society, resulting in a
tendency toward a "closed" rather than "open" society in
these upper echelons. In the 1960's for example,
John Porter found that one-third of Canada's economic
elite came from upper class origins and four-fifths from
middle class backgrounds or higher (Porter, 1965: 291-292).

Within this elite, kinship links were extensive, more

extensive than at the top of the country's other major

institutions. Porter concluded:

> By and large, over generations, the
> children of the economically powerful
> have been marrying within their own
> group   (Porter, 1965: 526).

Clement's study, conducted some years later, found

that access to the economic elite had become even less

likely than before. Clement flatly states:

> At the top a small number of people
> with common social origins, common
> experiences, and common interests
> oversee the direction of economic
> life. The inner circles of power
> are almost impenetrable... (Clement,
> 1975: 125).

When he scrutinized the importance of kinship,

Clement found that members of the elite whose main

career was in a family firm represented one of the highest

proportional groups in the elite, and were the most

powerful in terms of interlocking directorships (Clement,

1975: 185).

> ...the extent of family control over
> the corporate world in Canada is far
> from insignificant. It is as powerful,
> even more powerful, than it ever was
> (Clement, 1975: 187).

Family helps directly, in the ways outlined by

Porter and Clement and indirectly through providing

private school education (Porter, 1965: 284, 528;

Clement, 1975: 244-247).

Factors influencing mobility at less exalted levels

of society have been investigated by scholars such as
Kohn who argued that parents transmit values to their
children that help in a variety of ways to prepare the
children for life in the same social class position as the
parents, thus perpetuating inequality   (Kohn, 1969:200).

Reporting on a study of trends in occupational
mobility in the United States over a thirty-year period,
Rogoff summarized:

> The most likely occupational
> destination of all the sons was
> the occupation of their fathers
> (Rogoff, 1953: 106).

However, analysis of a Canadian study conducted in
1974, led to this more moderate conclusion:

> For the general public, the long-
> term perpetuation of family status
> seems to be much less than that
> found at the very upper end of
> Canadian society...or at the very
> bottom of the social order by
> studies of poverty...(Goyder and
> Curtis, 1977: 316).

It seems then, that if we put aside considerations
of the very rich and powerful and the very poor and
powerless, we should take a middle-of-the-road attitude
toward the ascription versus achievement issue as it
applies to this vast bulk of more ordinary people. Better
yet, perhaps we should take it as an empirical question.

In addition to studies of elites and of status
attainment, some research closer to my own present interest
has investigated the role of direct family assistance in
occupational placement. An early study in the United States

found friends and relatives provided the most common

means by which workers found jobs (de Schweinitz, 1932:

89). Another scholar reviewed five pertinent studies

conducted in the United States in the 1940's and found

manual workers learned about jobs from friends or

relatives between 27% and 58% of the time. Help from

friends or relatives was even more commonly cited as the

way in which these people found their first, as contrasted

with subsequent, jobs (Parnes, 1954: 162-165). In

one of these studies, employed manual workers were asked

how they thought they would go about finding a job if they

found themselves out of work (Reynolds, 1951). One-third

said they would talk to friends and relatives; this was

by far the most common answer.

Elizabeth Bott, in her well known study of British

family life, found working class people helped one

another find jobs (Bott, 1957: 135; see also Young &

Willmott, 1962: 94).

Another U.S. study of out-migration of families in

the Eastern Kentucky mountain area found that these

families moved to a common destination, and that kinship

ties provided highly effective channels of communication

and assistance.

> The kinship structure provides a highly
> persuasive line of communication between
> kinsfolk in the home and the new
> communities which channels information
> about available job opportunities and
> living standards directly, and most
> meaningfully, to Eastern Kentucky

families. Thus, kinship linkage
tends to direct migrants to those
areas where their kin groups are
already established. This effective
line of communication among kin
(which is, in our experience, over-
whelmingly more important than that
of State employment offices) helps
also to explain the fact that the
rate of out-migration is so immediat-
ly responsive to fluctuations in the
rate of unemployment in migratory
target areas (Brown et al., 1968:
151-152).

Sussman and Burchinal, in an article enumerating

the many ways in which members of contemporary extended

families support and help one another, note that...

Families or individual members on the
move are serviced by units of the
family network. Services range from
supplying motel-type accommodations
for vacationing kin passing through
town, to scouting for homes and jobs
for kin, and in providing supportive
functions during the period of in-
migration and transition from rural
to the urban pattern of living
(Sussman and Burchinal, 1962: 237-238).

This phenomenon of family assistance in finding a

job has been most thoroughly documented in working class

situations. However, more recent studies suggest that

personal contacts are also the key means by which those

in professional, technical and managerial positions find

out about new jobs (Shapero et al., 1965:50; Brown,

1965: 102; Granovetter, 1974: 11).

All in all, the evidence seems convincing;

family characteristics may not determine occupational

placement, but neither are the two entirely separate.

Kinship often spills over into occupational life,
although the manner and extent undoubtedly varies by
class. Keeping in mind the facets of theory and research
discussed above, I turn now to a consideration and analysis
of the position of placement officer in the families of
people living in Hamilton, Ontario in 1980.

The preceding discussion clearly indicates that
a position which involves the task of helping other
family members get jobs is one which we might reasonably
expect to find in some contemporary families. The exist-
ence and nature of such a position was investigated in
this study. Since the great majority of descriptions of
this position involved locating jobs for family members,
rather than sponsoring or funding them in businesses , I
have called this position the "placement officer". I do
wish, however, to distinguish the present investigation
from those described above. Whereas previous work has
generally investigated how a particular respondent found
out about a job, the present study asked whether any one
person on the respondent's side of the family specialized
in this task of helping other family members find jobs.
No previous study, to my knowledge, has investigated the
ways in which family resources are utilized in job
seeking from the point of view of a specialized position
in the wider family context.

To investigate the existence and nature of the
position of placement officer, respondents were asked in

the initial interview whether or not there was one person
"among you and any of the relatives on your side of the
family who helps other relatives find jobs or get started
in occupations or businesses." Respondents who were inter-
viewed a second time in the follow-up interview were asked
about this position in greater depth: they were asked
whether there was someone in their family who did this
task now, or had done it in the past, who that person
was, how and why the person had helped in this way, the
number of years the person had been doing this job, the
number of times the person had helped out in this manner,
how the person first came to be seen as someone who could
be counted on for this kind of help, and who in the family
had been helped in this way.

In describing and discussing this position, I will
show that a family position for sponsorship in job place-
ment exists as a structural feature in one out of six
families in this study. The placement officer in these
families usually assumed the position in response to a need
for a job by a family member. Once in the position, help
was usually given to more than one person in the family,
over a number of years. Placement officers were able to
help usually because of their own jobs, but often, too,
because of social and business connections. Almost all
placement officers are men, most commonly brothers of the
respondent. The flow of help is usually to people in the

generation below the placement officer, and usually
consists of fathers and uncles helping sons and nephews.
Finally, this position is one in which youth has some
advantage over age inasmuch as elderly family members who
are probably retired have less information about available
jobs and fewer "active connections" in the occupational
network. Consequently this position is occupied by
fewer people in their later years and more younger people
than are other positions.

Prevalence of the Position of Placement Officer

About one in six families in this study have a
placement officer--someone in the family who helps other
members get started in jobs or occupations.

Data suggest that, had the total sample been asked
about the existence of this position either at the present
time or in the past, about one-quarter would have identi-
fied such a position in their familial division of labour.
Table 5.1 reports these frequencies drawing on data from
both the main interview and the follow-up interview
(which, it will be remembered, was conducted with one-
quarter of the main interview respondents). While all
respondents were asked whether such a position currently
existed in their families, only follow-up respondents who
replied negatively were asked if anyone in the past had
ever held this position.

TABLE 5.1

Percent of Respondents Who Identify a Placement Officer

Family now has a placement officer (Main Interview, N=464)	16.4
Family now has placement officer (Follow-up Interview, N=113)	19.4
Family does not now have a placement officer, but used to have one (Follow-up Interview, N=113)	7.0

From these frequencies, I infer that the notion of a family placement officer is both meaningful to and within the experience of many respondents in this study, and indeed many people in contemporary urban settings.

At first glance, it may strike the reader that this position is found infrequently in families. I would contend, however, that when the findings of this study are viewed in the context of earlier studies and the norms of universalism, the present findings are both in line with earlier studies and indicate the persistence of particularism in the contemporary work world. Earlier, I noted that research in the 1940's found that workers found out about their present jobs from friends or relatives between 27% and 58% of the time; obviously, the percentage of cases involving help from relatives alone would be lower. In addition, the question did not ask whether the respondent had ever had a family member's assistance in finding a job but rather whether one person in the family specialized in helping out in this way. This

approach and definition could be expected to yield somewhat
fewer positive responses than in other somewhat similar
studies. Viewed in this context, the finding that 16.4%
of our respondents said such a position currently existed
in their families seems reasonably comparable to earlier
findings (although in the lower range), and suggests
family assistance in finding a place in the occupational
structure is not uncommon.

In one recent study of workers in upper level
technical and managerial jobs, respondents who said they
got jobs through some kind of personal contact were asked
to distinguish between relatives and friends. Of all
people who got jobs through some kind of contact, 16.5%
were through relatives or friends of relatives--family
contacts (Granovetter, 1974: 76). The congruence between
this proportion and the one in my study is highly note-
worthy.

TABLE 5.2

Percent of Respondents Who Say There Is a Placement Officer,
by Sex and Age

| | Age of Respondent | | | | | | | | | |
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	8.7	31.6	18.8	20.0	33.3	6.3	20.0	3.7	0	16.5
Females	20.0	25.0	17.1	16.1	15.4	9.5	19.4	8.0	14.3	16.3
All	14.0	27.7	17.9	18.2	23.4	8.1	19.7	5.8	9.3	16.4
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1
Males: Pearson's r = -.120, Sign. = .038
Females: Pearson's r = -.082, Sign. = .099
All: Pearson's r = -.099, Sign. = .015

As Table 5.2 shows, younger respondents identify
this position more than do older respondents (Pearson's r =
-.099, Sign. = .015). Although on the whole men and women
identified this position with about equal frequency,
there are differences in the age pattern for each sex
(Table 5.2). In fact, age is significant for males
(Pearson's r = -.120, Sign. = .038) but not for females.
The men show dramatic fluctuations between five-year age
periods in their perception of this position. Men are
more personally involved with this position, both as
occupants and as recipients of help, than are women, and
male respondents' perception of its existence reflects
their sensitivity to their own possession of power and
influence as they become established in the occupational
world and then as they retire from it. This position tends
to be found in families with a network of kin living rela-
tively close to one another. For female respondents,
those with lower educational attainment were more likely
to say the position exists in their families. This,
together with the examples in the verbatims below, suggests
that the placement officer functions primarily in the
working class, as opposed to the middle and upper-middle class.[2]

Responsibilities and Activities Associated With the
Position of Placement Officer

Most of the persons named as doing this job in
families had functioned precisely as placement officers;
they had helped family members get jobs either in their

own place of work or had put them in touch with a job through their "connections" (see Table 5.3). Only one-tenth helped through financial aid.

TABLE 5.3

Activities of the Placement Officer

Activity	Percent of responses saying is a placement officer
Got someone a job*	89.9
Financial assistance or advice	10.0

N = 30 (follow-up interview)

* Of these, 33.3% were in the placement officer's own place of work, 10% involved cases of direct hiring by the placement officer, and 16.6% did not specify location. Another 30% involved job placement through "connections".

Looking at these data in relation to the total sample, in one out of ten families placement officers either get relatives jobs in their own place of employment or hire them directly. Moreover, this assistance often occurs more than once:

> My father was with the Post Office.
> He got my brother-in-law and I in.
> Now I have got my two sons in. (3076)

* * * * *

> He helped my cousin and myself get
> jobs. He also encouraged a neighbour
> boy. It was all in one company.
> (4059)

* * * * *

>   My husband got his two nephews
>   a job at National Steel where
>   he works. (4086)

The above and other examples suggest that just
being employed somewhere is the prerequisite for
occupancy of this position; that is, one does not need
to be an executive to be able to provide this kind of
help. Stelco is a major employer in the city. Connections
certainly seem to help if one wants a job there.[3]

>   When a family member came from
>   Italy, he would find them a job
>   at Stelco.[4] (4119)

* * * * *

>   I helped my sister's boy and my
>   boys get jobs at the Steel
>   Company. (5161)

This assistance extends to summer employment for
young family members.

>   He got his son (my grandson)
>   employed in the Steel Company
>   for the summer. (8022)

One elderly respondent described how her deceased
father used to help people get jobs this way:

>   He was a foreman years ago and
>   it wasn't as hard to get family
>   members in to work at your
>   place of work as it is now.
>   (8075)

The respondent in the preceding example might be
quite surprised at the success some people still have
getting family members work.

The following example illustrates the informal

way in which placement officers make use of their
occupation. This quotation is also a good example of the
way in which both placement officers and their employers
seek to activate particularistic criteria, and the positive,
taken-for-granted way in which they view this kind of
particularism.

> I was able to (help). There's
> always job openings at the
> Steel Company and I could put
> in a good word for them (nephews
> and sons) and the Steel Company
> likes to help out families. (5161)

The above example illustrates what Young and Willmott
found in East London--"putting in a good word".

> Since relatives have the same kind
> of work, they can sometimes help each
> other to get jobs. They do this...
> by putting in a good word in the
> right quarter...reputation counts...
> a father with a record of being a
> good workman has a good chance of
> getting a job for his son, or
> indeed for any other relative he
> may recommend   (Young and Willmott,
> 1962:94).

The same example suggests also that the employer
was more than happy to allow particularistic methods to
intrude into the hiring process. Granovetter too noted
that employers, like employees, expressed a preference for
these hiring methods (Granovetter, 1974:12).

In a small number of cases, help was in the form
of hiring directly into the helper's own business.

> I had a business and my son.
> We gave a lot of family jobs. (7217)

* * * * *

> He had a store in Preston. He
> even gave a job to my one son.
> (8204)

Respondents were sometimes less explicit about the location of jobs obtained through the placement officer.

> He got my daughter a summer job.
> He also got my nephews summertime
> employment. (3012)

* * * * *

> I helped my oldest son find a
> job and he in turn found a
> job for his two brothers. (5049)

* * * * *

> I've helped a lot of nephews and
> nieces get jobs. I even helped
> the Deputy of Police get his
> first job. (7099)

Another common way in which the placement officer helped family members get jobs was to put them in touch with jobs through "connections" outside of their own place of work. This occurred in three-tenths of the cases.

> I was able to put them (relatives,
> friends, brother and others) in
> touch with available jobs and
> speak on their behalf. (3018)

In this example a "connection" helped ensure that the respondent's son's job application got special attention, rather than running the risk of getting filed and forgotten.

> He helped my son get a job. He
> had a lady he knew in the Steel
> Company who is in charge of the

> forms. She took over my son's
> form when he was applying for
> work. (4131)

In a similar example, the respondent said he

helped other family members find jobs in his place of

work by...

> ...speaking for them to a person
> in personnel. (7006)

Connections may also operate at a higher

level.

> He had connections. He was very
> active politically and in his
> local union so he knew a lot of
> people. He was the person others
> went to for advice and leaned on
> when they needed extra help. He
> helped his younger brother get
> jobs. (6115)

The way in which "connections" are activated in

the process of helping family members get jobs illustrates

what Granovetter calls the "strength of weak ties"

(Granovetter, 1973). Granovetter argues that weak ties

connect people who do not share contacts, either friends

or relatives, and who are likely dissimilar. Weak ties

bridge social groups and link individuals of different

groups. Weak ties are thus highly effective in the

transmission and diffusion of information or influence,

since a greater number and variety of people can be

reached via these pathways. While the ties to which I

refer are not as weak as those Granovetter discusses, they

do illustrate, in a less extreme situation, the point he

wishes to make about the usefulness of weak ties in
linking people to the larger social structure.

> ...weak ties, often denounced
> as generative of alienation...
> are here seen as indispensable
> to individuals' opportunities
> and to their integration into
> communities; strong ties, breeding
> local cohesion, lead to overall
> fragmentation (Granovetter, 1973:
> 1378).

I show below that placement officers tend to
cross generational and lineage boundaries when helping
family members. This implies that the ties between
the helper and the person helped are weaker than, for
example, those between parent and child or between two
siblings. This weaker tie enhances the possibility that
placement officers number among those in their own
social networks many people unknown to the individual in
need of help. In this sense, a "weak" tie may be more
effective than a "strong" tie in linking up individuals
who do not otherwise know one another.

Occasionally, financial help was mentioned as the
way the person helped out. For example, one respondent
said his deceased brother used to give relatives...

> ...financial help and guidance,
> when he was alive and they were
> starting out. (3056)

Another said,

> My husband loaned his nephew
> money to start a business.
> (8004)

The kinds of activities described above do not
represent unique, one-time-only activities for family
placement officers. These family specialists perform
such tasks more than once, often a number of times,
over a period of many years.

Of the respondents who said there is or used to
be a placement officer, the majority (three-fifths)
could also report the number of years the person had
held this position. The median number of years was fifteen,
with answers ranging from one to thirty-five years. This
is somewhat shorter than the length of time people were
said to occupy other family positions. This reflects
the structure of the occupational market which gives an
individual power in it for a relatively brief period of
time. It reflects as well the fact that there are propor-
tionally fewer older people in this position; the younger
a position occupant is, the shorter the potential length
of time the position can be occupied.

All the respondents in the follow-up interview
who identified this job in their family could say
how many times the person had helped in this way. Half
of the respondents said the person had helped in this way
either twice, three times, or "a few" times. One-quarter
said the person had helped this way once, and another
quarter said the person had helped this way many times.
It is clear that most respondents were not identifying this
position on the basis of just one instance of such help.

The findings that placement officers perform
their tasks more than once and do so over a span of many
years, strongly suggest that we are indeed looking at a
position in the familial division of labour, rather than
just an activity, and the identification of such a
position may be viewed as a modification of the network
theory approach to understanding occupational placement.

To sum up, three-fifths of the placement officers
got a family member a job, either by hiring them them-
selves or getting them a job in their own place of work.
Another fifth were helpful through connections outside
of their own place of work. Altogether, then, four-fifths
of those people who identified a placement officer in their
families described one or more instances of people getting
actual jobs in this way. The point I wish to stress
here is that this goes beyond the giving of guidance or
advice: this is job placement. It should also be noted
here that this kind of help, when available in a family,
was usually extended to several family members rather than
only one. The data thus indicate that this kind of assist-
ance is an available and utilized resource in a sizeable
number of contemporary families.

It is striking that despite the theoretical
importance of universalism in modern life (Parsons, 1951:
113-154), the respondents in this study were more than
willing to talk about particularism with some pride. The

family is still a locus of particularism, even when it touches on another major institution, the economy. Particularism is thus seen to be recognized by individuals, to be discussed as though it does not conflict with their values, and to be a relevant factor in behaviour and individual destiny.

Occupants of the Position of Placement Officer

Placement officers are most commonly respondents' siblings, usually brothers (Table 5.4). Self-designations, almost always by male respondents, comprise the next most common category. Children, usually sons, make up the third most common category of placement officers.

TABLE 5.4

Person Who is Named as Placement Officer

Relationship to Respondent	Sex of Placement Officer		
	Male (% of All P.O.s)	Female (% of All P.O.s)	Uncodable for Sex
Sibling, or sibling-in-law	31.6	7.5	1.2
Respondent*	25.2	3.7	
Child, or child-in law	13.9	2.5	2.5
Other	4.9	2.5	3.7
	75.6	16.2	7.4

N = 76

* Includes two husbands

The more frequent naming of a child than in the various other positions investigated is noteworthy here. These family   positions carry or imply authority, and authority is often related to age. In this position, however, being somewhat younger carries the advantage of active involvement in the work world.

The placement officer is clearly a man's job (see Table 5.4). Three-quarters of the respondents designated a male occupant of this position. An even higher proportion of follow-up interview respondents said a man was the family placement officer. This is not surprising since men are far more involved and reach higher occupational levels in the economic sphere than do women. It is reasonable to expect that family members would turn to a man for such help based on both normative and pragmatic considerations. However, it is also instructive to note Bott's description of the way in which the working class women she studied played a part in this process of help.

> ...it was usually these women who
> persuaded male relatives to help
> one another get jobs (Bott, 1957:135).

We may well imagine such behind-the-scenes activity taking place in the families of respondents in the present study. Women may, for example, be links in relaying information concerning who needs help to the person who is the placement officer. Or, they may perform a coaxing,

reminding, or persuading function. These data do not enable us to do more than speculate on such matters, but it seems worth cautioning against viewing this area as too exclusively male. That is, it is very much male territory as far as occupancy is concerned, but women may well be involved in the broader process.

The position of placement officer is more restricted by opportunity structure than any of the other positions in that a person needs either a job, job information, connections or money in order to assume this position. Interest, talent and the respect of others simply are not enough to enable people to help others get jobs. Because of these restrictions, placement officers tend to be clustered in a middle age group--having worked long enough to become somewhat established in the occupational world but not yet retired. While retirement does not entirely negate a person's ability to help in this way, it certainly is a limiting factor. This same limiting effect of retirement was seen earlier in the somewhat shorter length of time placement officers hold their positions relative to other family positions.

The relatively youthful cast of the position becomes apparent when generational level of the placement officer is analysed (Table 5.5). It will be seen throughout the analysis of diverse family positions that people tend to name position occupants who are their generational peers. In no other position investi-

gated does the middle age group name so many occupants
of a younger generation, and in no other position does
any age group name more occupants from a younger genera-
tion than from its own generational level, yet this is
the case for the oldest respondents here. Thus, while
on the whole the majority of placement officers do belong
to the respondent's generation, a far greater proportion
of them belong to a younger generation than is true for
the other positions, and far fewer belong to an older
generation.

TABLE 5.5

Generational Location of Placement Officers, by Age
of Respondent

| Age of Respondent | Generational Location of Placement Officer | | |
	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+ (N = 19)	57.1	42.8	0
55-69 (N = 26)	22.2	70.3	7.4
40-54 (N = 31)	0	93.3	6.6

Chi Square = 23.39, df = 4, Sign. = .001
Cramer's V = .39

The flow of help given by the placement officer
to other family members has two distinctive features: it

flows downward to a younger generation, and it more often flows to a recipient in the extended family than to someone in the placement officer's own lineage.

Table 5.6 shows that the great majority of help flows down to someone in a lower generation rather than to someone in the placement officer's own generation. Almost three-quarters of the codable cases involve help given from fathers to sons or nephews and uncles to sons or nephews (or occasionally, daughters or nieces).

TABLE 5.6

The Flow of Help, by Generation: Percent of Cases Involving Help to Own Generation Versus Help to Younger Generation

Help given to someone of the placement officer's generation	23.3
Help given to someone in a younger generation	76.6

N of Generation - codable cases = 30

In these data, this kind of assistance was given twice as often to someone outside the placement officer's lineage than to lineage members. This is clearly a position which crosses both generational and lineage boundaries.

Accession to the Position of Placement Officer

To elicit information on accession to this position, respondents were asked how the person named first came to

be seen as someone who could be counted on for help.
The reader will recall that earlier questions asked how
the person had helped and why this person, more than
other family members, helped out in this way. Answers
to the three questions were sometimes quite similar; that
is, some respondents tended to give the same answer for
all three questions. This may have been due to a lack
of sufficient probing on the part of the interviewer,
or perhaps the questions themselves were not worded
precisely enough. The reader may notice that some of the
verbatim quotations used in the present section echo
those in earlier sections. However, despite the limita-
tions I have acknowledged, these data do provide a sense
of the process of accession.

As discussed earlier, placement officers hold
this position because of their occupation or their
business or social connections. These qualifications
provided placement officers with the ability to help
other family members when the need arose. And, as the
quotations in this section will show, there seems to
be an underlying or taken-for-granted assumption that if
one is able to help, one will help.

In these data, two-fifths of the respondents
who identified placement officers explicitly said the
placement officer began helping in this way as a result
of a specific need for such help--that is, a specific
instance in which someone in the family needed help.

For example,

> I needed help and asked. (3088)

> * * * * *

> My son just asked him if he
> could help, that's all. (4131)

In the following example, the need arose out

of immigration.

> He was the only one in Canada
> the family could come to--when
> work was needed on coming to
> Canada. (4119)

Some respondents who said the placement officer

began helping because of a need in the family, also

said the ability to help was related to occupational

qualifications or circumstances.

> He was a superintendent and if
> you said you knew him you could
> usually get a job there. My
> brothers were needing jobs. (4099)

What is stated explicitly in the two examples

above is probably implicit in many other responses

quoted throughout this section. That is, it is a

combination of need on the part of a family member and

occupational location of the placement officer that

leads to and sustains occupancy in this position.

With this in mind, we may infer that respondents

who mentioned the placement officer's occupation or

connections (as did the majority of these respondents)

were implying that these qualifications converged with

a need for such help in the family.

He has seniority in the bank.
He was able to get them jobs
in the bank. (3012)

* * * * *

National Steel Car are always
hiring new men as they get a
new order and get busier. Dad
was superintendent of a
department. (4099)

* * * * *

Because of his position. And
he knows the people. He was a
national hero during the war.
He had the respect of many.
When you had this, anything
could happen. (3088)

Finally, it should be noted that people are
rarely said to have become placement officers due
to special talent, personality, interest, motivation,
or the giving of financial help.

In summary, placement officers assume this
position when a need for assistance arises in the family.
Occupational position--usually meaning the place of
work, but occasionally referring to a family business--
provides a particular family member with the opportun-
ity to step into the placement officer position. Many
placement officers had good social or business connections,
again providing these individuals with special opportuni-
ties to assist other family members. Tying these two
components together is a belief suggested by these
data that it is appropriate and even obligatory for
family members to help one another get ahead in the occu-

pational world. The process of accession may thus be
summed up as follows: first, there must be a need; in
a situation of such need, people feel it is appropriate
to help or be helped by family; someone with the appropriate
capability steps forward or is sought out; this process
having been successful once often becomes entrenched,
with the same helper being sought out by other family
members when the need arises.

Conclusion

The position of placement officer is not widespread.
However, it does exist as a potential task in families
and is found in one out of six families in this
sample. Where it exists, it is utilized as a resource by
family members over a period of years, above all to specif-
ically place people in jobs. This is evidence of the
persistence in many families in the contemporary world
of a traditional form of occupational placement. The
position represents, I have argued, a direct form of aid
from the older to the younger generation. The position is
one example among many in the larger context of the
various ways the parent generation equips and helps its
young enter and succeed in the world of work.

Throughout the preceding pages it has been apparent
that despite societal norms of universalism, particularism
is not uncommon when it comes to getting jobs for kin.
Running through the quotations from respondents is an

implied particularistic maxim: if you can help your family, you ought to. People speak with some pride about this kind of family help.

Alongside the two previous chapters, this investigation of the placement officer position has further supported the theoretical notion of a familial division of labour in the wider family as indicated by the existence of various positions. This particular position differs from those discussed previously in that it is instrumental, not expressive, in nature. Furthermore, placement officers bridge two institutions, family and economy, while the other positions discussed to this point involve activities within family boundaries.

Placement officers respond to real needs in the family. When the need arises, persons with the ability to help are called upon to do so. Persons who have shown themselves able and willing to help continue to be called on over a period of many years.

Finally, the analysis of this position shows once again that contemporary families help and support their members in a variety of ways. The transactions between placement officers and those they help characteristically cross generational and lineage boundaries, providing a good example of the usefulness or "strength of weak ties" (Granovetter, 1973). The placement officer responds to family members' needs and helps them to make their way in the wider society and at the same time contributes to and helps maintain the solidarity of the kinship unit.

THE FINANCIAL ADVISOR

Introduction

It seems eminently reasonable to expect that some families might have a person who specializes in the giving of financial or business advice. Although no previous research has investigated such a position in the extended family, much research on nuclear families and lineages indicates this activity is part of the general exchange of goods and services between family members.

The problem in discussing the giving of financial advice per se is that previous research has not isolated this kind of help. Some studies have included questions on the giving of "personal and business advice" while other studies have concentrated on the investigation of the giving of financial aid (see, for example, Sussman, 1959; Shanas et al., 1968: 428-9; Hill et al., 1970: 67). From the point of view of demonstrating the existence of a viable kinship network, it is unnecessary to specify the precise kind of advice. However, as background to my discussion here, these other studies tell us little more than that family members are sources of financial advice.

The task of giving financial advice may be viewed partly against the general theoretical background discussions of Parsons (1955: 34-47) and Zelditch (1955: 338-342) which would allocate the task under

discussion here to a male because of its instrumental nature and its obvious relation to experience in the world outside the family. Virtually all men, but only some women, have work experience. In addition, interest in financial matters tends to be stereotyped as a male interest.

The position of financial advisor may also be considered within the framework of the sociological literature on family power and decision-making, although studies of this sort have focused on nuclear families, and especially on the marital couple. This area of study is beset with its own conceptual and methodological shortcomings (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970; McDonald, 1980) with some arguing for an interpretation of a developing equality between the sexes (Blood and Wolfe, 1960) and others contending that male dominance is still very much the general rule (Goode, 1964:74; Gillespie, 1971; Kenkel, 1977: 469). Part of the problem, as Scanzoni has pointed out, is that most research has focused on who makes the final decision, and has ignored the decision-making process (Scanzoni, 1979). One instructive finding has been that the participation and influence of wives in economic decision-making is positively related to wife's education and exposure to the occupational world through employment (Hill et al., 1970: 211; Blood and Wolfe, 1960: 40-41).

Unlike former research, I chose to study the giving
of financial advice as an activity in its own right, and
to consider it as indicating a family position
in the sense that someone in the family might specialize
in such an activity, and be routinely sought out by
other members of the family.

To investigate this position, respondents were
asked, "Is there currently any one person among you and
any of the relatives on your side of the family who is
often turned to by other family members for advice about
money matters?" Those who answered affirmatively were
asked who the person was. Because of time limitations, resp-
ondents were not asked other detailed questions about the
nature of activities or the number of times such advice
was given, etc. Thus, the following discussion will be
limited to questions of prevalence and identification
and characteristics of those who occupy the position.

Prevalence of the Position of Financial Advisor

Close to one-fifth of the respondents in this
study said there was currently someone in their family who
is often turned to by other family members for advice
about money matters (Table 5.7).

Men and women were equally likely to perceive this
position as existing in their families. The relationship
between age and identification of this position was
significant for women (Pearson's r = -.129, Sign. =
.021) but not for men. Older women were a lot less likely

than younger women to say someone in their family is
turned to for financial advice. And the oldest women
in the sample, the group among whom financial dependency,
as well as other kinds of dependency, would be highest,
were the least likely of all respondents to say this
position existed in their family.[5]

TABLE 5.7

Percent of Respondents Who Say There Is a Financial Advisor,
by Age and Sex

				Age of Respondent					
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	21.7	15.8	18.8	17.1	28.6	12.5	20.0	14.8	20.0	18.8
Females	20.0	25.0	28.6	25.8	23.1	14.3	16.1	12.0	10.7	20.0
All	20.9	21.3	23.9	21.2	25.5	13.5	18.0	13.5	14.0	19.4
N:Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Males: Pearson's r= -.015,Sign. = .412

Females : Pearson's r= -.129,Sign. = .021

All : Pearson's r= -.076,Sign. = .050

Occupants of the Position of Financial Advisor

The great majority of financial advisors were either
respondents themselves or their siblings (Table 5.8).
Sons were named one-tenth of the time, but daughters were

never named. Parents were named close to one-tenth of the
time as well; here it is interesting that mothers were
named almost as often as fathers, although numbers are too
small to merit more than a simple recognition of this
occurrence.

TABLE 5.8

Person Who is Named as Financial Advisor

Relationship to Respondent	Sex of Financial Advisor		
	Male	Female	Uncodable for Sex
Respondent	32.5*	8.9	1.1**
Sibling or sibling-in-law	28.0	3.7	2.2
Child	10.1		
Parent or parent-in-law	5.6	3.3	
Other***	1.1	1.1	2.2
	77.3	17.0	5.5

N = 90

*   Includes 2 husbands
**   Respondent and spouse together
*** Aunt, uncle, cousin

As might be expected in a position related to
economic and instrumental tasks,there is a very strong
male cast to this position. The great majority of financial
advisors are men. In view of this, it is interesting to
note that close to one-tenth of those named as financial
advisors were women designating themselves; like men,

women feel the position of financial advisor is a male
sphere, but appear to make something of an exception of
themselves. This may be because these women are exceptional,
compared to the female sample in the study. They are some-
what less likely to be currently married and far more
likely to be employed. While only two-fifths of the women
under age seventy in the sample were employed, virtually
all the women who designated themselves financial advisors
were working either full-time or part-time, and the one
woman who was over age seventy had been employed full-
time prior to her retirement. Experience in the occupa-
tional world appears to help women feel they fill this
position. This mirrors other research which found
occupational experience was a predictor of wives' part-
icipation in economic decision-making (Hill et al., 1970:
211; Blood and Wolfe, 1960: 40-41)

For women, the likelihood of occupying the position
of financial advisor decreases with age (Pearson's r. =
-.129, Sign. = .021); this may be seen in the pattern of
those who designate themselves, the only group of financial
advisors for whom precise age data are available (Table 5.9).
The reason for this decline may relate to the greater
numbers of women in younger age groups who are employed (Appendix
C, Table C.8) or may represent a carry over from the
women's movement for these women in early middle age.
Certainly, the male pattern presents an interesting
contrast; here, although there is a definite drop in self-

designations around retirement, soon after this self-
designations return to their former levels. It appears
that men, once they have gained enough experience to
be financial advisors, are able to continue in this
position even after occupational involvement ceases.

TABLE 5.9

Percent of Respondents Who Designate Themselves as Financial
Advisor, by Age and Sex

Age of Respondent

	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	8.7	10.5	9.4	14.3	19.0	6.3	13.3	14.8	6.7	11.9
Females	10.0	7.1	2.9	3.2	3.8	4.8	3.2	0	0	3.7
All	9.3	8.5	6.0	9.1	10.6	5.4	8.2	7.7	2.3	7.6
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	214
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Males : Pearson's r = .021, Sign. = .377

Females: Pearson's r = -.121, Sign. = .028

All: Pearson's r = -.039, Sign. = .198

Sex: Pearson's r = .156, Sign. - .000

Self-designations in the financial advisor position
were more common among better educated respondents (Pearson's
r=.099, Sign.=.015), and among respondents at higher occup-
ational levels (Pearson's r =.089, Sign.=.052). In addition,
respondents who designated themselves as occupants of this

position were more likely than other respondents to
have helped out their parents in a time of financial
crisis during the past ten years (Pearson's r = .072,
Sign. = .058).

The great majority of financial advisors, three-
quarters or more, come from the respondents' own
generation (Table 5.10). This is highest for the middle
age group, no doubt because these are the years when men
reach their highest levels of influence and achievement
in economic life.

TABLE 5.10

Generational Location of Financial Advisor by Age of
Respondent

Age of Respondent	Generational Location of Financial Advisor		
	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+ (n = 24)	26.0	73.9	0
55-69 (n = 31)	12.9	80.6	6.4
40-54 (n = 35)	0	77.1	22.8

Chi Square=15.79, df=4, Sign.=.01   Cramer's V=.30

The other strong tendency revealed by Table 5.10
is that when people do not get financial advice from a
generational peer, younger persons consult someone in an
older generation, and older persons turn to advisors in a
younger generation. It is interesting that, for the
sample as a whole, there is a stronger tendency to consult
someone in a younger generation than in an older generation.

This indicates that, despite the financial wisdom and authority that accrue with age, younger people might have an advantage of being more educated and more in touch with the modern marketplace.

Conclusion

In summary, close to one in five families in this study have a person to whom other family members turn for financial advice. This finding extends earlier research which did not separate financial advice from other types of advice given and received from family members. As women grow older they show a decreasing tendency to perceive this position as existing in their family, whereas age is not significant in the perception of the position by male respondents. Paralleling these findings, when self-designations are used to indicate the age of the occupants of this position, it appears that older women are much less likely than younger women to be financial advisors while age does not seem to handicap men at all, except right around retirement. Of course, on the whole, this position is masculine territory, conforming to theoretically informed expectations about male and female roles in the family. Finally, the predominance of siblings (who comprise one-third of the financial officers named) underscores once again what has been emerging with ever-greater strength since Chapter Three: siblings are a very important part of respondents' effective kinship networks.

THE AMBASSADOR

Introduction

Kinship networks may be thought of as systems
in which a number of sub-systems or lineages interlock
with one another to form extended kin networks. This
view gives rise to several questions. How do these
lineages manage to keep in touch and maintain a sense
of being one family over time? How is membership in
this broader group declared and sustained? Is there
a family position which is especially concerned with
maintaining relationships between the lineage and the
broader kin network?[6]

One way to explore these concerns is to examine
ritual events such as rites of passage at which the
larger kin body gathers to see who, if anyone, in the
respondent's more immediate family, represents that
family to the larger kin group. I theorized that such
a person could be thought to occupy an important family
position, and to make a significant contribution to
the overall continuity and solidarity of the wider family.

Much of the content of this dissertation may be
thought of as embodying the problem of death and the
potential threat death poses to family continuity, not
only because it disrupts lineages but also because it
destroys linkages to the larger kin group. Because of the

intimate connection between death and the problem of continuity, I hypothesized that there would exist a family position consisting of being responsible for re-affirming and strengthening the ties between the lineage or modified extended family and the wider kin group whenever these linkages were threatened or broken through the death of a family member.

Solidarity, cohesion and continuity, whether the group is a society, an extended family, or a nuclear family, are always problematic to some extent. They must be achieved, affirmed, and reaffirmed, over and over again. Crises such as death present grave threats to solidarity and continuity (Marshall, 1980: 30-37), but at the same time carry opportunities for preserving and strengthening the group. I will expand on this theme below, looking first at the nature of ritual, then at the ways in which death threatens group continuity, and how ritual, specifically the ritual occasion of the funeral, helps meet and overcome this threat. Then I will discuss the particular role of the ambassador in overcoming the disruptive effect of death.

Ritual assists in both the dramatization and achievement of continuity and solidarity. Through ritual, life's events, both large and small, become endowed with meaning, for both the individual and the group. Shared meanings strengthen group solidarity. Myerhoff provides

a description of ritual which captures these qualities.

> Rituals may be likened to a vessel
> into which anything may be poured:
> an order-endowing device, it gives
> shape to its contents. This order-
> ing function is furthered by the
> morphological characteristics of a
> ritual--precision, accuracy, predict-
> ability, formality, and repetition.
> Thus the characteristics of ritual
> as a medium suggest that its contents
> --whatever they may be--are enduring
> and orderly. By virtue of these
> traits, ritual always delivers a
> message about continuity, in addition
> to its other symbolic messages
> (Myerhoff, 1978: 86).

Myerhoff says, "It is in their very nature for rituals to establish continuity", and goes on to describe how a graduation ritual in the Senior Center in her study provided a sense of both individual or personal continuity and a sense of collective and historical continuity (Myerhoff, 1978: 108). It is easy to argue, I think, that funerals achieve the identical ends.

Of course, ritual in general, and family ritual in particular, are not confined to religious worship or occasions related to religious events or to holidays or rites of passage (Bossard and Boll, 1950: 18). However, my concern here with family continuity justifies looking at the ritual surrounding that event which is the most threatening to continuity--death itself.

Anthropologists have long been cognizant of the impact of death on the social group. Malinowski describes the effect not just as loss but as mutilation.

> The death of a man or women
> in a primitive group, consist-
> ing of a limited number of indiv-
> iduals, is an event of no mean
> importance...A small community
> bereft of a member, especially if
> he be important, is severely
> mutilated. (Malinowski, 1948: 34)

At the level of the family, this "mutilation"
may be felt most keenly, for families also consist of
a limited number of individuals. The death of a family
member may create a ragged tear in the social fabric of
the group, a tear which can only be mended by the efforts
of group members. Funeral ceremonies and the social
interaction to which funerals give rise begin this process.
Symbolically they are important as occasions for members
to reaffirm membership in what is for many relatives an
ambiguous and optional kin group (Ayoub, 1966). Funeral
rites serve to redefine the status of the newly deceased
person, and thus to separate the living from the dead.

> Funeral ceremonies are the final
> and most dramatic rite of passage
> in the life cycle: the public
> statements of the separation of
> the dead from this world, and of
> the bereaved from the dead, and
> finally of the aggregation of the
> ghost of the deceased to the com-
> munity of the dead and the bereaved
> to the community of the living
> (Goody, 1962: 28).

Funeral rites, like all rituals, serve an important
social purpose, in that they help maintain social stab-
ility and solidarity through the expression of group
sentiments (Durkheim, 1961: 475). Despite prayers and

activities seemingly engaged in for benefit of the
deceased, we may well agree that "the funeral ritual
serves the living more than it serves the dead" (Marshall,
1980: 31).

Bengtson takes these scholarly insights and places
them in a more personal and contemporary context. Bengtson
talks about funerals not only as ceremonies but as broader
social occasions:

> Funerals, in my experience, are
> occasions for people who perhaps
> have gotten together relatively
> infrequently within the last few
> years to come together, not only
> to mourn the loss of the departed,
> but also to knit up the shredded
> fabric of disrupted families that
> death has caused. Wakes in Irish
> and Mexican families are the
> occasions for family members to
> tell stories about the departed.
> The same is true in Swedish fam-
> ilies (Bengtson, 1979: 54).

The institution of the "shiva" in Jewish tradition
provides the same opportunity for reaffirming family
continuity and solidarity. For several days following
the funeral, the immediate family receives relatives and
friends at the home of the deceased or another close
family member. A major focus of conversation is the
deceased. This is a time for reminiscence--memories,
incidents, dreams fulfilled and hopes that died, all these
are told and retold throughout this period. Much talk
concerns the dead person's character; a picture is
painted through words of the kind of person who has been

lost. It seems clear that what actually transpires is
that a new person is in fact created, a new reality is
constructed, a new identity emerges. What is created
through this social endeavour is the identity of the
deceased as he or she shall be remembered. The process
is that of the social construction of reality through
conversation (Berger and Kellner, 1964). It seems that
reminiscence, a process seen as common and important in
individual aging (Butler, 1963; Marshall, 1980: 109-
121) may also be seen to be a useful endeavour among
mourners and their relatives and friends.

In the previous pages, I have been attempting to
build a picture of the importance of ritual in achieving
solidarity, and of the special importance of funerals in
achieving family solidarity and continuity in the face
of the most disruptive of all events, the death of a
family member.

In our society, funerals stand out from other rites
of passage in that they are more open to attendance by
distant kin and are less optional in character. Rites
of passage in the contemporary world are often occasions
for family gatherings, such as a ceremony and party in
honour of a graduation. Marriages provide occasions for
extensive gatherings in many families. Religious confirma-
tions, or the Bar Mitzvah ceremony in the Jewish religion,
may also provide reason for family to gather. However,
these rites of passage, both in ceremony and celebration,

differ from the funeral/death rites in contemporary society
with respect to the extent to which they are treated as
optional or compulsory and the degree to which they are
open to the community or closed and private.

Looking first at the optional/compulsory distinction,
I wish to make the point that in general we treat the
question of whether or not to hold a funeral and the form
it shall take as less open to individual choice than
observation of other rites of passage. People do not always
attend their own graduation ceremonies, and certainly a
party is not compulsory. Likewise, people do not always
observe their religious customs to the letter. When it
comes to marrying, some people choose a church wedding with
all the trimmings. Others, however, may marry at home
with just immediate family present, or may have a civil
ceremony, or may even have a small ceremony in a country
meadow. The style and location of the ceremony, and the
type of celebration that follows, are open to choice.
Whether or not the majority of people follow traditional
patterns is irrelevant to this discussion; the point is
that a fair degree of choice does exist as to whether or
not to follow traditional forms at all, and if so to what
degree these forms shall be observed. In sharp contrast
is the non-optional nature of funeral rites. While this
is more a matter of degree than a sharp dichotomy, and
while I say this on the basis of impression rather than
empirical research, I assert with some confidence that

most families feel committed to bury their dead with some
dignity and ceremony.

A second major difference between funerals and other
ritual occasions connected with rites of passage is that
these latter events are not strictly "open" to all who
might wish to attend. It is customary to issue invitations.
People, be they relatives or friends, cannot simply take
it on themselves to attend a wedding dinner, though it is
true they might attend the ceremony without a specific
invitation. However, to do so would likely engender
discomfort and even antagonism in the family, rather than
building solidarity. How different this is from the
funeral situation. Here, people take it on themselves
to attend and to pay their respects at whatever other
occasion the particular mourning customs provide for. The
individual decides to declare closeness, in effect, by
being present at the event. And these declarations are
usually much appreciated by the bereaved; it is common
to hear immediate family of the deceased discussing with
one another some time after the funeral who they noticed
at the funeral, who came to the funeral home, and how
thoughtful it was of them to come.

Funerals, then, differ from other rites of passage
in the nature of the opportunities they provide for
family representation, in that attendance is not by
invitation, or in any way "closed", but rather is open to
all who feel moved to attend. They differ also in that

they are less socially optional in contemporary society.
Most familes undertake a formal ceremony of some sort to
send off their dead.

One final clarification remains to be made.
This study did not investigate how funerals affect close
relatives of the deceased. Rather, funerals were viewed
as an important opportunity for more distant kin to draw
together. For this reason, respondents were asked whether any
one person had this specialized role of customarily
representing the respondent's family at funerals of more
distant relatives or of old family friends. In either
case there are two sides to the ambassador's role. On
the one hand, the ambassador expresses and reaffirms ties
between the smaller family he or she represents and the
family unit or friendship unit surrounding the deceased.
At the same time, the ambassador represents the unity,
interest and worth of his or her own family group.

In summary, funerals represent particularly
critical events in the continuity of groups and relation-
ships. This is true whether the deceased has been a
close or distant relative or a friend of the family.
Some ties have been broken by death and other ties between
the survivors need to be reaffirmed and strengthened.
Funerals thus present unique opportunities for someone
in the family to assume the task of contributing to
this family solidarity by being an ambassador to the
larger kin group or the social group surrounding a

deceased family friend.

Because of the central importance of death in
the larger problem of family continuity, and because
of the role of funerals in providing opportunities for
the establishment and maintenance of family continuity,
I hypothesized that a specialized position consisting
of action and responsibility in this area would exist in
many families and would represent an important
position in the family. To investigate this position
which I have called the "ambassador", the following
question was asked of respondents:

> Is there any one person among
> you and your side of the family
> who, more than others, makes a
> point of making sure that the
> family is represented at things
> like the funerals of more distant
> relatives or old family friends?

Although the phrasing of the question did not
entirely limit respondents to funerals, I make the
assumption that in most instances respondents did indeed
answer in terms of persons who attend funerals rather
than other ritual events. However, most of my discussion
in this chapter is generalizable to ritual events beyond
those surrounding death.

Those who said someone held this position in the
family were then asked who that person was. Since
respondents were questioned only about the existence and
occupant of the position, the following analysis focuses

on prevalence, identification, and occupants' characteristics. No data were gathered on the nature of activities, reason for doing the task, or aspects of accession and succession. Thus, the following discussion is somewhat limited, though still illuminating.

Prevalence of the Position of Ambassador

The position of ambassador is a common one in families; in fact, next to the position of kinkeeper, this position was the most frequently identified of those studied. Over four out of every ten families in this sample had someone who acted as ambassador. In my view, this a surprisingly high proportion, more surprising somehow than the prevalence of the kinkeeper position. It must be remembered that this position is more exclusively concerned with extended kin than was the kinkeeper position, and is more bound up with ritual and less with mundane activities. Because of the prevalence of the ambassador position, it may be inferred that funerals continue to play an important role in continuity of the larger kinship group.

Men and women are equally likely to perceive the existence of this position in their families. Differences in identification between the sexes were not found to be statistically significant.

However, differences between men and women do appear when the sexes are examined separately by age groups (Table 5.11). Overall, there is no significant decline in

identification of this position with age for male respondents, but a decline does occur for female respondents (Pearson's r = -.176, Sign. = .009). The major difference is that women in their younger years have consistently high levels of identification, while men have low points in both early, middle, and later periods of the adult life course.

TABLE 5.11

Percent of Respondents Who Say There Is an Ambassador, by Age and Sex

| | Age of Respondent | | | | | | | | | |
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	43.5	31.6	59.4	34.3	28.0	31.3	56.7	33.3	33.3	40.8
Females	45.0	57.1	48.6	67.7	38.5	38.1	51.6	20.0	28.6	44.9
All	44.2	46.8	53.7	50.0	34.0	35.1	54.1	26.9	30.2	43.0
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Males: Pearson's r = .035, Sign. = .301

Females: Pearson's r = -.176, Sign. = .002

All : Pearson's r = -.109, Sign. = .009

For men, identification of this position was
related to education and having proximate kin. Men
with higher education and a parent, adult child and
sibling living close by were more likely to say they
belonged to a family with an ambassador (education: Pearson's
r=.156,Sign.=.017; AVAIL: Pearson's r=.182, Sign.=.007).
Married women, with higher family incomes (Pearson's r =
.183, Sign. = .004) and with older living generations
in the lineage (Pearson's r = .114, Sign. = .046) were
more likely to belong to families which had ambassadors. [7]

Occupants of the Position. of Ambassador

Table 5.12 displays data on the ambassador's
relationship to the respondent. Almost half of the
ambassadors are respondents' siblings, with sisters being
more commonly named than brothers. Here again, as seen
so often elsewhere in my analysis of family positions,
siblings are perceived to perform key roles in main-
taining family continuity. Respondents themselves comprise
close to three-tenths of those named. The remainder is
rather evenly split between the three categories of
parents, children and other extended family members.
It is noteworthy that mothers were named far more often
than fathers, well beyond the proportion of living
mothers to living fathers of respondents in the sample
(see Appendix C, Table C.6).

TABLE 5.12

<u>Person Who is Named as Ambassador</u>

Relationship to Respondent	Sex of Ambassador		
	Male	Female	Uncodable for Sex
Sibling or sibling-in-law	19.7	26.6	.9
Respondent*	12.8	14.2	.4
Parent	.9	6.8	
Child	2.9	4.4	
Other**	1.9	4.9	2.9
	38.2	56.9	4.2

N = 203

* Includes one case where both respondent and spouse named

** Includes aunts, uncles, cousins, nieces, nephews

Analysis of the <u>sex</u> of position occupants revealed that this is a female-dominated position; close to three out of five ambassadors are women. This is perhaps surprising for despite the expressive nature of the activity involved, and the accompanying expectation that females will more commonly fill the position, in my impression there is something "masculine" about funerals. Perhaps this is related to the custom of having male pall bearers, and to the fact that men in the family usually look after funeral arrangements. In truth, I do not believe the anthropological literature would support a view of funeral rites as more a male than a female domain. For

example, among the LoDagaa of West Africa, members of
both sexes seem to participate in the burial (Goody,
1962: 129-155).

I note here and discuss more fully below that when
self-designations are analysed, older male respondents
designated themselves more frequently than older females,
whereas the situation is reversed in respondents under
the age of seventy (Table 5.13). This suggests that one
reason for female dominance in the position may be
related to availability. Men who are actively involved
in the workplace are less free to attend funerals, and
when these funerals are for fairly distant relatives or
friends, the demands of the job may well take priority
over an inclination to attend the funeral of such a
person.

TABLE 5.13

Percent Self-Designations in Ambassador Position, by
Age and Sex

| | Age of Respondent |
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	4.3	10.5	12.5	8.6	14.3	12.5	23.3	11.1	6.7	11.9
Females	5.0	14.3	14.3	16.1	23.1	14.3	9.7	4.0	3.6	11.8
All	4.7	12.8	13.4	12.1	19.1	13.5	16.4	7.7	4.7	12.0
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Males: Pearson's r = -.067, Sign. = .161

Females: Pearson's r = -.078, Sign. = .111

All: Pearson's r = -.010, Sign. = .411

One method of ascertaining the <u>age</u> of ambassadors
is to use those cases which involve self-designations in
the position (Table 5.13). On the whole, based on self-
designations, ambassadors tend to be in the 60 to 74 age
range. This makes some sense, since these people are
themselves experiencing losses through death of friends,
spouses and siblings and are perhaps more sensitive to
the disruption and emotional trauma death brings. However,
there are differences between the sexes. Younger women,
up until age 65, are more likely than men to designate
themselves. Women from 45 to 70 are most likely of
their sex to be ambassadors, and this peaks in the 60 to
64 age group. Here again, then, women in middle age,
but especially in late middle age, appear to be heavily
burdened with family responsibilities.

Another important feature of these data on self-
designations is the dramatic decline in self-designations
by women from age 70 on. This points to a perceived lack
of involvement or importance in the wider family by these
elderly women. This echoes to some extent the finding
of Matthews that, despite objective findings of other
studies which point to involvement of older people in
the extended family, the quality of relationships between
the old women she studied and their children and children-
in-law showed the old mother lacked a viable position in
the family (Matthews, 1979: 113).

Describing old mothers' involvement in family gatherings,
she says, "Old women are merely expected to 'be' rather
than to participate" (Matthews, 1979: 119). Matthews
was analysing emotionally charged lineage relationships,
whereas the ambassador position involves contact with the
broader extended family. However, it is possible that these
same feelings of loss of power, damaged identity and the
expectation of passive rather than active involvement in
family events may extend to the broader family context
as well.

In this position, as in the others studied, people
of all ages show a strong tendency to name someone from
their own generation as the position occupant. Thus,
in the younger and older age groups, three-quarters of the
respondents name a generational peer as ambassador, but
in the middle age group fully nine of out ten do so
(Table 5.14). The other strong pattern is for a fair
minority (one-quarter) of older respondents to say someone
in a younger generation occupies the position, and for
respondents in the younger age group to say someone in
an older generation does so. Inevitably, these figures
imply, spurred on by the inescapable demographics of aging,
declining health and death, generational succession occurs.

TABLE 5.14

Generational Location of Ambassador by Age of Respondent

Age of Respondent	Generational Location of Ambassador		
	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+ (N = 59)	26.2	73.0	0
55-69 (N = 61)	4.8	90.3	4.8
40-54 (N = 76)	0	76.9	23.0

N = 196   Chi Square= 48.75, df=4, Sign.=.001

Uncodable for generation: 3   Cramer's V=.36

One feature of the data that is a bit surprising is that the percentage of respondents age 70 and over naming someone in their own generation is not higher than it is. I expected that this position, having to do as it does with death, might be one that elderly family members would fill. While it is true that there are simply fewer family members of this generation available than is the case for respondents in the younger and middle age groups, it was seen in Chapters Three and Four that a somewhat larger proportion of people 70+ named a same-generation occupant in the kinkeeper and comforter positions. Perhaps the ambassador position is

somewhat more difficult for elderly people to fill than
these others, requiring as it does that a person be
vigorous enough to travel about and have access to
transportation. At any rate, the data show that the
ambassador position is not characterized by any special
affinity for elderly occupants.

Conclusion

In discussing the ambassador position, I have argued
that this position represents an important contribution
to family solidarity and continuity. It is distinguished
from other positions discussed in the dissertation by
its direct connection with death, and its explicit linkage
with the broader extended family. This position was
shown to be a widespread social reality, existing in some-
thing close to one out of two families in this study.
Ambassadors tend to be women of middle age, pointing once
again to the caught generation phenomenon. Further support
was found for the pattern of perceiving family involvement
as vested in one's own generation.

The discussion of the ambassador position provides
an understanding of one of the ways in which families
seek to overcome the threats to their continuity, fill in
the vague edges of their membership boundaries, reaffirm
their solidarity and their reality as a social group and
achieve continuity through time despite a continual
change in membership.

OTHER POSITIONS

In this study, constraints of time and money
dictated that only a few positions in the familial
division of labour could be investigated directly. While
I have indicated that the positions that were studied were
chosen for reasons of theoretical importance, they
represent only a select few of a larger number of such
positions that might be hypothesized to exist in
contemporary families.

Some of these other postions were mentioned or
implied by respondents during the interview. It is
worthwhile noting these for the richness that they may
add to the overall content of the dissertation. Of course,
no assertions as to   prevalence or occupancy are
possible. I simply wish to include these examples as
illustrative of the variety of positions in the familial
division of labour.

I noted in Chapter Three that some of the descrip-
tions of kinkeeping activities suggested a few additional
positions. One was the family genealogist (the person
who comiles a family tree and keeps it up-to-date). This
activity is a concrete manifestation of the desire to
perpetuate the family, to pass on its history, and to
provide for its members a location in social and historical
time. A family tree makes clear to family members the
fundamental way in which they are bound together.

A related activity or position is the family

historian or story-teller. In this position, one person
more than others in the family knows a great deal about
family anecdotes and historical details about the family,
and recounts these to other members, especially, we might
imagine, to children.

One position that was mentioned, and that had
emerged previously in the description of kinkeeping
activities, was that of family mediator or conciliator.
This position is interesting as it points to disharmony
and makes clear that family harmony is precarious and must
be worked at by members. Examples of this position follow.

> I try to sort out differences between
> my mother and her sister. (4094)

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

> They come to me with their problems and
> I try to be the peacemaker. (4149)

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

> I try and keep everyone happy
> and get them to not let anything
> happen. When somebody gets upset
> I tell them to just wait and try
> and get over it. (8015)

Respondents talked quite often about keeping the
link with the old country and relatives there, or with the
hometown elsewhere in Canada.[8]

> I try to visit England every once
> in a while. I have offered to
> pay others to come for a visit,
> even live here, but they refused.
> (4001)

<p align="center">* * * * *</p>

        I invited my mother over here.
        I sent my daughter over to
        Yugoslavia to visit them. (4108)

                    * * * * *

        At least once a year I try to
        visit the Ottawa Valley and call
        on everyone in my family--all
        my cousins who are left. (7092)

The above examples, although they refer only to

other ways respondents felt they contributed to family

continuity, suggest that this activity of keeping the

ties with relatives in the country of origin is con-

sidered important. This implies the possibility that there

may be one person in the family, who, more than others,

assumes responsibility for this activity.

Another possible position in the family is that

which might be called the funeral director. This is

different from the ambassador position in that this is

a more instrumental task involving looking after funeral

arrangements. For example, one respondent said,

        I arranged funerals for other
        family members and was executor
        of my aunt's estate. Previously
        my Dad did this. When he died,
        I did it. (5133)

Not only did the respondent in the above example

describe the position, but he also gave information

on succession of the position.

Before the interview schedule was shortened,

a question had been included concerning the position of

visitor to the sick--a person in the family who made a

point of visiting relatives who were sick or in the
hospital. No respondent mentioned this activity
specifically, although some did refer to activities
related to illness in the family.

> I phone if I know they are ill
> or had an operation. (4109)

> * * * * *

> If I knew someone in the family
> was ill, I would let others
> know. (5060)

Another question which was dropped from the
shortened interview schedule concerned the existence
of someone in the family on whom other family members
could always depend for help. Some of the respondents
indicated such a position did exist in their families.

> I am always there whenever I
> am needed. (4007)

> * * * * *

> I do anything I can for my
> mother. (3005)

Finally, it may well be that in Canada, especially
in large urban centers, a common position might be that
of immigration sponsor. The high number of respondents
who had emigrated to Canada has already been noted
(see Footnote 9). It could be hypothesized, then,
that many families might have a person who, more than
others in the family, had taken an active role in
sponsoring the immigration of family members to come to
Canada from the family's country of origin. For example,
one respondent said her sister had occupied this position.

> Maria was the first of our
> family in the U.S.A. After,
> she helped each of us to come
> to Canada or the U.S.A. (3121)

These, then, were a few more possibilities among a larger group of positions that were not investigated directly but that might be expected to exist in many families.

In summary, three positions in the familial division of labour have been explored and analysed in this chapter. Two, the financial advisor and the placement officer, have involved instrumental tasks associated with economic affairs. The third, the ambassador, represented leadership in the ritual sphere of family life, and was primarily an expressive activity. As might have been expected in tasks to do with the family, the position involving expressive activity was far more widespread than the other two positions which mediated between the familial and economic institutions. However, aside from comparisons of prevalence, the findings in this chapter round out our sense of the variety and importance of such positions . in the modern family, and the ways in which these contribute to the maintenance of the family as generation follows generation.

A detailed comparison of the five major positions I have discussed so far follows in the next chapter.

FOOTNOTES

1   For the placement officer position, in addition to the two questions asked in the initial interview, a number of additional questions were asked of the one-fourth of respondents who were interviewed a second time as a follow-up. This yielded a rich body of data for this position. Countering this, however, was the problem of numbers: only a small proportion of the follow-up respondents said they had a placement officer in their family and provided information on the various aspects of the position. Given the suggestive rather than conclusive nature of these data, then, it seemed wiser to treat this position in a combined chapter format, rather than placing it in a chapter of its own.

2   Several additional variables were investigated with respect to identification of the placement officer position. For men, identification was related to proximity and availability of kin (Proxkin: Pearson's r = .183, Sign. = .006. Avail: Pearson's r = .225, Sign. = .001), having at least one child (Pearson's r = .118, Sign. = .005), the number of living children (Pearson's r = .181, Sign. = .007), the total number of generations in the lineage (Pearson's r = .187, Sign. = .005) and the number of generations above the respondent in the lineage (Pearson's r = .163, Sign. = .013). Marital status, the number of generations below the respondent, retirement status, income and occupation were not significant for men. Like men, women identified this position more often when they had available kin (Avail: Pearson's r = .113, Sign. = .048), at least one child (Pearson's r = .139, Sign. = .020), a multi-generational lineage (Ngen: Pearson's r = .150, Sign. = .013), and generations older than themselves in the lineage (Pearson's r = .121, Sign. = .035). In addition, marital status (Pearson's r = .149, Sign. = .014) and education (Pearson's r = -.143, Sign. = .017) were important for women. Having a large pool of proximate kin, or a large number of living children were not important for women. As with men, significant relationships were not found for for either retirement status, income or occupation.

3   Nepotism may be more pronounced at Stelco than in other places of employment, and this one company's dominance in the city may bias these data. Thus, it is possible that the placement officer may be a less important position in other cities. However, previous

studies cited in the introduction to my discussion
of this position lend support to the view that the position
is, in fact, found in a variety of occupational situations.

4   Respondents often referred to "Stelco", an abbrev-
iated form of the full name,"Steel Company of Canada".

5   A number of variables in addition to age and sex
were investigated to determine their relationship to
identification of the financial advisor position. These
were: length of residence in Canada, marital status,
availability of proximate kin, having at least one living
child, number of children, total number of generations
in the lineage as well as number of generations above and
below the respondent, retirement status, education,
income, and occupation. For men, lineage size was
important (NGEN: Pearson's r = .171, Sign. = .010.
NGEN 2: Pearson's r = .154, Sign. = .018. At least one
child: Pearson's r = .145, Sign. = .025). For women, age
(Pearson's r =-.128, Sign. = .029) and income (Pearson's
r = .168, Sign. = .008) were important.

6   The problem of terminology, to which I referred
in the conclusion of Chapter Three, arises here. The kin
group I wish to designate here is the lineage plus the
respondent's siblings. My investigation in this section
concerns one way in which this group maintains relations
with the wider extended family.

7   As with the other positions, for this position
a number of variables were investigated: age, sex, marital
status, availability of proximate kin, having at least one
living child, number of children, generational composition
of the lineage, retirement status, education, income and
occupation. For men, the important variables were having
proximate kin (Pearson's r = .182, Sign. = .007) and
education (Pearson's r = .156, Sign. = .017). For women,
age (Pearson's r = -.175, Sign. = .005), the number of
generations above the respondent in the lineage (Pearson's
r = .114, Sign. =.046) and income (Pearson's r = .183,
Sign. = .004) were important.

8   The potential importance of immigration in the
family lives of these respondents is underlined by the
fact that, in our sample, 41.3% of the respondents had
been born outside Canada. Among respondents 70 years
and over, the figure was higher; of this group, 49.6% had
been born outside Canada. This figure is very close to
Nicholas Zay's estimate that 54% of Toronto's population
aged 65 and over was born outside Canada (Zay, 1978).

CHAPTER SIX

THE FAMILIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

INTRODUCTION

The analysis and discussion in the preceding
three chapters focused on different positions in families.
These positions involve specific kinds of activities and
responsibilities and comprise a familial division of
labour. In this chapter, I turn from a concern with
individual positions to an examination of the relation-
ship between the positions, in order to gain a more
comprehensive understanding of the familial division
of labour. I begin with questions of prevalence. Next
I turn to issues related to the clustering of positions
and of position occupancy. Following this, I look at
the identification of these positions to see how this
identification varies according to various respondent
characteristics.

In earlier chapters, the analysis of the individual
positions demonstrated that these positions do indeed
exist. In this chapter, however, I wish to achieve an
overall sense of just how common or uncommon it is
for families to have a division of labour of the sort
investigated in this dissertation. Therefore, I begin
the chapter with an investigation of the prevalence of
each position, and of how the positions compare with one
another in this respect.

The analyses in earlier chapters dealt with each

212

position individually. One question which could not be
addressed in earlier chapters, and which is of key
interest here, is the concentration of positions as it
relates to prevalence. That is, I have not addressed
the possibility until now that some respondents may
identify many positions while other respondents identify
none of the positions, thereby creating a false impression
of how widespread the existence of such positions really
is. To overcome this problem, I analyse the data to see
how many families have at least one position, how many
have two, how many have three, and so on. This analysis
shows that these positions are even more widespread than
previous chapters indicated. Three-quarters of the
families in this study had at least one position and
half had two or more.

From prevalence, I move to a concern with clustering.
First of all, I investigate how these positions cluster
according to the type of position. When two or more
positions are identified in families, I wish to determine
whether there are certain characteristic combinations
of positions. Analysis shows that the kinkeeper and
ambassador positions tend to occur together in families,
as do the comforter and financial advisor positions.

Next I turn to questions to do with the clustering
of position occupancy, to see how many people are
involved in the division of labour. I analyse the data
to see whether position occupancy tends to center on one

individual in families or whether occupancy of these
positions tends to be spread out and held by a variety
of family members. In other words, when a family has
more than one position, does the same person tend to
do the different tasks, or are tasks shared by a
number of family members? Analysis shows that families
usually have two people, or less commonly three people,
sharing the work in the familial division of labour.

The next problem is to explore the relationship
between the clustering of positions and the clustering of
occupancy in individuals. The data suggest that position
pairs that tend to be occupied by the same person are
comforter and financial advisor, comforter and kinkeeper,
and financial advisor and placement officer. Position
pairs which are rarely occupied by the same person are
kinkeeper and financial advisor, kinkeeper and placement
officer, comforter and ambassador and financial advisor
and ambassador.

The tendency to name occupants who are members
of the respondent's own generation is explored in more
detail in this chapter. Of all the positions investigated,
this same-generation trend is strongest for the positions
of kinkeeper and comforter. Implications of this are
discussed. In addition, I analyse the "intergenerational
mix" in the familial division of labour, and note that
families with greater numbers of positions tend to have
greater generational diversity in position occupancy.

Finally, I analyse factors which affect respondents'
identification of these family positions. It is striking
that men and women identify these positions in about
equal numbers. However, the factors which are related to
position identification are different for men and women.
For men, age, having proximate kin, and having a multi-
generational lineage are important, while for women,
age, marital status, husband's retirement status and
number of siblings are important. Changes with age
follow very similar patterns for men and women who are
at the same family life stage, strongly suggesting that
events in the family life course influence people's
perceptions of the familial division of labour.
PREVALENCE

How prevalent is each of the five positions in the
families to which the study's respondents belong? In
Chapter Two, I gave a brief summary of the number of
respondents who identified each of the five major positions
investigated as existing currently in their families.
(see Table 2.1).

I pointed out that the position identified most
frequently by respondents was that of kinkeeper; half
the respondents said there was someone in their family
who did this task. The next most frequently identified
position was that of ambassador, a position which was
said to exist in the families of two-fifths of the
respondents. The comforter was almost as common as the

ambassador, being identified close to two-fifths of the
time. The financial advisor was next, followed by the
placement officer; both of these positions were quite
uncommon, being identified less than one-fifth of the
time.

Frequency, as discussed above, is one aspect of
prevalence. Another is concentration: do some families
have several positions while others have none?

When data on prevalence of all positions are
considered together, the existence of these positions
in families is far more prevalent than my earlier
analyses of individual positions indicated. When all data
are examined to see how many families are said to have
at least one of the positions, we find that one or more
positions exist in three out of every four families
in this study (see Table 6.1).

TABLE 6.1

The Prevalence And Concentration of These Five Positions
in Families

Number of Positions	% of Respondents Identifying This Number of Positions in Their Families	N	Cumulative %
5	2.8	13	2.8
4	7.3	34	10.1
3	17.6	82	27.7
2	23.4	109	51.1
1	24.1	112	75.2
0	24.8		100.0

N = 463

Missing Observations = 1

This is clearly an important social pheno-
menon. Furthermore, one out of every two respondents
identified two or more of these positions as currently
existing in their families; again, this is strikingly
common. One-quarter of the families represented by the
respondents were said to have three or more positions.
One-tenth of the families had very high divisions of
labour, with four or five positions identified, and,
at the other end of the spectrum, close to one-quarter
of the families had no positions identified.

There are, then, four distinct types of families,
each representing roughly one-quarter of the sample.
There are those families with a high concentration of
positions--three or more. There is a second type with
a moderate concentration--two positions. The third
type has a low concentration, having only one position.
And the fourth type has no positions at all.

The Clustering of Positions and Position Occupancy

The next question of interest is whether or
not there is a characteristic clustering of these five
positions in families. The reader should bear in mind
that these positions are not conceptually discrete, and
were not investigated as though they were. In fact, the
three most common positions bear some relation to one
another. All three--the positions I have called the
kinkeeper, ambassador, and the comforter--represent
different aspects of kinkeeping activity. The kinkeeper

performs activities which are specifically aimed at
keeping the family members in touch. The ambassador
also keeps family in touch--both by personally performing
an act of contact and goodwill, and symbolically by
representing a smaller kinship unit to the broader
extended family, performing a linkage activity.
Unlike the kinkeeper, though, the activity is performed
specifically in the realm of ritual. The comforter
performs an expressive activity, and one which is often
argued theoretically to be a prime task of the contemporary
family (Lasch, 1977; Parsons, 1955: 17; Treas, 1977).
However, to distinguish my usage here from other theorists,
the expressive task under discussion here is being per-
formed in the context of the extended rather than the
nuclear family. All of these positions, however, can be
seen to contribute directly to family solidarity through
the strengthening of its dimensions of association,
affection and exchange.

The financial advisor and placement officer
positions are somewhat distinct from the others. Both
are instrumental, rather than expressive in nature. Neither
position is especially common in families, probably because
neither task is one that is commonly or normatively
allotted to the family in our society. The ability to
hold such a position in a family is more related to
special training or structural features such as where one
works than is true for the other positions. As I discussed

in Chapter Five, placement officers frequently helped
find jobs for other family members, either in their own
place of work or through personal connections. With
respect to the position of financial advisor, there are
no data on why occupants of the position were thought
to do this job. However, both the findings on sex of
occupants and common sense may contribute to an under-
standing of why this position is more limited in distribu-
tion than most of the others. Overwhelmingly, financial
advisors are said to be men. Usually, in our society,
the expertise needed to hold such a position is far more
available to men than women, both because of experience
in the workplace and because economic interests and
responsibilities tend to fall to men in families. This
curtails the field of eligibles; whereas anyone in a
family may be considered eligible for, say, the ambassador
position, the financial advisor position is generally
open to men only and only to those with requisite
expertise.

Having made these preliminary comments on similar-
ities and differences between the positions, I turn now
to an analysis of the clustering of positions. When
two or more positions exist, do certain positions tend
to be found together? Related to this is another question:
When a family has only one position, which of the five
is that most likely to be?

I will show below that the kinkeeper and ambassador

positions tend to appear together in families, as do
the comforter and financial advisor positions, with the
placement officer standing apart from both pairs. These
findings reflect underlying similarities between the
paired positions and have interesting theoretical
implications.

Looking first at the kinkeeper and ambassador
positions, both of these positions may be taken on at
the initiative of the incumbent. As I discussed above,
both are "linkage" activities involving active efforts
at maintaining family contact. The finding that these
positions tend to appear together in families suggests
that families which are characterized by contact efforts
in one sphere of family life are also likely to have
similar kinds of efforts in other areas of family life.
That is, some families may be broadly characterized
as emphasizing or specializing in contact and association.

The comforter and financial advisor positions also
share some similar features. Both involve the giving
of help, whether in the form of advice or emotional
support, and incumbents of both positions must be sought
out by other family members. Both positions involve
supportive and helpful activity and may often involve
intimacy and trust between giver and receiver. The
finding that these positions tend to appear together
in families suggests that some families may be character-
ized as specializing in the provision of a range of

supportive and helpful services to their members.

A detailed summary of which positions are found together in the respondents' families appears in Table 6.2.

TABLE 6.2

The Clustering of Positions in Families: Various Position Combinations in Families, by Number of Positions

No. of Positions in family	Position Combination	% of Families in Which This Combination Occurs
1	Kin.	42.4
	Amb.	24.7
N = 112	Comf.	20.3
	Fin.	3.5
	P.O.	8.8
		99.7
2	Kin. - Amb.	47.7
	Kin. - Comf.	22.9
N = 109	Fin. - Comf.	7.3
	P.O. - Amb.	6.4
	Comf. - Amb.	4.6
	Kin. - P.O.	3.7
	P.O. - Fin.	2.8
	Kin. - Fin.	2.8
	P.O. - Comf.	.9
	Fin. - Amb.	.9
		100.0
3	Kin. - Comf. - Amb.	42.7
	Kin. - Fin. - Comf.	11.0
N = 82	Fin. - Comf. - Amb.	11.0
	Kin. - Fin. - Amb.	9.8
	Kin. - P.O. - Comf.	6.1
	P.O. - Comf. - Amb.	6.1
	Kin. - P.O. - Amb.	4.9
	P.O. - Fin. - Comf.	3.7

TABLE 6.2 (Cont'd)

No. of Positions in family	Position Combination	% of Families in Which This Combination Occurs
	P.O. - Fin. - Amb.	3.7
	Kin. - P.O. - Fin.	1.2
		100.2
4	Kin.-Comf.-Fin.-Amb.	47.1
	Kin.-P.O.-Comf.-Amb.	26.5
N = 34	Kin.-P.O.-Fin.-Comf.	11.8
	P.O.-Comf.-Fin.-Amb.	8.8
	Kin.-P.O.-Fin.-Amb.	5.9
		100.1

When only one position is identified in a family, it is most likely to be that of kinkeeper. This is more than a simple reflection of the fact that this is the most common position generally. Whereas kinkeeper identifications account for three-tenths of the total number of position identifications by respondents in this study, they comprise over four-tenths of identifications in families with only one position. (Table 6.3).

TABLE 6.3

Percent of Total Number of Positions of Each Family Position

Position	% of Total Number of Positions	N
Kinkeeper	30.6	238
Ambassador	25.6	199
Comforter	22.2	173
Financial Advisor	11.5	90
Placement Officer	9.7	76
	99.6	776

The positions of comforter, ambassador, and placement officer all occur in about the same proportions as they hold in the total number of identifications; therefore, I conclude there is no special tendency for them to be found in families when only one position is identified.

The position of financial advisor occurs less frequently in one-position families than it occurs in the total number of identifications. While this position accounts for over one-tenth of all identifications, it accounts for less than one-twentieth of identifications in one-position families. It appears that the position of financial advisor is unlikely to exist by itself. Instead, it is normally found, if at all, in families with two or more positions--usually, as I will show below, with the comforter position.

By far the most common combination of positions is kinkeeper-ambassador. When only two positions are named, this combination is found more than twice as often as the next most frequent pair, kinkeeper-comforter. The comforter and ambassador positions are rarely found together when only two positions are identified in a family.

One characteristic combination that emerges here is that of financial advisor and comforter. This may be related to the underlying similarity in these two jobs in that both may involve the giving of advice. As I shall

discuss in more detail below, in four-fifths of the instances when these two positions occur in the same family, they are shared by one occupant, usually a man. One-quarter of these men were said to be the family comforter because of ability to give good advice.

In three-position families, the most common combination is, predictably, that of the three most commonly identified positions--kinkeeper, ambassador, and comforter.

The next most frequent combinations are any two of the three most common positions plus the financial advisor. This is quite a bit more common than any two of the common positions plus the placement officer.

In three-position families, the kinkeeper position no longer seems to be pivotal. Whereas in two-position families, the kinkeeper seemed to be linked separately to the ambassador and the comforter, with these latter two positions infrequently occuring together, in three-position families each pairing of the three major positions is about equally common.

When four positions are identified, again there is no particular separation of the comforter and ambassador positions; they appear together and independent of the kinkeeper position as often as they do with it. However, one pattern which continues to occur here is that which emerged in the analysis of three-position families: the financial advisor is far more likely (occuring almost

twice as often) to be found in combination with the
three major positions than is the placement officer.
And again, the financial advisor appears most frequently
with the comforter.

To summarize the findings concerning the clustering
of positions, when only one position exists in a family,
that position is most likely to be kinkeeper and least
likely to be financial advisor; the frequency of both
of these positions diverges significantly from that which
would be expected from their overall frequencies. When
families have two positions, the most common combination
by far is kinkeeper/ambassador. The comforter and
ambassador positions are rarely found together in two-
position families, although they seem to be found together
when more positions are identified. Lastly, whenever
two or more positions are identified in a family, the
financial advisor position appears linked to the comforter.

Cluster analysis was performed to further investi-
gate these pairing patterns. This analysis clarified and
confirmed the above discussion. The kinkeeper clustered
with the ambassador position, and the comforter with
the financial advisor position. These two pairs then
formed a cluster of four positions, and this large
cluster joined with the position of placement officer to
make a cluster of five positions. These data are
displayed in Table 6.4.

TABLE 6.4

Cluster Analysis of Five Positions

Position	Variable Number	Other Boundary of Cluster	Number of Items in Cluster
Kinkeeper	14	15	5
Ambassador	17	14	2
Comforter	16	18	2
Fin. Advisor	18	14	4
Pl. Officer	15	14	5

The Clustering of Position Occupancy in Individuals:
The Number of Family Members in the Familial Division
of Labour

An earlier section examined the extensiveness of
the familial division of labour as indicated by the number
of positions identified per family. In this section,
I investigate a related issue: the number of people
involved in the familial division of labour. Interest here
is in the distribution of personnel in staffing these
positions. Are positions filled by several different
family members in any one family, or does one member tend
to fill several positions? Table 6.5 summarizes the data
on the number of different family members named as occupants
of the identified positions in each family.

TABLE 6.5

Percent of Family Members Involved in the Familial
Division of Labour in Families with Two or More Positions

Number of Positions	Number of Occupants				No. of Families	Percent of Families
	1	2	3	4		
2	53.2	46.7			109	46.0
3	26.2	57.5	16.2		80	
4	8.5	48.5	25.7	17.1	35	14.8
5	30.7	53.8	7.6	7.6	13	5.5
N of Families	86	121	23	7	237	100.1

Chi Square = 73.40, df = 9, Sign. = .001
Pearson's r = .42, Sign. = .001

Of all the families in which two or more of these
positions were identified, over one-third have one person
shouldering all the jobs identified. Half have a division
of labour in which two family members share the division
of these familial tasks, and over one-tenth have three or
more people sharing the positions.

This, of course, partly reflects the predominance
of families with two or three positions, increasing the
probability of fewer people being named.

However, when families are grouped according to
number of positions named, we still find that in families
with three or more positions the most common pattern is
for two people to share these positions. For families
with only two positions, occupancy by either one or two
persons is equally likely.

What seems clear is that occupancy of these positions does tend to cluster. With the above-mentioned exception in two-position families, it is always very uncommon for each position in a family to be held by a different person. Usually two persons share in the division of labour, but it is worthy of note that one-quarter of all families with three or more positions have three or more position occupants.

The Relationship Between the Clustering of Positions and the Clustering of Position Occupancy in Individuals

In the previous section, I examined the clustering of position occupancy to see how many family members were typically involved in the familial division of labour. I showed that, typically, two people were involved.

In this section, I move from the question of the number of persons to the question of which positions tend to be held by the same person and which positions tend to be held by different persons.

I address this problem by analysing each possible pair of positions, with the five positions yielding ten possible pairs in all. Table 6.6 summarizes data based on the number of times each position pair occurs in the data, and shows the percentage of times the position is occupied by the same person or by two different persons. The first column summarizes these percentages for each pair using the total number of times the two positions

occur--that is, taking all cases where a respondent identified two or more positions. The second column uses only the cases where two, three or four positions were identified; the third column takes cases where only two or three positions were identified, and the last column is based on data where only two positions were identified.

Position Pairs Which Are Held by the Same Person

Analysis will focus primarily on the first column, based on all identified positions, using the other columns to check the consistency of the pattern indicated. Some of the pairs in the third column, and most in the fourth are based on such small numbers that comparisons in these cases must be made rather cautiously.

Table 6.6 reveals that certain positions clearly tend to be held by the same person, while others go to different occupants.

The same person tends to act as both comforter and financial advisor. I showed earlier that these positions tend to be found together in families, and now it can be seen that in addition they are usually held by the same individual. As I will discuss more fully below, the person who acts as both comforter and financial advisor is commonly a man. Of the cases where these two positions were occupied by the same individual, two-thirds involved a male. Of these, one-quarter were said to be comforters because of their ability to give good advice.

TABLE 6.6

The Clustering of Occupancy, by Position Pairs

Percent of Families in Which There Are:

Position Pair	2,3,4 or 5 Positions			2,3 or 4 Positions			2 or 3 Positions			2 Positions		
	Same Person Occupies Both Positions	Diff. Persons Occupy Each of the Two Positions	(n)	Same Person	Dif. Persons	(n)	Same Persons	Diff. Persons	(n)	Same Person	Diff. Persons	(n)
Kin.-Amb.	46.7	53.2	(139)	45.2	54.7	(126)	48.4	51.5	(99)	55.7	44.2	(52)
Kin.-Comf.	54.3	45.6	(116)	53.3	46.6	(103)	56.7	43.2	(74)	64.0	36.0	(25)
Fin.Adv.-Comf.	63.0	36.9	(65)	59.6	40.3	(52)	55.1	44.8	(29)	62.5	37.5	(8)
Fin.Adv.-Pl.Off.	63.3	36.6	(30)	52.9	47.0	(17)	62.5	37.5	(8)	50.0	50.0	(2)
Pl.Off.-Amb.	32.6	67.3	(46)	24.2	75.7	(33)	36.8	63.1	(19)	57.1	42.8	(7)
Fin.Adv.-Amb.	49.0	50.9	(55)	40.4	59.5	(42)	38.0	61.9	(21)	0	100.0	(1)
Comf.-Amb.	44.2	55.7	(95)	39.7	60.2	(78)	46.2	53.7	(54)	60.0	40.0	(5)
Kin.-Pl.Off.	30.9	69.0	(42)	24.1	75.8	(29)	42.8	57.1	(14)	25.0	75.0	(4)
Kin.-Fin.Adv.	33.9	66.0	(56)	25.5	74.4	(43)	23.8	76.1	(21)	0	100.0	(3)
Pl.Off.-Comf.	46.5	53.4	(43)	40.0	60.0	(30)	57.1	42.8	(14)	0	100.0	(1)

> He...tries to give us good
> advice and help. (3033)

> * * * * *

> They think I can give them
> advice. I'm glad to do it.
> (5072)

This suggests that these two positions share an underlying similarity, such as requiring the same talents or attributes of occupants.

Of the men who occupy both the comforter and financial advisor positions, roughly two-fifths occupy no other positions, while three-fifths occupy one or more other positions as well. For women occupants of the comforter-financial advisor pair of positions, however, the contrast is more striking. Three-quarters of the women who hold both these positions also hold additional positions in the family. That is, women who are both comforters and financial advisors are more likely than their male counterparts to be overall "stars" in the familial division of labour.

The same person tends to be both kinkeeper and comforter; although the differences are not very large, they show up consistently in each column in Table 6.6. When one person occupies both these positions, that person is far more likely to be a female than a male. Of all the cases where these two positions were paired, almost three-quarters involved female occupants. Comforters who were also kinkeepers were often said to be qualified because of personality characteristics, special talents

or personal interests.

> I am a good listener and am
> very sympathetic. (4149)

* * * * *

> She's a very loving person. (5012)

* * * * *

> Because she is sympathetic and
> interested and easy to talk
> to. (4012)

However, this occurred more often for female
than male occupants--close to seven-tenths of the time for
females, compared to half the time for males. Close to
one-third of the male kinkeepers who were also comforters
were said to have financial or occupational authority,
respect of other people in the family, or unusual
wisdom or life experience.

> He's financially stable. (6070)

* * * * *

> I have more knowledge to help
> them. (5060)

* * * * *

> We respect and look up to
> him. (3038)

* * * * *

> It is his profession. He is a
> chaplain in the marines. (5114)

These were rarely offered as reasons for women
kinkeepers who also occupied the comforter position.

The comforter is, apparently, a versatile job.
It, and the ambassador, are more equitably shared by both

sexes than any of the other positions. It is linked
both to the kinkeeper and financial advisor positions
and these combinations occurred frequently in the data
(see Table 6.2). In this section, I have shown that when
these position-pairs occur it is common for one person
to be the occupant of both positions. Furthermore,
this occupancy is patterned according to sex. When
the comforter position is paired with the financial
advisor, it is usually a man who is the occupant. When
the comforter and kinkeeper are one and the same person,
that person is commonly a woman.

The third pair of positions which appears to be
held by the same person is that of <u>financial advisor</u> and
<u>placement officer</u>. This seems reasonable, since both
may relate to the occupant's position in the occupational
or opportunity structure or involve similar attributes.

> I have contacts. My contacts
> are more from my community work--
> then business, then financial. (3018)

Position Pairs Which Are Held by Different Persons

There are some positions which, when they are
found together in families, tend to be occupied by differ-
ent persons. These position pairs are kinkeeper-financial
advisor, kinkeeper-placement officer, comforter- ambassa-
dor, and financial advisor-ambassador.

The kinkeeper and financial advisor are seldom
the same person. The same is true of the kinkeeper and

placement officer. Obviously, kinkeeping--"keeping family members in touch with one another"--is quite a different task from either giving financial advice or helping people get jobs, and it makes sense both intuitively and theoretically that different people should be active in these areas. Parsons and others have theorized that men should and do perform instrumental tasks in the family and that men connect family members to the economic structure through occupation. Women, they theorize, should and do perform expressive, emotional, integrative functions in the family. Not only theory but research findings as well support the separation of kinkeeping from giving financial advice or finding jobs for people. Adams (1968), for example, found that men gave more financial help to parents than women did. In the sample in my study, far more men than women were employed, thereby giving men a considerable advantage over women in the family in finding jobs for people.[1] The dominance of women in kinkeeping activities was discussed in Chapter Three.

Finally, the patterns for two positions are unclear.

The placement officer and comforter positions seem to be more often occupied by different people, but given the small number of cases, and the reverse pattern in column three which analyses cases where only two or three positions are identified, I hesitate to conclusively

attribute any connection or lack of it to these two
positions or to occupancy of them.

The other inconclusive pair of positions is that
of kinkeeper-ambassador. As I showed in the previous
section, this pair was the most frequent combination in
two-position families, and was also the most frequently
found combination when the total group of all respondent's
families was analysed. In the majority of cases when
these positions are both identified in a family, they
are held by different people, but the differences are
never very great. Furthermore, the pattern reverses
slightly when only two positions are identified in a family.
Therefore, there does not seem to be a distinct overall
pattern for these two positions to be held either by the
same or by different people. Rather, they seem to be
held by the same individual in families with only two
positions, but by different individuals when there is a
greater number of positions in the family.

Another pair of positions that quite clearly tends
to be held by different persons is that of the comforter
and ambassador. The previous section showed that these
two positions did not seem to appear together in families,
at least not in families where only two positions were
named. Here, this apparent lack of connection is further
supported. They tend to appear separately because they
involve unrelated tasks that seem to be taken on by
different family members rather than by the same person.

The placement officer and the ambassador positions
are usually held by different persons. The picture is
less clear for the financial advisor and ambassador
positions, but these probably should be considered as
being customarily occupied by different persons. Table 6.6
shows that it is only in the first column, where responses
identifying two, three, four or five positions are sum-
marized, that the percentage of cases where both these
postions are occupied by the same person is not clearly
less than that indicating two different people perform
these positions. Of the thirteen cases where respondents
identified all five positions, there were ten cases where
the financial advisor and ambassador were the same
person. These ten cases shift the comparative frequencies
from being clearly weighted toward different occupants
to being almost equal. The apparent connection indicated
by the sharing of these two jobs by one person in the
ten such cases when five positions are identified is
probably more spurious than real. In fact, in only one
case does the person named as doing both these jobs do
no other job in the family. Four cases involved families
where one person did hold all five positions; these people
are "stars" in the division of labour. They are simply
very active and responsible people who do whatever jobs
there are to be done. They truly carry family
responsibility.   But in these cases it is more a case
of the person linking the positions than the positions

bearing some natural relationship to one another. Four
other cases involved self-designations by respondents
where the respondent did four jobs. Here, again, the
"star" effect may be operating. In fact, of these eight
cases I have been discussing, the "star" is also the
head of the family, a position I analyse at length in
the next chapter.

To summarize this section, the positions of
comforter and kinkeeper, when they both exist in a
family, are more often than not held by the same family
member (usually a woman), as are the positions of com-
forter and financial advisor (usually a man). Similarly,
the same person usually acts as both financial advisor and
placement officer when both these positions exist in
one family. Figure 6.1 shows these links, and illustrates
the absence of links between several other position pairs,
indicating that the same person does not usually act as
kinkeeper and financial advisor, or as kinkeeper and
placement officer. The same person tends to be both
ambassador and kinkeeper in families with only two positions,
but this tendency does not hold consistently in families
with more positions. Finally, the financial advisor
and ambassador, although the data are somewhat fuzzy,
are usually different people.

FIGURE 6.1

The Clustering of Position Occupancy: Position Pairs
That Tend to Be Occupied by the Same Person

GENERATIONAL DIVERSITY IN THE DIVISION OF LABOUR

The Preference for Generational Peers

A pattern for individuals to designate generational
peers as position occupants emerged in the analyses of
the three previous chapters. Here, I return to the
matter of generational location of position occupants in
order to compare the different positions in this respect
and to deepen understanding of this same-generation
phenomenon.

TABLE 6.7

Comparison of Generational Location of Position Occupants

	Generational Location of Position Occupant		
Position	Younger Generation than Respondent	Same Generation as Respondent	Older Generation than Respondent
Kinkeeper (N=238)	6.7	82.2	11.0
Ambassador (N=199)	9.9	78.2	10.3
Comforter (N=173)	6.8	81.5	10.2

TABLE 6.7 (Cont'd)

| Position | Generational Location of Position Occupant | | |
	Younger Generation than Respondent	Same Generation as Respondent	Older Generation than Respondent
Financial Advisor (N=90)	11.2	77.5	11.2
Placement Officer	22.7	72.1	5.0

Table 6.7 compares each of the five positions investigated with respect to the generational location of position occupants. Perhaps the most striking feature is the youthful cast to the position of placement officer; this position stands out as having by far the largest proportion of lower generation occupants and smallest proportion of middle generation occupants. And while no position has many occupants in the upper generation, the placement officer has very few indeed.

While percentage differences for the remaining positions are most often quite small, the patterns are nonetheless worthy of consideration.

The financial advisor is the next most youthful position. Unlike the placement officer, upper generation occupants are as common as financial advisors as lower generation ones. A person needs connections or, better yet, a job in order to help others get jobs. However,

while active involvement in work and in the contemporary

financial scene may confer advantages on younger

candidates for the financial advisor position,

the wisdom and experience of years may also confer

advantages on older family members.

The ambassador position is very close to the

financial advisor in proportions of occupants in the

different generations. It is quite surprising that lower

generation occupants are about as common as upper genera-

tion ones. Conventional wisdom would surely suggest

that this position would be filled by many more older

people than younger ones. Younger generation members

have less time to make a particular point of attending

funerals, and might be assumed to have fewer funerals to

attend since they would be less likely to know or feel

close to people who have died. Furthermore, the younger

generation might be assumed to have less concern for

such family ritual and for family solidarity in general.

I refer the reader back to Chapter Five, Table 5.14,

showing that, for the ambassador position, it was

primarily the respondents aged 70+ who designated someone

in a lower generation. In other words, the proportion

in the lower generation for the ambassador position in

Table 6.7 really refers to people in middle age.

Although numbers are small, the kinkeeper and

comforter positions are very similar in their patterns.

They both have the highest proportions of occupants in the

respondent's own generation. When people need emotional support, they turn to generational peers. And, generational peers are felt to be the ones who do the work of trying to keep the family together. These two positions are most concerned with interaction, and it is interesting that they are the most generationally exclusive. They also are the only positions in which more upper than lower generation occupants are named. In the comforter position, this suggests that when people do cross generational boundaries to get comfort and personal advice, they show a slight preference to seek out someone who is older rather than younger than themselves.

The most prominent feature of Table 6.7 is that the great majority of respondents feel members of their own generation perform these various tasks in their families. This is a striking finding, pointing to a strong underlying phenomenon, yet this has never to my knowledge been reported in the literature. Although here I am roaming that shadowy border between data and intuition, I do get the feeling that perhaps many respondents define the term family in their own minds, especially when their attention is directed to the family beyond the lineage, as consisting primarily of generation-mates --siblings and, to a lesser degree, cousins.

The tendency to designate generational peers is not so surprising. A substantial number of respondents designated themselves as occupants of various positions.

In fact, altogether, almost half of the respondents either designated themselves in at least one of the five major positions or described some other task they did in the family.[2] It seems that people often feel that they themselves are carrying some of the family responsibility, and certainly they tend to see the torch as having passed to their own generation.

There are two sides to position occupancy: one relates to work, and one to responsibility, authority and power. Holding a position implies effort in performing that position's tasks. But these efforts also carry rewards in the form of self-esteem and feelings of importance, and a more general feeling that one has power and influence. This implies that, although it is inevitable that ultimately family responsibilities either die or are passed on to the next generation, the generation in command is in no hurry to see this happen.

This is further illuminated by looking at the overall tendency to name members of each generational level by respondents of different ages (see Table 6.8). The older the respondent, the greater the tendency to name someone in a younger generation, and the younger the respondent, the greater the tendency to name someone in an older generation. Only the middle age group names occupants in both older and younger generations. However, the strongest tendency is for respondents to name position occupants who are their generational coevals. This is

most true for respondents in the younger age group.

TABLE 6.8

Generational Location of Position Occupants in Five
Positions Combined, by Age of Respondent

Age of Respondent	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+	31.5	67.2	1.1
55-69	21.2	63.3	15.4
40-54	0	74.4	25.5

N = 776 codable position occupants identified

N = 70+ = 180 position occupants
    55-69 = 357 position occupants
    70-54 = 239 position occupants
Chi Square=109.62, df=4, Sign.=.001   Cramer's V=.27

Clearly, the succession of family responsibility
does occur. As people get older, more and more of these
family tasks are taken on by younger family members.
But what is equally clear is that people tend to see
their own generation as still holding the reins, so to
speak. No respondents under the age of 55 designated
a member of a lower generation as a position occupant
although some of these respondents must certainly have
had children or nephews and nieces in their thirties.
From this, we may infer that these family responsibil-
ities are not taken up until somewhere around the age
of 40, a time we might loosely define as the lower

boundary of middle age.[3]

One final problem remains to be considered. A number of respondents designated themselves as position occupants. These self-designations would certainly swell the number of position occupants in the respondent's generation in Table 6.8. Perhaps the generational effect--the trend toward naming a generational peer--would disappear if self-designations were removed from the analysis. Table 6.9 analyses generational location of position occupants, excluding self-designations.

TABLE 6.9

Generational Location of Position Occupants in Five Positions Combined, Excluding Self-Designations, By Age of Respondent

Age of Respondent	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+	48.7	49.5	1.7
55 - 69	28.6	50.5	20.7
40 - 54	0	63.0	36.9

N of codable position occupants:

70+ = 117
55 - 69 = 265
40 - 54 = 165

Chi Square = 113.96, df = 4, Sign. = .001
Cramer's V = .32

On the whole, the same pattern remains, despite
the smaller proportion of same-generation occupants
once self-designations are put aside. In all age groups,
between one-half and three-fifths of the respondents
name generational peers; these must still be viewed as
very sizeable proportions. The only real difference
resulting from the exclusion of self-designations is that
respondents aged 70 and over are about equally split
between naming someone of their own generation and
someone in a generation below them. In this age group,
generational succession is clearly occurring.

The Intergenerational Mix in the Familial Division of Labour

One question that arises is: to what extent do
different generations share in the division of labour
in any one family, and to what extent does the same
generation carry the weight of responsibility. Table
6.10 provides data obtained when each individual family
is analysed for "generational mix" of position occupants.

TABLE 6.10

The Intergenerational Mix in the Familial Division of Labour
Generational Location of Position Occupants by Number of
Positions in Family

Generational Location of Position Occupant	Number of Positions in Family			
	1	2	3	4
All in higher generation than respondent %	9.8	4.6	7.4	---
Same generation plus higher than respondent %	---	8.4	13.5	24.4

TABLE 6.10 (Cont'd)

Generational Location of Position Occupant		Number of Positions in Family			
		1	2	3	4
Same generation only	%	79.4	71.0	65.4	55.5
Same generation plus lower than respondent	%	---	9.3	12.3	17.7
All in lower generation than respondent	%	10.7	6.5	1.2	2.2
N of families		112	107	81	45

When there is only one position in the family, there can, of course be no mix, but if can be seen that in four-fifths of such families the position occupant is from the respondent's generation, with the remaining families having about equal proportions of position occupants in an upper or lower generation.

As the number of positions in the family increases, the tendency for all positions to be occupied by someone in the respondent's own generation decreases quite dramatically, to less than three-fifths. Also, the tendency to have all occupants be members of the upper or the lower generation decreases. What emerges is a pattern for an increasing generational mix with an increasing number of positions in the family. Furthermore, this is stronger for the mixture of same-generation and upper-generation family members, than for same-generation

and lower-generation.

This suggests that families which have available
and involved older members have a greater chance of
having more highly organized and more complex divisions
of labour.

FACTORS WHICH AFFECT RESPONDENTS' IDENTIFICATION OF POSITIONS

In this section, I investigate personal and family
characteristics of respondents in an effort to understand
what factors are associated with the identification of
a high or low number of positions. I investigate the
relationship of a number of independent variables to the
total number of positions identified and then determine
which of these are related to the number of family
positions.

The variables investigated are age, occupation,
retirement status, marital status, and several family
structure variables including whether or not the respon-
dent has children, the number of siblings the respondent
has, the availability of proximate kin, and the number
of generations above and below the respondent in the
lineage. Pearson's Zero Order Correlation Coefficients
and significance levels for these variables are shown in
Table 6.11.

The reader will recall that men and women were
about equally likely to identify the various positions
investigated in the previous chapters. This agreement

TABLE 6.11

Factors Which Affect Respondents' Identification of Number of Positions: Pearson's Zero Order Correlation Coefficients

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Number of Positions	
	Males	Females
Age	-.119*	-.229**
Occupation	.096	.029 (spouse's)
Retirement Status	-.100	-.113*(spouse's)
Marital Status	.051	.173*
Children yes/no	.131*	-.002
Number of Siblings	.080	.205**
Availability of Proximate Kin	.244**	.034
Number of Generations Above Respondent	.196*	.105
Number of Generations Below Respondent	.131*	-.002
N	219	228

Missing Observations = 22

* Significant at .05

** Significant at .001

between men and women on the presence or absence of these various positions in their families is quite striking. Common expectations and assumptions would tend, I think, to favour the notion that women would be more likely than men to be attuned to these nuances of family organization

and activity. Women are often thought to be more
"family minded" or family-oriented". Yet the men in
this sample are quite as aware as the women of who does
what job and what jobs exist in their families.

However, aside from this consensus, the patterns
of identification for men and women are somewhat differ-
ent, both with respect to age and to important variables.
For this reason, I will discuss the sexes separately,
beginning with the men.

Variables Related to Position Identification by Male Respondents

Occupation, as an indicator of social class, is a
potentially important variable when studying family life.
Several studies have shown that lower social class is
related to a variety of instabilities in the family
(Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Komarovsky, 1964; McKinley, 1964;
Rubin, 1976; Scanzoni, 1970). Since these family
positions represent aspects of support and stability in
families, I hypothesized that higher social class would
be related to identification of a greater number of
positions. This hypothesis was not supported: men of
higher occupational levels identified the same number
of family positions as men at lower levels.

Retirement is a major life course event for men,
and one which may be hypothesized to affect family
relationships. Friedmann and Orbach, in reviewing the
"retirement as crisis" literature, argue that the crisis

viewpoint leads to the hypothesis that retirement will
be disruptive of family life and relationships (Friedmann
and Orbach, 1974). This point of view, to which Friedmann
and Orbach do not subscribe, has a long history in soc-
iology (see for example, Burgess, 1960: 3-28; Miller,
1965). Many other studies, however, point to continuity
between pre-and post-retirement family relationships
(for example, Kerckhoff, 1966; Streib, 1958, 1965).
Based on this latter perspective, I hypothesized that
retirement status would not affect the number of family
positions men identified. This hypothesis was supported,
in that retirement status did not prove significant.
Therefore, to the extent that identification of a high
number of positions may be taken to indicate that the
respondent views his family as a supportive and active
group, we may conclude that retirement does not dampen
this perception.

Overall, these data give no indication that
retirement brings about disrupted or attenuated extended
family relationships, such as would be suggested by a
drop in position identification by men who are retired.
However, the effect of retirement in these data is not
quite as clearcut as my discussion to this point might
imply. Patterns of identification vary at different ages.
Figure 6.2 displays the mean number of positions identified
at different ages by men and women. Complete data on position
identification by age are displayed in Appendix D, Table D.1.

There is a very sharp drop for men at the point of
retirement. Furthermore, this same drop appears with
less strength for women. And, keeping in mind that
the average woman is married to a man a few years older
than herself, if the female plot on the graph is shifted
over a few places it appears that the same family life
course events affect both sexes at the same time. This
is particularly true for retirement which, after this
mental shifting of the female plot, seems to produce a
sharp decline in women's identification of family
positions mirroring their husbands' decline.

FIGURE 6.2

Mean Number of Positions by 5-Year Age Groups Controlling
For Sex

Mean
Number of
Positions

Females=_____
Males =_____

Age of Respondent

This drop is sharp, but short-lived. Men, and
women as well, soon return to their former high levels of
identification, although as I show in the next section,
husband's retirement was related to identification of
fewer positions by women. To reconcile the finding
that retirement, for men, is not significantly related to
position identification with the obvious decline around
the time of retirement, I make the following interpretation.
The event of retirement appears to have a negative effect
on position identification, but as men move further
along in the process of retirement the negative effect
subsides. Such an interpretation is consistent with the
retirement literature which suggests that people antici-
pate more negative features about retirement than they
actually experience once they are in retirement (Streib
and Schneider, 1971). Atchley, too, points to the nega-
tive anticipation of the event of retirement (Atchley,
1972:166). Keating and Cole, in a recent study, do not
report on the period immediately before and after retire-
ment but they imply that there is an unsettled time which
they refer to as the "period of adaptation" (Keating
& Cole, 1980). The event of retirement is part of a
larger process of retirement. While the process, in the
long run, is not a negative experience, the event may
well be. This, at any rate, is suggested by these data
on men's perceptions of their families.

Marital status might be hypothesized to have an
effect on position identification. I expected married
men to identify greater numbers of positions than
widowed or unmarried men. This expectation flowed
from a more general assumption that married men would
be involved in a more active and connected family net-
work, partly because their wives would act as key links
to the rest of the kin group. Much of the literature
reviewed in the introduction to Chapter Three makes
this point. However, marital status did not prove
significant for men's identification of family positions.

While having a spouse was not a critical variable
for men, other aspects to do with family structure were
found to be important. Having children, the number of
generations above the respondent and the number of
generations below him in the lineage were all significantly
related to position identification. Respondents with
children and with older and younger lineage generations
identified more positions in their families. The more
generations alive in the family, the more likely that
family is to have several positions in the division of
labour.

Another aspect of family size and structure that
might be hypothesized to be related to the extent of
the familial division of labour is the number of siblings
the respondent has. However, this variable did not prove
significant for men.

<u>Geographical proximity</u> of kin did prove important.
Men who had at least one parent, child, and sibling living
nearby tended to identify more positions in their
families than men who did not have such proximate kin.

Finally, <u>age</u> is related to position identification.
As men get older, they identify fewer positions. Figure
6.2 shows that this decline is not at all steady. It
is, rather, an overall decline marked by a series of
rises and falls as men move through the adult years.
The overall pattern, though, is one of loss. As men age,
they view their families as less active and supportive
environments.

Adherents to the view that the nuclear family
neglects its aged kin would see the decline in position
identification with age as consistent with their
theories. However, so much research has documented
extensive contact, affection and support between older
parents and adult children that neglect or exclusion does
not seem to me to be a plausible explanation. Age-
related changes in the family life course such as
retirement and widowhood did not prove significant
and therefore cannot be called on to explain the decline
in position identification with age. However, family
structure changes as people age. The addition of younger
generations to the lineage through birth may only partly
compensate for the loss of siblings and parents. Here,
it is not so much family size or generational diversity

that might be relevant, but the fact that the quality
of relationships with older and especially with same-
generation family members is quite different from that
with family members in younger generations. As people
grow older, while their extended family membership is
both depleted through death and replenished through
birth, the aging individuals become increasingly bereft
of significant kin. I shall return to this point later
in this chapter.

Having separately investigated each of the above
variables, I entered them into a two-step regression
analysis.[4] The variables that were most important in
predicting the number of positions identified by men
were having proximate kin (Beta=.19) and the number
of generations above the respondent in the lineage
(Beta=.13). Men who have living parents and who have a
parent, sibling, and adult child living relatively
close by are more likely than men without these available
kin to perceive their families as active and supportive
entities.

Variables Related to Position Identification by Female
Respondents

Occupation, a variable which did not prove to be
important in the number of positions identified by men,
also failed to prove significant for women. This increases
confidence in the assertion that, in general, having a
familial division of labour is not a class-bound
phenomenon.[5]

One variable which was significant for both men and women was <u>age</u>. In fact, the relationship between age and position identification was even stronger for women than for men. Older women were much less likely than younger women to identify a high number of family positions.

In contrast to the findings for men, <u>having children</u>, <u>having proximate kin</u>, and the <u>number of generations above or below</u> the respondent in the lineage were not related to the number of positions identified. One important family structure variable for women, however, was <u>number of siblings</u>, a variable not at all important for men. The more siblings women have, the more family positions they identify. This is an interesting finding, for it suggests a more general importance of siblings for women that is not relevant for men.

Another variable that was not important for men but was significant for women was <u>marital status</u>. Married women were more likely to identify greater numbers of positions than were unmarried or widowed women. This finding helps to explain the decline in position identification with age. The reason that older women identify fewer positions than younger women is probably because older women no longer have spouses.

One final variable that was important for women but not for men was <u>retirement</u>. Women whose husbands were retired identified fewer positions than those whose

husbands were not retired. This suggests that retirement has a more long-term, negative effect on women's perceptions of their wider family than is the case for men.

When all variables discussed in this section were entered in a two-step regression analysis, the variables that were most important were age (Beta=-.19) and number of siblings (Beta=.16). Younger women who have greater numbers of siblings are more likely to belong to families with many positions in the division of labour.

The parallelism in position identification by men and women is very striking. As I mentioned above, the apparent differences in the years prior to age 65 as shown in Figure 6.2 are really simply a "time lag" effect. When the female plot is adjusted, so that women may be compared with men of their husband's ages, the patterns become very similar. This presents rather strong indications that some similar family life course events affect both men and women and are related to position identification. While a full explanation of this phenomenon is beyond the scope of this dissertation, I have attempted in the preceding pages to investigate some of these related events. Retirement, for example, was discussed in some detail. We may speculate that other events such as the marriage of

children, the birth of grandchildren, and the death
of parents and siblings have their impact too on the
perceived familial division of labour in families.

The time lag effect between the sexes breaks
down from about the age of 65 on. This is entirely
consistent since most of the women over this age were
no longer married. In the sample, only one-quarter of
the women 70 and over still had husbands. Perhaps the
rise for both sexes at age 70-74 is less tied to the
family and more to the individual life course. This
appears to be a good period in people's lives, at least
in their perceptions of their families. It perhaps
represents the "golden years" of later life, when people
have redefined themselves as older, retired, widowed
or vulnerable to widowhood; these definitions may or may
not be construed as favourable but they may well be
seen as appropriate to one's age. Also, people do
become somewhat more involved with family in later years.
Whatever the underlying reasons, these people do show an
increase in identifying family positions, indicating
that this is a positive time of life.

An important point to note is that there is an
overall decline in perception of the number of positions
in the familial division of labour from the beginning
to the end of the adult years under study. This is
true for both men and women. The perception of the
family and the meaning it holds for people is obviously

quite different when one is 40 and when one is 80.
Furthermore, this decline becomes a steady low after the
age of about 75.

However, it is misleading to concentrate simply
on overall trends. Family life is literally and figurat-
ively a series of "ups and downs." All of us recognize
this in our day to day experience in families--raising
children, being married, being part of a family. Things
do not stay the same or travel a steady course; rather,
there are good times and not-so-good times. With
children, we attribute changes to the "terrible two's" or
to adolescence, when such explanations seem to fit.
At other times we may throw up our hands and speculate
about the possible effects of the phases of the moon
or changes in air pressure. We do not always know why
changes occur, but simply that they are occurring. The
analysis in this section shows that, for the aspect of
family life studied, changes are socially patterned
by and are understandable in terms of other life events.

To summarize the foregoing discussion, four major
points were made. First of all, when the time lag effect
was taken into account, life course events affected
both men and women with similar results as far as percep-
tions of the family were concerned. Secondly, the early
70s were seen to be a positive period in people's
family lives. But, thirdly, this was no longer the case
after the age of about 75.[6] Finally these data revealed

change from one 5-year period to the next. This under-
lines the importance of studying the family from the
perspective of individuals of different ages and at
different stages of life, for the meaning of the
family and perception of family realities obviously
varies according to where individuals are currently
located on this age-stage continuum.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have endeavoured to synthesize
some of the themes and findings of earlier chapters, in
order to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding
of the familial division of labour. As a phenomenon,
this division of labour is widespread in families, yet
this aspect of family functioning has never been investi-
gated systematically prior to the present study. It
represents a common and important aspect of extended
family life and structure. Data presented in previous
chapters indicated that these positions are passed down
from one generation to the next in families. They are
aspects of family structure that persist over time.

However, as individuals move through their own
slices of historical time, their perceptions of their
families change. Thus, we saw that position identifica-
tion fluctuated according to the age and family life
state of the respondent. Overall, there was a significant
decline with age. This is related to losses and changes
that age brings, such as widowhood, retirement, loss of

parents and loss of generational peers within the famiy.
These losses represent losses in resources, and exacerbate
a more   general tendency among people of all age
groups to avoid crossing intergenerational boundaries
(Dowd, 1980:62). Rather than engage in cross-generational
relationships in which they are in a less powerful, more
dependent position, many older people "retire" from
active participation in the family system maintained
by the division of labour. This is not to say they
may not still reap some benefits from it. For example,
if the kinkeeper arranges a reunion, the older person
may go to it. However, these older people no longer per-
ceive the family as providing such a strong and active
support network, nor do they perceive themselves as
major contributors to it.

The division of labour is a complex phenomenon,
in which certain positions tend to appear together, and
certain positions tend to be occupied by the same
individual. Furthermore, the work connected to these
positions tends to be shared by two or more family
members.

If we think of the family as an organization,
the family members who occupy the various positions may
be thought of as the staff. When the staff was analysed
according to generation, the strongest trend was for
respondents to perceive their own generational peers
as making up the staff of their family. As the size of

the staff increased, so did the generational diversity
of the staff members.

Organizations not only have workers, but bosses
as well. Someone usually heads the organization. In
the next two chapters, I investigate who holds the top
leadership position in the family, a position I call
the "head of the family."

FOOTNOTES

1   In the study sample, 52% of the men and 28% of
the women were currently employed.

2   Following the series of questions on the various
family positions, respondents were asked whether there
was anything, in addition to what they had already
told the interviewer, that they themselves did to keep
the family together.

3   A competing but less satisfactory explanation is
that persons in their thirties are still perceived as
children by older family members, too young to seriously
carry family responsibilities.

4   Step one involved entering all of the proposed
independent variables (occupation, age, retirement
status, marital status, living children, number of
siblings, availability of proximate kin, number of gen-
erations in the lineage above and below respondent) into
the model. Step two involved re-running the regression
with only those variables with a Beta of .10 or greater
remaining in the model.

5   This assertion does not preclude the possibility
that the distribution of any particular position might
be patterned by class.

6   I interpret the variations in position identification
at different ages as reflecting changes in the family life
course and pointing to a change in perception of the family
as people grow old and especially as they reach very old age.
Here, as elsewhere in the dissertation, I infer longitudinal
changes from my analysis of cross-sectional data. Such a
procedure may take as age-related changes differences which
are in fact attributable to different cohort experiences.
Thus, a competing hypothesis in interpreting the decline in
position identification with age might be that the lower
rate of identification by elderly respondents is a cohort
effect related to differences in fertility and marriage rates
for this group of people. The respondents aged 70 and over
were part of a distinctive cohort that came to marrying and
child-bearing age during the depression. A higher proportion
of these respondents were childless and never-married than
of other age groups in the study. However, when I controlled
for having children and for marital status, age, along with
number of siblings, remained the most important variable for
women, although not for men. For men, having available kin
close by was the most important factor, followed by occupation.
Thus, although there may indeed be differences between cohorts
that influence family life, these data indicate declines that
are related to age over and above the possible influences of
cohort differences in fertility and marriage.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, as well as in Chapter Eight, I investigate a pervasive but hitherto neglected aspect of family life, a phenomenon I refer to as "family headship". This phenomenon clearly exists in the majority of families in this study, and is probably quite common in contemporary families, at least in Canada. Family members are quite easily able to discuss it and to identify a person who is considered the head of their family. Family headship is, I shall argue, a demonstrable social fact. It is not solely an observer's concept, limited to the student of social behaviour or of family life. On the contrary, it is meaningful to ordinary people.

While family headship has never, to my knowledge, been explicitly investigated as a family position, there is evidence that it exists as a somewhat taken-for-granted notion. Howard, for example, remarks that "good families have a chief" (Howard, 1978:268) and Miller refers to the difficulty in remaining "head of the family" after retirement (Miller, 1965: 78). Gallup Polls periodically survey Canadians concerning opinions on who should be "top boss" in the family (Gallup Poll of Canada, 1966, 1981).

Studies on family power and decision-making (for example, Gillespie, 1971; Hill et al., 1970:19) approach the notion of headship, at least in some of its dimensions.

Feminist literature assumes the existence of headship, beginning with the premise of the subordination of women and endeavouring to trace the roots of this situation. Zaretsky, for example, argues that the separation of family and work has been accompanied by the relegation of women to the family or personal sphere of life, thereby cutting them off from sources of power. Furthermore, he contends that "the establishment of private productive property as the basis of the bourgeois household meant that society was organized into separate households each of which was ruled by the father..." (Zaretsky, 1977). Hartmann, on the other hand, argues that a patriarchal system in which men controlled the labour of women and children existed prior to the rise of capitalism (Hartmann, 1976). Certainly, the idea that men are superior to women, and that husbands should have authority over wives, runs through the Judaeo-Christian tradition (Glazer et al., 1977:41).

Most investigations of family authority focus on the household, and often simply on the married couple. In this study, however, I am interested in headship in a broader context -- that of the lineage. I investigate the prevalence of such a position in contemporary families, the content of the position, and factors which influence whether or not people identify such a position in their families. In Chapter Eight, I extend this investigation to a consideration of who it is in families who occupies

the position of head, how or why they came to be head, the chain of occupancy from one generation to the next, and events which precipitate the succession or passing on of the position.

As these research interests suggest, I conceive of headship as a dynamic rather than static concept. Since headship implies authority and power, and since these are related to age, I expect changes in perceptions and occupancy of the position of head to be related to age and to age-related family life stages. Dowd has argued cogently that aging may be viewed through an exchange theory perspective which emphasizes power resources of actors in social relationships (Dowd, 1980). The occupancy of headship represents power and authority, and implies deference from other family members. Since power and authority are high in middle age but decrease in old age (Dowd, 1980:22), I expect headship to become somewhat problematic in old age. That is, men may be less likely to feel they are head of the family when they are old, and their wives may share this feeling. Adult children, as they reach their own middle years, may be less inclined to view their parents as family heads, and more inclined to see themselves in this role.

I shall show in the following pages that many families do indeed have heads, and that family members have a recognition of family headship that covers not only the present time period but often extends backward in time

prior to the respondent's own lifetime and extends into the distant future as well. Most people were able to identify a person who was currently the head of their family. In addition, many people were also able to name the person who was head before the present head took over, and many people could also name the person who would succeed the present head as the next head of their family. It is important to note that the position is not merely symbolic or honourary; a number of specific activities and responsibilities are usually part of being head. I show as well that the existence of head-ship is not randomly distributed but appears more often in certain kinds of families than others, being patterned by a variety of factors including age, occupation, retirement status, marital status, having children, and having living parents.

The questions about the head of the family followed all the other questions on family positions that have formed the basis of investigation in the four previous chapters. The other positions were investigated in a wider family context, and the preponderance of siblings named as position occupants makes it clear that respondents were thinking about their wider family when they answered those questions. In investigating the head of the family position, however, respondents were asked to narrow their conception of the family to the lineage. It is important that the reader bear in mind, then, that

the frame of reference in this chapter is rather
different in its familial membership than that in
previous chapters. In Chapter Nine, I will show how
lineage headship and the wider familial division of
labour relate to one another. For now, though, I
put considerations of the extended family to one side,
and focus full attention on the lineage and the many
facets of lineage headship.

PREVALENCE OF THE POSITION OF HEAD OF THE FAMILY

To ascertain whether such a position exists in
families, respondents were asked,

> Now,thinking of your side of the
> family as including yourself, your
> spouse and children, and your
> parents and grandparents--whichever
> of these people are still alive, is
> there anyone who is thought of as
> "head of the family" on your side
> of the family?

Two-thirds of the people in this study said there
was a person who was currently considered the head
of their side of the family (See Table 2.1, Table 7.1).[1]

Respondents who said there was no present
head were asked a second question.

> Was there ever a time when someone
> was thought of as the head of the
> family on your side of the family?

Another sixteen percent of the respondents
answered this question affirmatively.

TABLE 7.1

Percent of Respondents Who Say There Is a Head of the Family,
by Age and Sex

Sex of Respondent	Age of Respondent									
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	73.9	94.7	83.3	64.7	90.0	53.3	66.7	40.7	50.0	68.9
F.males	85.0	76.0	88.6	73.3	46.2	70.0	63.3	44.0	53.8	67.1
All	79.1	84.1	86.2	68.8	65.2	62.9	65.0	42.3	52.5	67.9
N Males	23	19	30	34	20	15	30	27	14	212
Females	20	25	35	30	26	20	30	25	26	237
All	43	44	65	64	46	35	60	52	40	449

Missing Observations = 15

Men: Pearson's r = -.257, Sign. = .000

Women: Pearson's r = -.235, Sign. = .000

In all, then, four-fifths of the respondents in the
sample in this study said that someone is now or used to be
the head of their family. I infer from these data that the
position of "head of the family" exists or has existed in
the families of these respondents.

Since the great majority of respondents of almost all
age-sex categories in the study identified someone who is or
was head of their family, I conclude that "head of the family"
is a meaningful concept to most people. Furthermore, since
two-thirds of the respondents said there was a current head
of their family, I conclude that in the majority of contemporary
families there is a person who occupies the position of

head.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE POSITION OF HEAD

The main emphasis in researching this position was on accession and succession. Respondents were asked why the person is considered head and how the person came to occupy the position. However, while activities and responsibilities were not investigated directly, a fairly clear picture of what the head of the family does may be constructed from the answers to the open-ended "how" and "why" questions.

The head of the family is a person who shoulders ultimate responsibility for the family, and demonstrates this by assuming a variety of specific responsibilities. Furthermore, the head's authority is recognized by other family members who seek out the head for a variety of reasons.

These heads hold their position on the basis of "legitimate" power or legitimate authority (French and Raven, 1968). That is,family members acknowledge the right of the head to occupy that position and to exert appropriate influence on other family members. Often, as I shall discuss later, this right is related to ascriptive characteristics. But I show in this section that this right stems also   from the recognition that the head performs the relevant duties well, and has earned or deserves to occupy the position of head. It should be noted that in a small but interesting minority of cases, the head is recognized as holding the

position on the basis of coercive power. Such people
have bullied their way into the position and are rec-
ognized as being domineering and even nasty by the
rest of the family. However, the responses imply that
these individuals have the power to enforce their will
on others and are, grudgingly perhaps, said to be the
heads of their families. Family tyranny is not new,
of course. In fact, historians have shown that it was
far more typical of family life in past eras than it
is today. When the family was an economic unit, and
individual destiny was more tied to inheritance than
it is today, the older generation might well have
been more feared or despised than loved by the young
(Stearns, 1976:38; Fischer, 1978:250).

Heads of families take on, or are given, family
responsibilities. These may include: carrying financial
responsibility for and supporting the family; handling
financial affairs for various family members; taking
charge in crisis situations; taking care of or taking
responsibility for aging parents; giving advice and
solving problems; making decisions, or having the final
say in decision-making; expressing interest in and concern
for family members; and doing the planning and organ-
izing for various family-related matters.

Many respondents referred to the relationship
between headship and responsibility. Sometimes this
simply meant feeling a sense of responsibility.

> I feel it's my respon-
> sibility. (3002)

More often, the head was said to accept or take on responsibility.

> I accept the responsibilities.
> (3005)

> * * * * *

> I feel that I should take
> on the responsibility.
> (3080)

One specific responsibility that is clearly identified with headship is the responsibility for supporting the family financially. A number of respondents mentioned this, with the implication that the person who supports the family financially has the right to be head.

> Because he pays the bills.
> (3065)

> * * * * *

> Because he is the breadwinner.
> (4050)

> * * * * *

> Because he provides the
> money. He is important.
> (4126)

The head of the family may be involved in running the family's financial affairs. In the following example, it is clear that this is related to looking after a parent, and that financial responsibility is

only part of a larger complex of responsibilities.

> My father was dead for so many
> years and I handled everything
> at my mother's home--so I always
> have handled the money. I always
> took the lead in looking after
> things. (4069)

In these examples, too, financial responsibility

is one among many.

> I guess because I handle the
> financing and am consulted and
> generally have the final say. (3077)

* * * * *

> I have always handled the money
> and everything around the house,
> so the children came to me. (4069)

As I will discuss in a moment, giving financial

advice is one of the activities of the head.

> The children have come to me for
> financial advice since being on
> their own. (5133)

The head makes decisions, and is consulted about

decisions. In situations where other family members

participate in the decision-making process, the head

is the one who has the final say.

Numerous respondents said the head made decisions;

this is obviously an important activity related to the

position of head of the family. The verbatims that follow

support Gillespie's assertion that when it comes to major

family decisions, men hold family power (Gillespie,

1971).[2]

> Because I make all the plans and
> major decisions. (4008)

<center>* * * * *</center>

> He's the one I go to for all kinds
> of decisions. (4012)

<center>* * * * *</center>

> He's the one who makes all the
> big decisions. (4089)

<center>* * * * *</center>

> I make most of the major decisions
> in my family. (5057)

In some cases decision-making is autocratic;
the head's decision is final. However, in the follow-
ing example, the respondent conveys the feeling that
this is the way things should be. The head has the
legitimate authority to affect other family members
in this way.

> What he said was law. He was
> the father and we all respected
> him. He was strict and he made
> the rules. (4099)

Even in families where other members par-
ticipate in decision-making, the head is the one who
makes the final decision or has the final say.

> My mother discusses major things
> with me and usually abides by my
> advice. The same with my family.
> We discuss things but I'm really
> the one that has the last word.
> (3116)

<center>* * * * *</center>

> I am the father. In Europe the
> father is considered the head of
> the family. He is the breadwinner
> and has the right to make the final
> decision. (3082)

When family members are faced with the need

to make decisions or are trying to work out problems,

they often go to the head for advice, guidance, or

assistance.

> My wife and children come to
> me for advice. (3063)

> * * * * *

> We're their parents and give
> them advice when required.
> (4013)

> * * * * *

> I feel I am an equal but
> in terms of the family going
> for help or advice they go
> to their father. (4058)

> * * * * *

> They always lean on me for
> advice and comfort. I am the
> senior member. (7028)

Most of these responses do not specify what

kind of advice the head gives, although we may

assume such advice covers a full range of personal

or family matters. Some responses referred specif-

ically to financial advice, as I mentioned earlier.

> He uses common sense, is
> dependable, a good provider,
> and he can give good advice on
> money matters. (4058)

The inter-twining of advice-giving and decision-making is made clear in the following example:

> We all turned to him for advice
> and he made decisions for us and
> provided for us. (6032)

In a few cases, respondents said someone was head through force. These individuals are able to impose their will on others but do not have the respect and affection that customarily accompany occupancy of the position. These quotations give no indication that the respondent sees position occupancy as in any way based on legitimate authority, despite the fact that the first two examples refer to the respondents' mothers.

> She is a strong person. She still
> can control us and seems to be
> able to get us to do things. (3057)

> * * * * *

> She was a bully and a tyrant. No
> one else was there to talk back
> to her. (3019)

The man in the following example was talking about his sister, whom he named as head of his family.

> She is an aggressive person. Emma
> never loses an argument. (7117)

These preceding examples reveal that sometimes the activities of the head of the family include bossing other family members around. These heads are not particularly loved, and not necessarily respected. They hold their positions through domination, and this domination is perceived as such by others.

The head of the family takes charge in a crisis.
This is implied in a number of responses which refer
to the head's ability to stay calm or think clearly
in emergencies. The broader implication is that
one of the responsibilities or activities of the head
of the family is to steer individual members or the
family group through crises.

> He's thoughtful and in a
> financial way he is sound. He
> keeps calm in a crisis and is
> not an erratic person. (4081)

> * * * * *

> I trust him and I have confidence
> in him. He can handle things
> clear-headedly in emergencies.
> (4082)

One of the most important responsibilities
that heads assume is caring for a parent. This may
mean providing a home for a parent, as in the
following example.

> Because Mother lived with
> him and he looked after her.
> (5041)

Such parent-caring by the head may be related
to the parent's declining health.

> He was a priest and he looked after
> my mother when she was an invalid.
> (6075)

Parent-caring my be related to the death of
a parent.

> Since my father died, Mother
> mainly just had me. In the
> last year, Donald* has come
> round to helping Mom. When
> Dad died, I looked after
> everything. (3115)

The respondent in the next example was talking

about his father, whom he named as head of the family.

> Grandfather died when I was
> young and he took care of
> things for my grandmother
> also. (5080)

Just what it is that the heads in the above

examples looked after is not made explicit. Perhaps

they looked after financial matters, or funeral

arrangements, or helping the surviving parent find

new living quarters, or providing emotional support

during the bereavement and after. In the following

example, the person who is head played an important

financial role when the father died, and took

charge of steering the family through this difficult

transition.

> He took charge of my father's
> estate at his death. He guided
> and directed the family. (3056)

Less dramatic than responsibilities connected

with death, but important because they must be repeated

---

* Donald is the respondent's brother.

many, many times are a variety of activities of an
affective nature. Reminiscent of activities in the
comforter position, the head may provide comfort, show
concern, care about family members, and listen to
people when they need to talk to someone.

> He shows an interest in all
> members of the family. (8116)

* * * * *

> He's always been a very con-
> cerned person. (4042)

* * * * *

> He is always ready to listen to
> you and he is always there. (3036)

* * * * *

> She is a great listener and under-
> standing at all times. (6060)

* * * * *

> I am the mother and the oldest
> and always interested in what they
> tell me. (8009)

Heads plan and organize on behalf of the fam-
ily.

> She made everything happen. She
> was the organizer and planner as
> well I guess. (3018)

* * * * *

> I seem to be the organizer and
> everyone seems to lean on me. (4141)

Sometimes the activities of the head resemble
those that were described for the kinkeeper, although,
as I show in Chapter Nine, these positions are both

conceptually and empirically distinct.[3]

In the following examples, the "mother role" is men-
tioned as an aspect of headship. The implication is that
heads do what mothers do, be this kinkeeping or
nurturing or advising. In fact, the sister named as
head was also said to be the kinkeeper in this family.

> She took over the mother role
> after my mother died. (5064)

In the next example, too, the mother was considered
head because she kept the family together.

> My father died. She was widowed
> quite young. She did the things
> that had to be done, kept us from
> falling apart, helping, listening.
> (6031)

Whatever the activities engaged in, some heads
are truly centers of gravity. They are like "glue"
holding the family together.

> She's what keeps them all together.
> They turn to her when they need
> help in the long run. (5117)

This respondent presented an eloquent metaphor
to describe this phenomenon.

> They seemed to be the ones best
> informed of the family and the
> spindle around which the family
> revolved. (5030)

In this section I have shown that the position
of head involves a variety of activities and respon-
sibilities. Prior to that, I demonstrated that the
position exists widely in contemporary families. I
turn now to the question of variation in the identif-

ication of the position to gain understanding as to why some people say such a position exists in their family while others do not.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE POSITION OF HEAD OF THE FAMILY

In this section, I analyse responses concerning whether or not there is a present head of the family. My purpose is, first of all, to see what variables help explain variation in position identification. Secondly, I wish to move from such explanation to a slightly more abstract level and make some statements about headship in families.

The variables which were considered theoretically important were occupation, age, retirement status, marital status, whether or not the respondent had children, having kin who were geographically proximate, and the number of generational levels above and below the respondent in the lineage. Pearson's Zero Order Correlation Coefficients for these variables are displayed in Table 7.2.

My analytical strategy was to investigate the effect of these theoretically important independent variables on the identification of the position of head of the family. As a first step, these variables were entered into a model analysed by multiple regression. A second step involved re-running the regression with only those variables with a Beta of .10 or greater.

remaining in the model. Data from male and female
respondents were analysed separately, as has been
my practice throughout this study, as different
variables proved important for each sex. Below, I
organize my discussion around each variable, pointing out
sex differences and similarities as I proceed.

TABLE 7.2

Factors Which Affect Respondents' Identification
of Position of Head of the Family: Pearson's Zero
Order Correlation Coefficients

Independent Variables	Dependent Variable: Is There a Head of the Family? Yes/No	
	Males	Females
Age	-.257**	-.235**
Occupation	.153*	.044 (spouse's)
Retirement Status	-.234**	-.134* (spouse's)
Marital Status	.239**	.308**
Children yes/no	.242**	.106*
Availability of Proximate Kin	.206**	.007
Number of Generations Above Respondent	.176*	.087
Number of Generations Below Respondent	.242**	.106*

N

Missing Observations = 29

* Significant at .05

** Significant at .001

Before proceeding with the analysis, however, I wish to clarify one point for the reader. In Chapter Eight, when I investigate in detail which family members occupy the position of head, I show that three-quarters of the heads are either self-designations (usually by men), husband-designations, or designations of the couple (that is, the respondent identifies both the respondent and his or her spouse). I also demonstrate that respondents are thinking in terms of lineage rather than household headship. The relevance of these patterns of occupancy for the present discussion is that, very often, identifying someone as head of the family is synonymous with identifying oneself or one's spouse as head, and in the discussion that follows, I often make this implicit connection.

Looking first at _occupation_, I hypothesized that, as an indicator of social class, it would be positively related to identifying a head of the family. As I discussed in Chapter Six, studies have indicated that, contrary to the myth of the warm and supportive working class family, higher social class is associated with more stable family life. The way in which class relates to family headship is illuminated by the following quotation:

> In America, a man's personal worth
> both in his own eyes and those of
> others is tied to his success on
> the job market...his self-esteem
> and the respect he receives from

the family are tied up with
his occupational status. Iron-
ically, the upper-middle class
father, who needs less ego-
bolstering respect and submission
from his wife and children is
more likely to find family mem-
bers going along with him in
everyday decision making. The
frustrated lower-status father,
more demanding of deference and
obedience, is likely to find his
wife and children less willing to
accede to him; the less legitimate
does the rest of the family re-
gard his authority (Skolnick, 1978).

Occupation was significantly related to saying
there is a head of the family for men, but not for
women. Men of higher occupational levels were more
likely than those at lower levels to identify a head.
On the other hand, women whose husbands were at high
occupational levels were about equally as likely as
those whose husbands were at lower occupational levels
to say there was a head. Headship, then, is a phen-
omenon that is patterned by class for men, but not for
women.

I hypothesized that age would be inversely
related to identification of headship. This hypo-
thesis was supported by the data. Younger persons
were more likely than older persons to say someone was
head of their family. Several age-related family
life course events such as retirement and changes in
lineage composition are investigated below. The net
result of these and other changes is, I infer, an age-

related decline in the perceived distribution of power, authority and prestige in the family. In addition, birth and death alter the lineage structure as the family members grow older.

Table 7.1 shows how strong the age patterns are. However, while emphasizing the overall decline with age, I also point out that comparatively high proportions of both sexes identified someone as head at most of these five-year age periods. For men, in two of the age categories, the late forties and early sixties, at least nine out of ten said someone is head. And, despite a sharp drop at retirement age, in only one period did fewer than half the men identify a head. Identification levels are generally very high prior to age 65, but fall after that point. Prior to age 55, three-quarters or more of the women said someone is head. After this age the proportion fluctuates between this higher level and less than half. Beyond age 75, under half the women said there is a head.

As I show below, age is an index of other factors that contribute to a decline in identification of this position. At the same time, it is important to note that, regardless of the underlying factors, the net result for both men and women is a decreasing perception, as they age, of the existence of a person with centralized authority for the family.

Retirement is a major personal and family
life change, and has implications for authority
in the family. Although it is probably the case
that after retirement some occupational identity or
prestige continues to cling to a person, on the whole,
retirement means loss of occupational identity, both
in the eyes of the retiree and in the view of other
family members. In Chapter Six, I noted that retire-
ment research has not supported the view of retirement
as a time of crisis for family life and family relation-
ships. On the other hand, Dowd points out that retire-
ment involves a change in social identity and a shift
in power, and requires the negotiation of new deference
relationships (Dowd, 1980:37). This decrease in power
resources could be expected to be related to a decline
in identification of the position of head. Miller
expresses the possible connection between family
authority and retirement as follows:

> Before retirement, the role of
> "husband" as mediated by his
> occupational identity results
> in high prestige and supports
> the various roles that the
> person is expected to assume
> in the family system. It would
> be extremely difficult to main-
> tain the role of "head of the
> family" if an occupational
> identity were lacking (Miller,
> 1965:78).

I mentioned earlier that three-quarters of the
persons designated as head were either self-designations,

husbands, or designations of the married couple. The
fact that three-quarters of the heads were persons in
the respondent's marital dyad means that when I discuss
the effect of retirement on identification of the
position I am really talking about the effect of
retirement on self-and spouse-designations. Further-
more, it has become increasingly clear with the analysis
of each new family position that respondents do not
readily name members of younger generations as position
occupants. This could be expected to be especially
true with respect to naming a head of the family,
since this position is more closely tied to authority
than the others.

My hypothesis, then, was that retirement would
result in a lowered rate of self-designation by men
and a lowered rate of spouse-designation by women.
Rather than openly recognizing the loss of authority by
saying headship had shifted to someone in a younger
generation, the effect of retirement is reflected in
a decline in identification of the existence of the
position of head.

This hypothesis was supported. Men who were
retired, and women whose husbands were retired, were
less likely than their non-retired counterparts to say
someone was head of the family. This finding is at
odds with the more positive view of retirement expressed
by Friedmann and Orbach in their review of the retire-

ment literature (Friedmann and Orbach, 1974). It points to a perceived loss of familial authority by these men and women.

Marital status is an important variable whenever family life is the focus of investigation, and I hypothesized that it would be very important in the identification of headship. Married people were found to be more likely than those not currently married to identify a head of the family. From this, I infer that people who are married are more likely to feel "part of a family." Although having older and younger generations in the lineage contributes to this feeling as well, the marital relationship might be viewed as anchoring two people in an immediate family situation as the wider family situation changes through the death of parents and the maturing and departure from home of children. In addition, having a spouse is a social power resource in interaction with other lineage members. Thus, marriage provides an element of psychological and social independence that might be more problematic when a person is without a spouse. It should be noted here that while marital status was significant for both men and women in relation to perceptions of headship, most men in this sample were married while a high proportion of older women were not married (see Appendix C, Table C.5 for marital status of respondents).

Thus, the impact of being unmarried on perception

of headship is felt by many women but relatively few
men.

Generational complexity of the lineage is
related to headship, because relations between generations
involve differences in power and authority. This leads
to the hypothesis that the greater the number of gen-
erations in the lineage, the greater the likelihood
that the lineage will have a position of authority in
which one person is recognized as the head of the family.
Having children was significant for both sexes. More-
over, the number of generations below the respondent
was significant for both men and women; people with
younger generations in the lineage were more likely to
say someone was head of the family. This may be thought
of as a "dynasty" effect. The larger the dynasty
below the respondent, the more likely the respondent
is to say there is a head of the family-- and, as I
have pointed out earlier and elaborate upon in the next
chapter, this usually means a self- or spouse-desig-
nation as dynasty head. Having generations above
the respondent in the lineage was important for men
but not for women. Men with older living generations
in their lineages were more likely than those without
such family members to say someone was the head of the
family, even though, as I show in the next chapter, less
than one-third of respondents with living parents
named a parent as head. For men, then, the total gen-

erational length of the lineage is related to saying
someone is head of the family, while for women it is
the generational length below the respondent that is
important.

Finally, not simply having certain kin alive
but having them geographically proximate might be
expected to influence headship. Headship is manifested
in social interaction and the potential for the family
to interact is clearly related to geographical proximity.
Availability of proximate kin (operationalized as having
at least one parent, adult child and sibling living
within one and one-half hours' travel time from the
respondent) proved significant for men, but was not
related to women's identification of the position of head.

To summarize the discussion to this point: men
and women who are comparatively young, married, have
children and grandchildren, and are not in retirement
are more likely to say someone is head of the family
than those lacking these characteristics. Being in
the higher occupational levels, having living parents,
and having kin living close by are important for men
but not for women.

The significant variables for each sex were
entered into a second-step regression. For men, age
was the most important predictor of identifying a
head (Beta=-.18), followed by marital status (Beta=.15)
and the number of generations below the respondent

(Beta=.13). For women, marital status was most important (Beta=.26), followed by age (Beta=-.13) and having children (Beta=.10). The sexes are remarkably similar, except that marital status has a much stronger relationship for women than for men, and that both children and grandchildren are important for men while simply having children is the discriminating factor for women. It is interesting to note that the passing years have a negative effect on headship with respect to age and marital status, but a positive effect with respect to adding children and grandchildren to the lineage.[4]

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have shown that family headship is a widespread phenomenon that is well understood at a commonsense level by the respondents in this study. Headship is not a hollow crown, or merely an honourary or symbolic position. While the question concerning headship did not tie the position to any behavioural components, the data make clear that the position of head involves important family work. This work often has to do with financial responsibilities and decisions, crisis management, advice-giving, problem-solving, and decision-making. Perception of the existence of the position of head of the family is patterned by sociologically relevant variables and changes over time as other changes, occasioned by births, deaths and marriages,

occur in the family life course.

My investigation of headship is only partially
accomplished. In the next chapter I pursue questions
to do with occupants of the position, accession and
succession. By the end of the next chapter, then,
a more complete picture of family headship will be
attained.

FOOTNOTES

1   Of the 502 children of respondents who returned the mailed questionnaire, 44.2% said someone was currently head of their family.

2   The data are not clearcut on this point but there is a suggestion that there is a difference between "major" decisions, which are normally made by heads, and other decisions which are more personal, perhaps, but on which the head's advice or help might be sought and valued.

3   The person who occupied the position of head was less likely to also occupy the position of kinkeeper than any of the other positions. This overlap occurred in less than one-fifth of the families in which both positions were found (See Chapter Nine, Table 9.1).

4   The issue of a possible cohort effect, related to differences in fertility and marriage rates, arises here, as it did in Chapter Six (see Chapter Six, footnote 6). Again, when my analysis controlled for marital status, as well as for having children, age remained an important variable for both men and women in that identification of the position still declined with age. This points to an independent effect of age, over and above cohort variations in child-bearing and marrying.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE SUCCESSION OF HEADSHIP

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I explore the chain of succession,
as the position of family head passes from generation to
generation, the rules which govern this succession, and
the processes of timing and negotiation that accompany
shifts in headship.

I begin by addressing the question of occupancy,
and show that headship is usually located in the marital
dyad. Parents are quite often named, if the respondent
has a living parent, but children are very rarely named
as heads. Most heads are men. Women become heads, if
at all, in their later years, after their husbands have
died.

A strong tendency for respondents to name gen-
erational peers as heads is found in these data. Respon-
dents definitely perceive their own generation to hold
family authority. At the same time, respondents may
name an older generation head, if an older generation
lineage member is still living. However, there is
great resistance toward perceiving a younger generation
member as head.

An intensive analysis dispels worry that respon-
dents might have been thinking of "head of the house-
hold" when they talked about the head of the family.

294

I present evidence that supports the view that most
respondents were indeed discussing the head of the
lineage.

Comparisons are made between perceptions of
headship by respondents and their children, utilizing
data from the mailed questionnaire to children. Close
to half the parent-child pairs agreed on whether or
not the position of head existed in their family.
When both parent and child said there was a head,
seven-tenths agreed on who that person was.

Accession to headship is perceived by respon-
dents to be governed by certain rules: a person who
is the father, the breadwinner, or the eldest is
seen as being rightfully head of the family. However,
the qualitative data show that these rules provide a
framework within which headship is negotiated in social
interaction.

The paths of succession from one generation
to the next are traced out through an analysis of
responses identifying the past, present and future heads
in families. The main pattern is father to son to
grandson. Headship may be held by women on occasion,
but this is usually on a purely interim basis. It
is quite striking that the respondents in this study
view family authority in these very traditional terms.

Finally, I investigate timing in the passing
on of headship. Family and individual life course

transitions are perceived as creating vacancies in
headship into which the respondent's own generation may
step. However, these same events are rarely percived
as precipitating succession of headship to the younger
generation.

OCCUPANTS OF THE POSITION OF HEAD OF THE FAMILY

Relationship of Head to Respondent

Headship is usually vested in the respondent,
husband or couple. In all, almost three-quarters of
those named as heads were one or both members of the
respondent's marital dyad.

As I noted in the previous chapter, in questions
investigating headship, respondents were asked to think
of the family as including their spouse, themselves,
and other lineage members of upper and lower generations
(parents, grandparents, children, grandchildren); it
was from this group of family members that respondents
were asked to name a head. This contrasts with all
the earlier positions discussed in the dissertation in
that for those positions respondents were directed to
think of their side of the family as including themselves,
parents, children, aunts, uncles, and so on. In other
words, the other positions were investigated in terms
of a broader definition of the family; it was left
to respondents to answer in terms of whatever bounded
group was meaningful to them. Here, however, the defini-

tion of the family was narrowed to the respondent's lineage and included the respondent's spouse. This changed definition results in a striking contrast in occupancy between the position of family head and the other positions.

TABLE 8.1

Sex and Relationship to Respondent of Persons Named as Head of the Family

Relationship to Respondent	Percent of Heads Who Are:		
	Male	Female	Uncodable for Sex
Respondent	24.8	13.2	
Spouse	23.5	1.6	
Couple (Respondent and Spouse)			10.9
Parent or Grandparent	4.3	6.9	
Sibling	2.6	3.3	1.6
Child or Child-in-law	3.7		.6
Other*	.6	.9	.9
	59.7	25.9	14.0
N	182	80	43

*Includes aunts, uncles, cousin, other.

Whereas siblings were the main occupants of most other positions, respondents designating themselves are the most common occupants of the position of head (Table 8.1). Most of these are male respondents, but it is striking

that a substantial minority of these are women who named
themselves as heads. This is noteworthy in that it is
clear from the analysis of sex of occupants and of the
reasons people are perceived to be heads that respondents
of both sexes feel this is properly a male position. Further-
more, the steady increase with age in women naming themselves
as head (Table 8.2) is noteworthy in its implications concern-
ing the effects of the women's movement.

TABLE 8.2

Percent of All Respondents Who Designate Themselves as
Head of the Family, by Age and Sex

Sex of Respon- dent	Age of Respondent									
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Males	34.8	57.9	43.8	31.4	38.1	18.8	40.0	18.5	33.3	35.3
Females	5.0	10.7	8.6	16.1	11.5	19.0	29.0	24.0	32.1	17.6
All	20.9	29.8	25.4	24.2	23.4	18.9	34.4	21.2	32.6	25.9
N Males	23	19	32	35	21	16	30	27	15	218
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	245
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	463

Missing Observations = 1

Men: Pearson's r = -.121, Sign. - .037
Women: Pearson's r = .217, Sign. =.000
Sex: Pearson's r = .198, Sign. =.000

I had expected younger women to be somewhat influenced by
the women's movement of the 1970s, even though these women
are generally too old to have been affected in their form-

ative, young years. However, these data suggest that
for these women the old-fashioned notion of the male
being the head of the family is very much the rule.[1]

The other major kinship category from which
heads are named is that of spouse (Table 8.1); here,
"spouse" almost always refers to a husband.

In addition, about one-tenth of the respondents
who identified a head said that both the respondent
and the spouse together acted as head of the family.
Again, considering the rise of feminist ideology, we
might expect women to protest against the male dominance
in this position of authority, and thus to show a tendency
to name the couple as a kind of compromise solution.
It is surprising, therefore, that men in every age group
were more likely than women to name the married couple
as head. A total of 13.4% of men but only 5% of women
gave this response. It is also interesting that in the
oldest group of women, those over 70 years of age, not
one woman named the married couple as past or present
head. Those few older women who still had husbands
might have been expected to name the couple as head,
since studies have suggested that in post-retirement
years the couple becomes more democratic in some respects.
For example, research has indicated that after retire-
ment, husbands and wives share in the performance
of household tasks (Ballweg, 1967; Kerckhoff, 1964)
and move from an emphasis on instrumental behaviour to

a new emphasis on expressive behaviour (Lipman,

1960, 1961). That is, the traditional sexual division

of labour in the Parsonian sense breaks down or becomes

blurred in these years. This is thought to be related

to an increase in power for wives in this period (Troll,

1971; Feldman, 1964). Nonetheless, these elderly,

married women do not feel headship is vested in the

married couple.

Parents were named as heads in about one-tenth

of the cases. When availability of parents is controlled

for, 30.8% of the respondents who had a living parent

and named a head said a parent was head of the family.

There is male dominance in the position with

respect to parents. Although in absolute numbers, more

mothers were named than fathers, this merely reflects

the fact that many more respondents had surviving mothers

than fathers. Again controlling for availability,

fathers were more likely to be named than mothers. Of

respondents who named a head of the family and who

had a living father, 33.3% said their father was head,

while for those with a living mother the figure was only

21.5%. Of the twenty-five respondents who identified

a head of the family and had both parents living, nine

named a father and four named a mother as head.

Another indication of this father-dominance

appears in the data on who respondents said was the head

of the family before the present occupant took over.

Of the respondents who named both a present and
previous head, fathers were named two and one-half
times as frequently as mothers.

Finally, more than half of those who named
their mother as present head, said their father was
the head before that.

All in all, it seems very clear that although
in absolute numbers more mothers than fathers were
named as present heads, the position is one normally
occupied by a man, in this case a father. When the
father dies, the position often passes to the mother
if she is still living. I examine this in greater
detail in the section below on succession.

Siblings were rarely mentioned as heads. In
fact, siblings and other extended family members were
said to be family heads in only one-tenth of the cases.
It is surprising, perhaps, that these individuals were
named at all, since they were not mentioned as being
eligible for this position in the phrasing of the question
as it was presented to respondents.

Children were named as head of the family in
less than one-twentieth of the cases. This is quite
noteworthy. Respondents certainly see headship as
having moved down from their parents to themselves or
others in their generation, and they frequently name a
child as future head, as I shall discuss shortly, However,

only twelve respondents felt that headship had <u>already</u>
moved from their own generation down to one of their
children. Because these deviant cases go against
an extremely strong trend in the data, it is worthwhile
pausing here for a moment to analyse these cases, to
see what factors might contribute to the perception
that headship has descended to one's child.

First of all, about the same number of men as
women named a child as present head (seven men versus
five women) a finding which immediately contradicts
the easy assumption that elderly widowed women made
up the group under consideration. All these respondents
were over the age of 55, and most were over 65.

Most (three-quarters) of these respondents
were widowed. This female respondent, employing the
implicit assumption that this is a male position, said
her son was now the head,

> Because his father died and he
> is the only male and healthy.
> (8010)

The reason given by the next respondent as to
why her son was head gives a clearer description of what
is involved in headship and conveys as well the shift
in female dependency from being dependent on a spouse
to being dependent on a child.

> He's the only one. After my
> husband passed away he took
> over everything. (8084)

These respondents were not characterized by
poor health. Only three of the twelve said they had a

health problem that stood in the way "a great deal"
of their doing things they wanted to do. However, for
these respondents, poor health might well have contri-
buted to seeing a child as head. Another respondent,
whose present health was fine, indicated that a health
crisis in the past played an important role in the passing
of headship to the child.

> I became very ill when my son
> was age 16. He has been help-
> ing as head ever since. (7057)

The elderly widow in the following example reveals
that she has moved from "the farm" to an apartment, a
move that probably coincided with the onset of widowhood.
The son named in this example was considered head because
of ability, but also because he showed responsibility
toward his mother.

> His sister gets his advice. He
> can straighten things out and
> talk things over. After I
> moved to my apartment from the
> farm he always dropped in to
> see me. One could depend on
> him. (8003)

In cases such as the above, the move from country
to city probably represents a move toward dependency
inasmuch as old responsibilities have been left behind,
and perhaps old social ties as well. This may well have
been a move by an older person to be nearer her children,
a fairly common occurrence among elderly people whose
children have been geographically mobile (Troll, 1971).
However, there is a strong likelihood that the parent-

child relationship becomes more asymmetrical in such a
situation in that the parent, having left familiar net-
works behind, becomes more exclusively dependent on the
child for social and emotional support.

Analysis of those children who are named as head
of the family by these twelve respondents leaves no
room for doubt that it is first-born sons upon whom this
mantle falls. Eight of the twelve children named as
present heads were first-born sons, two were the eldest
male children, while the remaining two were second-eldest
males.

The most common reason supporting the naming of
a son as head of the family mentioned the son's business
acumen or intelligence. This was stated by eight of these
twelve respondents, while only one-sixth of the total
number of respondents who named a head gave such a reason.
For example:

> He is a leader and successful
> in business. He has good
> leadership qualities and the
> family turns to him. (5009)

> * * * * *

> He is the only son. He is a
> business consultant and seems
> to assume the role of head. (5022)

> * * * * *

> He's the shrewdest -- the
> brainiest of them all. Every-
> one automatically went to him.
> (7204)

This lengthy consideration of the very small number of cases in which a respondent named a child as present head of the family has provided insight into possible correlates of this unusual occurrence. Respondents who designated a child always named a son, almost always a first-born or eldest male. These sons were far more likely to be considered to have special financial or business qualifications than was true for all heads taken as a group.

Respondents who were older were more likely to name a child as head, although this was not a dramatically strong relationship. Both sexes were about equally represented in this group, most were widowed, and retired. From this analysis, we may infer that "premature" assumption of headship by a child is most likely to ensue when the parent, father or mother, becomes widowed, when there is an eldest son among the children to take on this responsibility, and when that son is financially skilled or successful.

Sex of Occupants

The head of the family is a position most commonly occupied by a male (Table 8.1). Three-fifths of all present heads were men, compared to one-quarter who were women.[2] Furthermore, of present heads who were codable for sex, almost seven out of ten were men. Most female heads were self-designations by female respondents. Excluding these, only 12.7% of family heads were women.

The popular assumption that people of younger ages
have more liberal attitudes toward the vesting of
authority in a male figure, and that younger women may
have been more affected than older women by the message
of the women's movement, led me to expect that younger
women would be more likely than older women to name
a female head of the family. This expectation was
not fulfilled. As Table 8.2 shows, a relatively small
percentage of younger women designated themselves as
head. Self-designations by women increased markedly
with age, but this was closely related to changes in
marital status. The older women who designated them-
selves as family heads tended to be women who were
not currently married. In the 65 and over age group,
women who were not currently married were more likely
than their married counterparts to say they were head
of the family (Pearson's $r = .221$, Sign. $= .011$).

Putting self-designations aside, the remaining
designations of female heads were split rather evenly
between male and female respondents. Furthermore,
there did not seem to be any tendency for younger women
to name female heads more than older women did.

Age of Occupants

As elsewhere in the dissertation, self-designa-
tions will be examined here in order to get some indica-
tion of the actual age of occupants of the position of
head of the family. From the data on self-designations

(Table 8.2), it is apparent that this is a position men occupy in earlier mature years while women enter it late in life.

Table 8.2 also shows that men peak in self-designations between the ages of 45 and 54. In the lineage, these are years of authority for men. Even the youngest men in the sample had a high rate of self-designation, indicating again that youth is not a handicap for men in eligibility for this position. Men display a dramatic drop at retirement age, perhaps reflecting a perceived broader loss of status and authority. However, echoing what was seen in Chapter Six, men show a brief recovery by once again designating themselves in large numbers in their early seventies.

Finally, for men there is an overall decline with age in the tendency to be a head of the family.

The pattern for women is quite the opposite. With age comes an increasing likelihood for women to be head of the family. Analysis of self-designations suggests that women, when they are heads, are usually elderly. The same inference may be made from designations of mothers. As I suggested above, mothers tend to be heads after fathers die, making these women quite old when they enter the position.

To sum up, when self-designations are used as an indicator of age of heads, it appears that younger men,

but older women, are more likely to be designated

occupants. Men are heads while children are still

dependent and at home, and as the nest empties. Women

become heads, if at all, in their later years, long after

children have left home, and after husbands have died.

Generational Location of Occupants

The head of the family is usually someone from

the respondent's own generation, and this tendency

increases with the age of the respondent (see Table

8.3). Whereas about four-fifths of respondents in the

TABLE 8.3

Generational Location of Head, by Age of Respondent

Generational Location of Head

Age of Respondent	Younger Generation than Respondent %	Same Generation as Respondent %	Older Generation than Respondent %
70+ (N=77)	10.3	88.3	1.2
55-69 (N=97)	5.1	85.5	9.2
40-54 (N=126)	0	77.7	22.2

uncodable = 5

Chi Square = 30.67, df=2, Sign.=.001

Cramer's V = .23

younger age group named a generational peer, about nine-
tenths of the older respondents did so. Furthermore,
respondents were more inclined to name an older generation
occupant of this position than a younger generation one.
These data indicate that when people feel there is a head
of the family they usually see this responsibility as vested
in their own generation; they see their own generation as
"on stage" or running the show, as occupying the seat of
authority.

The pattern of naming a generational peer implies
a felt sense of importance, authority and responsibility.
Naming an older generation head does not necessarily have
negative connotations for the respondent. When someone
in an older generation is named as head, this places the
respondent in the position of "waiting in the wings". The
respondent's generation is next in line for the assumption
of family authority and responsibility.

However, there are negative connotations when a
respondent says a child or someone in a younger generation
is now the head of the family. Naming a younger generation
occupant implies loss of importance, authority or respon-
sibility. These respondents are saying, in effect, that
history has moved on, and that they have stepped aside to
make way for the next generation. No wonder people cling to
the perception that their own generation is in charge.

These data show that generational succession in

headship occurs; this is clear from the decreasing
tendency with age to name an older generation occupant
as head and an increasing tendency to name a younger
generation occupant.[3] Equally clear, though, and
hardly surprising, is the message that respondents
themselves are reluctant to recognize or perceive
succession as having moved on from them to their younger
offspring or relations. Practically to the end of life,
most respondents continue to see headship as located
in their own generation.

Head of the Household or Head of the Family?

As noted at the beginning of the section on
occupants of this position, three-quarters of the resp-
ondents located headship in one or both members of their
marital dyad. This might raise the suspicion that res-
pondents answered the question the way they would respond
to the census question asking who is the head of the
household.[4] While such a possibility cannot be completely
discounted, there are several lines of reasoning and
some supporting data that should allay worries in this
regard. I pursue this discussion by considering, first
of all, the phrasing of the question. Next, verbatim
quotations from respondents are drawn upon to give
support to the argument that the family to which respon-
dents referred was wider than the nuclear family. Then
I compare occupants of the head of the family position
with those named in other positions. Following this,

I draw upon data concerning the naming of past and
future heads. Finally, I turn to a consideration of
the strength of a same-generation preference which,
I argue, accounts in large part for the concentration
of the occupants of the head position in the marital
dyad.

The question specifically directed people's
attention to the vertically linked living generations
in the lineage.

> Now, thinking of your side of
> the family as including your-
> self, your spouse and children,
> and your parents and grand-
> parents--whichever of these
> people are still alive, is there
> anyone who is thought of as the
> "head of the family" on your
> side of the family"?

This phrasing should have induced respondents
to try to formulate a response in terms of the family
beyond the household, or at least have helped to counter-
act the tendency to think in terms of household only.
Of course, there is no guarantee that respondents did,
in fact, answer in lineage terms just because the
question was phrased this way.

It must be remembered that all questions other
than the head of the family question were phrased in
terms of the extended family--that is, the respondent
was instructed to consider members of the extended family
as well as the lineage when naming a person in the role

under question. Only the head of the family question

was restricted to the lineage and included the spouse

in the field of eligibles. This narrowing of eligibility

would account for some of the increase in numbers naming

self, spouse, or self and spouse. At the same time, the

fact that the head of the family question was immediately

preceded by a series of questions concerning five family

roles which directed attention to the extended family

should, I think, have had some residual influence on

keeping the respondent thinking in wider rather than

narrower terms, that is, thinking beyond the confines

of the household.

The effect of the narrowing of parameters of

the field of eligibles may be seen in Table 8.4.

TABLE 8.4

Extent to Which Self, Spouse, or Self and Spouse Are
Named as Occupants of Various Positions

Position	Percent of Occupants of Each Position Who Are:			
	Self	Spouse	Self and Spouse	% of Position Occupants Who Are Self, Spouse or Couple
Kinkeeper (present)	23.3	1.2	.4	24.9
Placement Officer	26.5	2.5	1.2	30.3
Financial Advisor	40.2	2.2	1.1	28.1
Comforter	36.2	2.2	1.1	28.1
Ambassador	27.6	0	0.5	39.5
Head (present)	38.0	25.1	10.9	74.0

When other positions are compared with the head of the
family position, self-designations are not notably
higher in the head position than in the others; in fact,
self-designations are slightly higher in the financial
advisor position and only slightly lower in the comforter
position. The real difference between the head and all
other positions is that over one-third of heads are
spouses or the couple, two categories which make up
very small proportions of occupants of all other positions.

A second argument that respondents did not think
of family as limited to household emerges when responses
to the question, "Why is this person head of the family?"
are examined. The following are illustrative of cases
where respondents were clearly thinking beyond the
household.

> My mother discusses major things
> with me and usually abides by my
> advice. (3115)

> * * * * *

> He shoulders the responsib-
> ility for us and for my mother.
> (6048)

In some cases, respondents named someone from the
marital dyad but were thinking beyond the household and
even beyond lineage boundaries. These examples implied
being head of a family that included siblings and
possibly other relatives as well.

> Even my family and his look to
> him as the head of the family--
> my brothers and sister and his,
> as well as our children. (6088)

> * * * * *

Because my brothers live all
over, sort of scattered-- so
it sort of has fallen on me. (6090)

An analysis of the content of open-ended
questions was conducted to see what proportion of res-
pondents were answering in terms of the lineage or
extended family, and what proportion were confining
themselves to the household. Table 8.5 shows the
results of this analysis by three broad age groups.

TABLE 8.5

Percent of Respondents Who Name a Present Head of
Lineage or Extended Family Versus Head of Household,
by Age of Respondent

Age of Respondent	Head is Head of Lineage or Extended Family	Head is Head of House- hold	Answer is Unclear as to Boundaries of Family Group Over Which Person is Head
70+ (N = 127)	82.5	8.7	8.7
55 -69 (N = 96)	48.9	32.6	18.3
40 - 54 (N = 82)	47.9	34.1	17.8

It can be said with complete confidence that about half
of all younger and middle-aged respondents answered the
question in terms of the lineage or extended family.
Close to one-fifth simply were not codable one way or
another. The one-third of cases in these age groups
that were coded as referring to the household may be

somewhat over-estimated since when respondents in
these age groups referred to being head of a family
that included their children I still coded them as
household. While this was no doubt quite accurate
for the younger group, in the middle-aged group some
would still have dependent children at home but most
would not. Thus, I have erred on the conservative
side of the issue. The reason that four-fifths of the
respondents in the 70+ age group were coded as answer-
ing in terms of the lineage or extended family is that
for this group if they referred to being head of a
family that included children, they were coded as lin-
eage since the children did not live in the household.

In the younger age groups, children live in the
household; however, as respondents age and children
establish their own independent households, our
respondents continue to perceive headship as applying
to the parent-child lineage.

In a sense, then, it is misleading to speak of
even the younger respondents as discussing head of the
family in terms of head of the household. Only a small
number of respondents really confined themselves to
the household inasmuch as they spoke of headship in
terms of the married couple. Most respondents, when
they speak of a head of the family, include their
children as part of the family and most often see one
or both partners in the marital dyad as head.

What really seems to be happening here is very
similar to what was seen in the analysis of generational
location of head. There is a very strong tendency to
feel that one's own generation and indeed oneself and
spouse are in charge, and occupy the seat of power or
authority. It appears that most people when they get
married and have children feel they are heads of their
families. And yet, when their own children grow up
and found their own families, our respondents continue
to feel they are heads, now of a wider family group
which includes their grown children. People are quick
to take up power and slow to relinquish it.

Strong evidence that respondents think of this
position as carrying authority for the lineage rather
than the household may be found in the data concerning
previous heads and future heads. Respondents who named
a present head were also asked to identify the previous
head and to name the person who would be head in the future.

TABLE 8.6

Percent of Respondents Who Name a Present, Prior, and
Future Head of the Family

	% of Respondents Who Name a Present Head
Name present, prior, and future	53.5
Name present, and past	33.8
Name present head only	6.7
Name present and future only	5.7
	99.7

N = 295
Missing Observations = 10

Over half the respondents who named a present head could
also name the former and future heads (Table 8.6). This,
to my mind, is strong evidence that these respondents
thought about headship of the lineage as spanning
time (by extending into the past and the future) and
space (by including in the conception of family, people
living in other households). In all, 87% of respondents
who named a present head also named a previous head, and
59% of those who identified a present head also named
a future head. As I note later, in the discussion of
succession, three-quarters of all headship transitions,
either from past to present or present to future, involve
a generational descent. That is, lineage headship moves
in most cases from grandparent to parent to child. It
would be impossible for people to describe these transi-
tions unless they thought beyond the confines of
household.

Perhaps the strongest argument that respondents
were not thinking strictly of household even though
they so frequently named someone in the marital dyad
as head is one that emerges out of much of the analysis
of earlier chapters in the dissertation. Over and over
again, I have shown that respondents express, through
their designations of occupants, a very strong tendency
to name a generational peer. This preference asserts
itself with the same strength in the head of the family
position, but here there were constraints as to which
generational peers were properly eligible to be named

as occupants. Strictly speaking, according to the phrasing of the question, the only eligible generational peers were the respondent or respondent's spouse. I believe that the preference for naming someone of one's own generation should be viewed as contributing, and contributing rather significantly, to the very large proportion of heads who are members of the respondent's marital dyad.

All in all, while it may well be that some respondents drew on a census notion of head of the household when answering this question, the many other considerations discussed above lend confidence to the view that the majority of respondents were indeed answering in terms of the lineage.

Agreement Between Parents and Children on Existence and Occupants of the Position

I look next at how respondents' children replied to the question asking who is the head of the family. Looking at these data which include many respondents under the age of 40, the minimum age of respondents in the main interview sample, adds to our understanding about how family members perceive the allocation of a family authority and responsibility and how this perception changes with age.

Of the 506 children who returned the mailed questionnaire, 44% said someone was head of their family. Table 8.7 lists the lineage members named as head by

these children and shows how the person identified
as head varies with the age of the child. In the
youngest group of children, fathers are overwhelmingly
named as heads. Overall, parents or grandparents are
named 90% of the time. In the decade of their thirties,
when children are generally married, established in
occupations, and having their own children, although
there are continuing high numbers who identify a parent
as head, there is a decrease in these identifications,
while spouse designations begin to increase.

TABLE 8.7

Family Member Named as Head of the Family by Respondents'
Children, by Age of Child

Family Member Named as Head of the Family by Child	Age of Child		
	18-29	30-39	40-59
	%	%	%
Mother	9.8	24.5	16.6
Father	75.0	55.7	40.4
Grandparent	5.3	0	0
Spouse	5.3	16.3	26.1
Self	4.4	3.2	16.6
N	112	61	42

Exclusions = 7 (2 uncodable, 1 great uncle, and 4 siblings)

Note: 44.2% of respondents' children who returned mailed
questionnaires said someone was currently head of the
family.

As these children become middle-aged, a surprising
number continue to name parents, showing an obvious
preference for fathers. However, the overall decrease
in naming parents is unmistakable, and is counter-
balanced by a large increase in children naming them-
selves or their spouse as head.

These data underscore my argument that people
do indeed refer to the head of the lineage when they
name someone as head of the family; if this were not
the case, much larger numbers of children would desig-
nate themselves or their mates as family head.

These data show, too, that when people are
young adults they feel their parents are the head of
the family. As they mature and move through the early
phases of the family life course in their own families
of procreation they generally still perceive a parent
to be the family head. However, by the time they are
middle-aged, although many still say a parent is head,
the tendency is on the wane. The figures in Table 8.7
for the 40+ age group clearly indicate a shifting of
authority in the lineage, even though parents are
still living, indicating a weakening of the hold on
headship by the aging parents and an accession to the
position by those in middle age.

By linking data from parents and children in
the same families, it is possible to see to what extent
there is agreement in families both on the existence

of the position and its occupant. Table 8.8 displays

these data.

TABLE 8.8

Agreement Between Parents and Children on Who Is Head
of the Family

Percent of Children Who Identify:

		Head	No Head
Percent of Parents Who Identify:	Head	31.5*	38.0
	No Head	13.0	17.3

N = 506

Chi Square=.26, df=1, Sign.=.5

Cramer's V=.02

*Of these parents and children who agreed that the family had a head, 71.2% identified the same person as head.

The table should be interpreted as follows:

of the 506 adult children who returned questionnaires,

31.5% both said there was a head of the family and had

a parent who also said there was a head of the family;

13% said there was a head of the family, but had a

parent who said there was no head of the family; 38%

said there was no head but had a parent who said there

was a head; and 17.3% said there was no head and also

had a parent who said there was no head. Of the cases

where child and parent agreed there was a head of the

family, there was a further agreement on the precise

identity of this head (most often, the father) in
71.2% of the cases. Taking these cases and the 17.3%
of parent-child pairs in which there was agreement on
the absence of a head of the family, there was perfect
agreement or consensus in 39.9% of the pairs.

Some readers may find this a surprisingly high
degree of consensus, while others may find it disturb-
ingly low. My own view is that consensus is not a
central issue, nor is it to be expected theoretically.

> ...our world is a world of
> meanings. Moreover...people
> do not always agree on the
> meanings...Divergences in
> meanings point to the impor-
> tance of active interpreta-
> tion processes (Marshall,1978-79:
> 356).

Summary: Position Occupants

To sum up this section on occupants of the
position of head of the family, most occupants were
either respondents themselves, husbands, or the married
couple. I discussed in some detail the problem of
head of the family versus head of the household, to
address the possibility that people answered this
question in terms of the common census question asking
who is the head of the household. Although such a
possibility cannot be completely discounted, the data
suggest that many respondents, at least, did respond
to the question in terms of their lineage and not their
household.

Analysis showed that occupants of this position are almost always male, although as husbands die women tend to name themselves as their husbands' successors to the position. For these women, a generational or seniority criterion becomes relevant upon the husband's death; being an eldest male is the best route to head-ship occupancy, but when the eldest male dies many of these women feel their generational seniority in the lineage renders their headship occupancy appropriate.

Men are heads when they are relatively young, especially in the late 40's and early 50's; for women, though, headship is assumed, if at all, in later years.

Analysis of generational location showed that headship is overwhelmingly concentrated in the respon-dents' own generation. In addition, a number of respon-dents did identify a head from an older generation. However, the opposite - saying a younger generation person is head - was extremely unusual.

Analysis of data from respondents' children showed that half the parent-child pairs agreed on whether or not the family had a head, while the other half dis-agreed. Perfect agreement was found in two-fifths of the pairs. Fathers overwhelmingly outnumbered mothers as position occupants, according to children; it was quite striking that fathers were still the most commonly named occupants even by respondents aged 40 to 59.

ACCESSION: BECOMING HEAD OF THE FAMILY

In this section, I investigate why certain people are considered to be the head of the family. The selection criteria as respondents perceive them are of particular interest here. To study this, I draw on responses to an open-ended question which asked why the person named as head was considered to be head of the family.

Ascriptive characteristics such as sex and kinship status have already been shown to pattern headship occupancy. The qualitative data provided by respondents as they explained why someone was head reveal that respondents are quite aware of the importance of these ascriptive characteristics and use them as criteria in the attribution of headship. Almost half the respondents who said there was a present or past head of the family gave an ascriptive characteristic as the reason for position occupancy.[5]

The most common reason a person was said to be head was related to age or birth-order. Half of the ascriptive responses were in this category. As many of the quotations below indicate, other reasons were often included in the responses.

> Because I'm the oldest and
> wisest. (3048)

* * * * *

I'm the old one and built
the family together. (3121)

* * * * *

I'm the oldest so everyone
looks up to me. (8145)

* * * * *

I'm the oldest. Even my
sister will say, we'll see
what he thinks. (5115)

* * * * *

I guess because I'm the senior
one living on my side of the
family and they all look to me.
(8227)

The head's sex is another qualifying character-istic mentioned by close to one-tenth of the respondents who named a head of the family. Being a male is seen by many people as naturally paving the way to headship occupancy.

Because I am the man in the
family. (3102)

Age combines with maleness to create strong qualifications to be head.

Because he is my uncle, the
oldest male figure. It was
my father. (3013)

* * * * *

It is a normal thing. The
eldest male is head of the
family. (7222)

About one-sixth of the respondents who named a head mentioned the person's kinship status-- being

a parent or being a son, for example. Most commonly,
being the father was said to be the reason the person
was head. For example, one respondent said her husband
was head,

> Because he is the father of
> the children and grandfather
> is not living. (8029)

Another gave this reason her husband was head.

> Just naturally. He is the
> father and the grandfather.
> (8070)

Sex, age, and being the father combine to qualify
men as heads, as this man who named his father clearly
understood.

> He is the patriarch. The
> father, the eldest, is auto-
> matically head. (3020)

The respondents in the following examples named
their mothers as heads and implied that the status of
"mother" qualified these older women to be head of the
family.

> Through respect she has earned,
> being our mother. (3130)

> * * * * *

> Respect because she is the
> mother, grandmother, and great-
> grandmother. (4115)

What does not come through in the above quotations,
but is important for the reader to note, is that the
predecessors of these mother-heads were respondents'
fathers who were no longer living. In other words,

if both parents were alive, the heads of these families would be the respondent's father, but with the father gone, the surviving parent assumed headship.

Many respondents specified that being the bread-winner entitles a man to be head.

> Because he is the bread-
> winner and the father
> of my children. (4052)

* * * * *

> Because I am the father and the
> provider. (3132)

As the above examples show, earning the family's income and being a man and a father are very intimately connected, both in reality and in respondents' minds.

The following example makes clear that the "rightness" of the man being head has to do with more than simply earning a living.

> He was male. He worked. I
> did too, but I just feel the
> man should be head of the house-
> hold. I handled the money, but
> he was still the head. (6079)

Many of the quotations convey the impression that people often have a strong sense that it is right or natural that a particular person be head. In other words, they perceive headship to be normatively governed --even though the particular rules vary from one resp-ondent to another. It is interesting that some respon-

dents subscribe to these traditional, ascriptive norms,
but also express a certain ambivalence about them or
imply that they consciously chose to allow someone
to be head. For example, the women in the following
examples said their husbands were heads even though
they have a partnership type of relationship.

> By his actions and the way he
> handles things. I trust him,
> although we have 50-50 sharing
> in our family decisions and
> finances. (4082)

> * * * * *

> I just accepted the tradition
> that the husband should be head.
> Actually, all major decisions
> in our life have been made
> jointly. (6114)

Authority stemming from education, occupation,
and financial ability qualify some people to be heads,
according to respondents.

> Because of his special financial
> abilities. (3056)

> * * * * *

> They seemed to look up to him.
> Everybody seemed to look up to
> him. He's well educated. (4001)

In the following example, the occupation of the
husband of the woman named as head was perceived to be
a contributing factor.

> I guess because she is the oldest
> and her husband is a minister. (6058)

Some respondents expressed the feeling that the
head came to occupy the position by virtue of particular

personality characteristics or because of a special

interest in other family members.

> Because he shows an interest
> in all members of the family.
> (8116)

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

> He is an easy person to talk
> to and discuss your problems
> with. (4081)

As implied above, having such personal qualities

results in other family members turning to the head.

> Relatives just turn to him
> because he is a good listener
> and gives good advice. (4072)

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

> I am the oldest son. My younger
> brother used to look to me for
> advice and guidance. (3146)

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

> He's always been looked up to
> by the family. He's level-
> headed, a church-goer, a good
> man. (5052)

Some people are perceived to be heads because

they took on the responsibilities involved. Headship

here is described as having been actively undertaken

rather than received.

> No one else assumed
> these responsibilities
> I guess. (3051)

<div align="center">* * * * *</div>

> No one else wanted the job,
> and I am the most outgoing
> and like to get things done.
> (4008)

The above examples are all cases where respondents designated themselves as head of the family. In addition, most of the speakers were men. The speakers in the above examples all gave what they perceived as legitimate reasons for their occupancy. However, occupancy may be acknowledged by others but not viewed as legitimate. Such is the case in the following examples.

> She had a dominant personality.
> She was outspoken, abrasive,
> opinionated and bigoted.
> (3133)

> * * * * *

> I guess just like any other
> leader. She just said she
> was (head) and that was it.
> (3018)

The two examples above referred to grandmothers. Both were named as past heads. It is hard to know whether the fact that the heads were female influenced the perception that headship was taken and held by force. Perhaps male heads with similar personalities would have been perceived the same way. One cannot help suspecting, though, that if the occupants had been male, the respondents might have said something similar to the following

examples, which referred to fathers.

> When we were children his word
> was law, so I guess it has just
> continued. (4151)

> * * * * *

> Because he was the father and
> he was pretty strict. (5038)

> * * * * *

> Because he was my father. What
> the boss says goes. If he told
> you to do something, you did it.
> (5044)

> * * * * *

The suspicion that headship occupancy by women,

when a same-generation man is available, is seen as

somewhat deviant is heightened by a few more examples.

In these, it is not that the woman who is head is

seen as a bully or anything so negative but rather that

respondents seemed to feel compelled to justify naming

the female instead of what they imply would be the more

obvious male choice.

> My Dad was a quiet person and
> my mother dominated the family.
> (3057)

> * * * * *

> Because my father was away a
> lot. She had the dominant
> personality. (4149)

> * * * * *

> My Dad gave her rein. (3073)

Finally, performing certain activities indicates

that someone is head. For example, as described earlier
in this chapter, making plans and decisions, organizing,
and giving advice are all associated with headship. It
is not possible to tell, from the examples, whether these
activities lead to headship or vice versa.

> I seem to be the organizer and
> everyone seems to lean on me.
> (4141)

*****

> I think because they have always
> looked to me for help and advice.
> (7075)

*****

> Because I make the plans and all
> the major decisions. (4008)

In this section, I have tried to elucidate
accession to the position of head of the family. In dis-
cussing each category of examples, I have necessarily
treated each as a separate facet of accession. In
reality, of course, these facets interact, and indeed
many of the quotations reveal that respondents know this.
Maleness and all that goes with it are strong criteria
in headship selection. Being a man, being a father,
being the breadwinner, being a son, being the eldest--
all of these assist a person into the position of head
of the family. This is what tradition dictates and what
many respondents feel is the way things ought to be.
But "oughts" merely create a framework within which
social reality may be actualized. In the process of

interaction between family members, some women allow
their husbands to be heads because they feel this is
proper, even though the husbands are amenable to a
more equalitarian arrangement. Other women have no
choice but to accede to their husbands' authority.
And still other women manage to seize headship despite
countervailing norms. Some men rule with an iron
hand ; these are the heads whose "word was law" or who
are said to be "strict". Others rule with a velvet
glove; they are "wise" and their "judgment" and "advice"
are "respected."

Regardless of ascriptive qualifications or
norms, some people are perceived as being head on the
basis of achieved characteristics such as education,
occupation, or special talents or motivational factors.

It is clear from the words of respondents that
the normative guide to headship exerts a powerful in-
fluence. Yet it is equally clear that several paths
to headship are possible; the path to be taken is
worked out in social interaction in each family as in-
dividuals make claims and counter-claims and negotiate
toward assumption of headship. As a specific example,
I have shown in this section that the selection criteria
favour the husband-father-male-breadwinner as head.
Even when family members recognize the person with these
qualifications as head, there comes a time when that
"ideal" head dies. At that time, headship either dies

as well or passes to a new occupant. It might pass
down to a child, or it might pass next to the widow
who, though not male, is, after all, a parent and an
elder in the family. The paths succession of headship
travels and the processes which accompany this succession
are the subject of the next section.

SUCCESSION

My goal in this section is to elucidate processes
of succession from one generation to the next of family
authority and responsibility as embodied in the position
of head of the family. These processes may be illumin-
ated by investigating the chain of relationships along
which headship travels, the events which precipitate
the passing on of headship, and respondents own under-
standings and descriptions of the way in which succession
occurs. I will look first at the chain of succession.

Pathways of Headship Succession

All respondents were asked to name the present
head of their side of the family. Those respondents
who identified such a person were also asked to name
the person who was the previous head and the person
they thought would be the next head.[6] Table 8.9 shows
the frequencies of responses to these questions. Most
respondents identified both a present and previous
head, and over a third named a future head.

TABLE 8.9

Identification of Present, Prior and Future Head of
the Family

Percent of Respondents in Total Sample Who Identify
Someone in These Positions:

Identify a present head	63.7
Identify a prior head	55.8
Identify a future head	36.8
Identify someone in all three of these positions	33.4

N = 464

One-third of the respondents named someone in
all three positions -- past, present and future. The
main analysis in this section is based on these 155
families in which heads were identified for all three
points in time. Where appropriate, I also use data
from families with incomplete transition patterns
(that is, past and present, present and future, or
present only) to strengthen the analysis.

Using these data, I investigate transition
sequences in the succession of headship, focusing on
the kinship category of the head relative to the
respondent, and the sex and generational location of
the head.

Using the respondent as the point of reference,
the purpose of this section is to uncover the most common

sequences of succession. That is, using the respondents'
answers concerning past, present and future heads, what
is the chain of relationships along which headship is
passed?

Looking first at the sequences of succession as
identified by male respondents, most men who were cur-
rently head of the family had inherited headship from
a parent, usually a father.

> My father died and I auto-
> matically became head of the
> family. Also, being the only
> son. (3038)

In the future, most of these men felt headship
would pass to a child, but a substantial minority said
the position would pass to their wife.

The most common pattern is parent to self to
child (Table 8.10). This sequence was given by close
to half the men who identified three-position sequences
in their families. Here, the parent who was past head
was far more likely to be a father (being named
four times as often as a mother), and the child named
as future head was far more likely to be a son (being
named four times as often as a daughter). The
typical sequence, then, in the families of male respon-
dents is perceived as being father to self to son.

The other fairly typical sequence is parent
(here it was always the father) to self and passing in
the future to the respondent's wife. Interestingly,

TABLE 8.10

<u>Transition Sequences for Three-position Headship</u>
<u>Transitiions: Prior, Present and Future Heads</u>

Transition Sequence	% of All 3-position Sequences Given by Male Respondents	% of All 3-position Sequences Given by Female Respondents	% of All 3-position Sequences
Parent-spouse-child	2.3	30.4****	14.8
Parent-self-child	46.5*	14.4*****	32.2
Parent-self-spouse	18.6**	1.4	10.9
Parent-spouse-self	0	18.8	8.3
Spouse-self-child	0	7.2	3.2
Gr.Parent-parent-self	5.8	0	3.2
Other	26.7***	27.5******	27.0
	99.9	99.7	99.6

N of 3-position transitions - males = 86

females = 69

*	Includes 8 cases of pt.-couple-child
**	Includes 1 case of pt.-couple-spouse
***	Includes 13 cases involving siblings, 4 cases involving other extended family, and 6 cases involving lineage members only
****	Includes 2 cases of paren-in-law-spouse-child
*****	Includes 3 cases of pt.-couple-child.
******	Includes 13 cases involving siblings and 6 involving lineage members only.

almost the identical proportion of female respondents

said this sequence occurred in their families, in

that they gave the parent-husband-self sequence.[7]

A few male respondents, the great majority

of whom named a father as present head, named a grand-

parent as past head and themselves as future head.

These respondents confirm our sense of headship extend-

ing ever back in lineage time, in the same way that

identification of a child as future head extends lineage

continuity in the direction of the future.

> My grandmother used to be head,
> but when she passed away my
> father became head. Italian
> families are like that. (3152)

The patterns identified by female respondents

are somewhat different (Table 8.10). Female respondents

most commonly said headship was passed down from their

parent (usually a father) to their husband, and would

pass, in the future, to a child (usually a son). The

mirror-image of this sequence, where the present

head is the female respondent rather than her husband,

was less common, but when this sequence of parent-self-

child does occur in women's families there are impor-

tant differences to note. Female respondents who said

they were the present head were equally likely to say

headship came to them from a mother as from a father,

and were more likely to say the future head would be a

daughter than a son. In other words, women who feel

their husband inherited present headship from a parent
tend to view headship as descending in a male line,
while women who feel they themselves succeeded a
parent as head do not show this male-line orientation
and in fact may see headship as passed from female
to female down through the generations. These women,
however, are a minority among females in the study.

The other fairly common succession sequence
identified by female respondents was parent (again,
usually a father) to husband to self. That is, in this
sequence, the respondent said she would be the future
head, presumably after her husband's death.

Some of the older female respondents whose
husbands were already dead, described this process.
For example, one woman gave this description of how
she became head.

> I became head after my
> husband's death. (4016)

Another woman, too, implied this was the
natural order of succession.

> After my husband died, I pre-
> sumed my family would accept me
> as the head. (8009)

There were only a few such instances in which
women said headship used to be held by a husband, now
was held by the respondent, and in the future would
pass to a child. However, this sequence is note-
worthy for two reasons. First, male respondents never

gave this sequence; it is clearly a sequence that occurs
only in the direction of husband to wife to child,
and not wife to husband and then to child. Secondly,
this sequence may be viewed as an extension of the
one in the previous paragraph. That is, if we were
to map out a four-position sequence for these respon-
dents, the sequence would be father-husband-self-child.
Although there were very few cases of this sort, sons
were favoured over daughters as the future recipients
of headship. Women involved in sequences such as those
described above are like "regents" who rule for a time,
after the king's death and until the prince is mature
enough to ascend the throne.

The major differences between men's and women's
perceptions of succession patterns are that women
sometimes see themselves as inheriting headship from
parents and passing it on to children, but men almost
never see their wives as linking past and future in
this way. And, while women quite frequently feel they
will inherit headship from their husbands, men never
feel they will receive it from their wives. Men, on
the other hand, frequently feel headship will pass
from themselves to their wives, but wives almost never
feel the position will pass from them to their husbands.

The "ideal type" of succession transition
sequence would be parent-self-child. This sequence

accounts for one-third of all the three-position

sequences under consideration, making it by far the

most typical pattern. A variation on this pattern,

but remaining close, is parent-spouse-child. To-

gether these transitions involving direct succession

of one generation by another are found in close to

half of the families with these complete 3-position

transition sequences.

The other common type of succession sequence

found in one-fifth of the 3-position families, involves

succession of headship from a parent to male respondent/

husband and then to wife/female respondent. In this

sequence, headship is inherited by a younger generation

tion male, to be passed in the future to a female,

either a female respondent naming herself or a male

respondent naming his wife.

The greater relative importance of fathers than

mothers in these sequences is shown in Table 8.11.

TABLE 8.11

Summary of Most Frequent Patterns of 3-position Transitions

Percent of All 3-Position Transitions Which Are:

Parent to respondent/spouse to child   46.8

father-self-child   22.5)
father-spouse-child   9.0) 33.4

mother-self-child   8.3)
mother-spouse-child   5.1) 13.4

Parent to respondent/spouse to spouse/respondent   19.2

father-self-spouse   10.3)
father-spouse-self   5.8) 16.1

mother-self-spouse   .6)
mother-spouse-self   2.5) 3.1
                                        ___
                                        66.0

N of all 3-position transitions = 155
Note: Transitions to "couple" were coded as to "self."

The implications of these patterns will become
clearer after sex and generational direction are analysed.
Discussion above focused on the kinship relationship
of individuals named as heads to respondents, and on
the succession of headship positions from one kinship
category to the next. However, kinship categories bear
a second kind of relationship to one another and to
the respondent, a relationship that I refer to as gen-
erational . location. While analysis of kinship categ-
ories of those holding headship positions revealed which
individuals take part in the succession of headship,
the analysis below concentrates on the generational
direction or sequence of succession of headship and the
relationship between the sex of the persons named in
successive positions to the generational direction of
the transition.

The great majority of headship transitions
involve a move to a new occupant in a younger generation
(Table 8.12). This conclusion is based on analysis of
all transitions in families with past, present and
future heads identified. Not only transitions between
lineage members, such as were highlighted in the
preceding section, have been analysed, but every transi-
tion mentioned including those involving aunts, uncles,
siblings, nephews and so on.

TABLE 8.12

Sex and Generational Direction in Headship Transitions

Sex of Transition Partners and Generational Direction
of Headship Transitions in Families Where 3-position
Transitions Identified

Sex of Transi-tion Partners	Percent of Total Transitions in Which:	
	Headship Stays in Same Genera-tion as Previous Occupant (22%)	Headship Descends to a Younger Gener-ation than Previous Occupant (78%)
	%	%
Male to male	2.0	42.1
Female to male	3.1	18.1
Male to female	16.3	8.7
Female to female	.3	9.0

N = 287

Uncodable = 23

Note: "Couple" was coded as "self"

Nor is this pattern limited to the high continuity families that have past, present and future heads. When the data base is expanded to include families with two of the three positions, the same conclusion results (Table 8.13). Again, the great majority of transitions involve a shift in occupancy to someone in a younger generation. Succession of authority in the family clearly involves a succession of generations as well.

TABLE 8.13

Sex and Generational Direction in Headship Transitions

Sex of Transition Partners and Generational Direction
of Headship Transitions in Two-position Transitions:

	Percent of Total Transitions in Which:	
	Headship Stays in Same Generation as Previous Occupant. (22%)	Headship Descends to a Younger Generation Than Previous Occupant (77%)
	% of 2-position Transitions	% of 2-position Transitions
Male to male	1.9	41.1
Female to male	2.7	14.7
Male to female	17.7	11.1
Female to female	.2	10.2

N transitions codable for both sex and generation = 360
Uncodable = 71
Chi Square = 62.11, df = 1, Sign. = .001
Cramer's V = .47

The preceding discussion has focused on the
question of how headship transitions are related to the
relative generational locations of the two transition
partners. Another characteristic of interest is the
sex of each of the transitional partners. Does headship
characteristically pass from one particular sex to
another? That is, does headship go from a male to
another male, or to a female; or from a female to a
female, or female to male? Furthermore, if several

patterns occur, under what circumstances is each likely
to be found?

Looking first at data for three-position trans-
itions (Table 8.12), when these transitions are coded
for sex of transition partners, almost seven-tenths of
the transitions originate with a male. The predominant
pattern is male to male, occurring in over two-fifths
of the transitions. About one-quarter are male to
female, with only one-fifth going from female to male
and just over one-tenth from female to another female.
Transitions usually originate with a male and usually
move to a male. When data for two-position transitions
are analysed, the resulting figures are almost exactly
the same (Table 8.13), increasing confidence that the
patterns discussed here are indeed typical for the
phenomenon being studied.

I have shown above that headship usually descends
a generation, usually originates with a male, and
usually moves to a male. I turn now to a consideration
of the relationship between the generational direction
of the headship transition and the sex of the transition
partners. Here, again, I base my analysis on data from
3-position families (Table 8.12); analysis of 2-position
transitions supports the 3-position findings and will
not be discussed (Table 8.13).

When headship succession moves to a male occupant,
it almost always descends to a new occupant in a younger

generation (Table 8.14). When succession is to a female, however, it as frequently moves sideways, within the same generational level, as it drops to a younger generation.

TABLE 8.14

The Relationship Between Sex and Generational Direction in Headship Transitions

Generational Direction and Sex of Occupant to Whom Headship Moves, Based on Data From 3-Position Transition Sequences

	% of Time Headship Stays in Same Generation	% of Time Headship Descends to Younger Generation
Headship moves to a male	8.0	92.0
Headship moves to a female	48.4	51.5

N: moves to male = 188

moves to female = 99

Uncodable: 23

The major pattern that has emerged in the analyses of these data is for generational succession to involve male partners and to descend through the generations. In the minority of cases that involve headship succession within the same generation, the new head is usually a woman.

Summary: The Succession of Headship

The succession of headship, on the whole,
involves the men of the family. As I have illustrated
in Figure 8.1, the most common and seemingly legitimate
succession pattern is from father to son to grandson,
and so on through time. This is how a "real" transfer
of authority and responsibility takes place. In some
cases, women become heads for a time, after their
husbands die. These women are regents - interim or
"acting" heads; the position is theirs for a while on
the basis of seniority and parental status, but since
headship is assumed late in life it is necessarily of
short duration.

FIGURE 8.1

The Pattern of Succession of Family Headship

Main Pattern: Alternate Pattern:
"Real" Head"   Interim or "Acting"
                                 Head

*   Father — — — — — — — — → Mother

        Son ← — — — — — — — — → Son's Wife

        Grandson ← — — — — — — → Grandson's Wife

*The solid lines in the diagram illustrate the general
pattern of succession as most often described by
men and women. Broken lines illustrate alternative
patterns.

These patterns have implications for the
conception of the lineage as a kinship unit. The
main pattern of succession renders men's lineages
more "pure" in the sense that authority is passed
down through the blood line. Women, on the other
hand, incorporate their spouses in each generation
as the repository of family authority.

To sum up, in the long run, succession of
headship is from male to male through the genera-
tions. Women are bystanders in this process. Head-
ship may be held by females on occasion, but is usually
of short duration and on a purely interim basis. This
traditional conception of authority and succession
is clearly supported by the respondents in this study.
From the various sequences respondents described, the
succession patterns can be extended back in time to
grandparents and forward into the future to grand-
children. Regardless of what else is changing in the
modern family and relations between the sexes, for
these respondents aged 40 and older, traditional
authority patterns, to the extent that these are
illustrated by being head of the family, prevail.

Process and Timing in the Passing of Headship

The sequences of succession have been traced
out. It remains now to understand when succession
occurs, and to discover anything further that we can
about the processes by which headship moves to a new

incumbent. Of particular interest here is the choice
of what might be metaphorically called the regent
versus the new king. Or, in more prosaic terms,
what can the respondents themselves tell us about
why women sometimes act as interim heads and why
children sometimes inherit headship directly from the
father?

The data in this section are drawn from an
open-ended question which asked respondents how the
person named as head came to be the head of the family.

In answering this question, a number of
respondents just repeated their views as to why the
person was head, again citing talent, personality,
and interest. This was the case for about one-fifth
of the respondents. One-third cited the kinds of
ascriptive qualifications discussed in the section on
accession to headship. What was implicit in most of
these responses was made explicit by a little over
one-quarter of the respondents: succession usually
occurs in connection with family life course changes
occasioned by death, marriage, or birth. It is at
these times, when the position either becomes vacant
as through the death of the old head, or a new position
is created through marriage or becoming a parent, that
qualifications such as age or sex become relevant.

The most common life course event connected
with the succession of headship is the death of a member

of the lineage. For example, speaking of his mother,
this respondent said,

> My father was head before.
> When he died, she became
> the head. (3118)

Although this was explicitly mentioned by
only 14% of the respondents, the analysis in the
previous section of three-position sequences makes it
clear that respondents perceive headship succession
as occurring upon the former head's death.

When a parent dies, headship must be claimed
or attributed in some way. Formal ceremonies and
established symbols of office may be lacking, but the
transfer of office is recognizable nonetheless.
In the next example, the claim to headship involved
stepping in and showing leadership in the difficult
time following the former head's death.

> He took charge of my father's
> estate at his death. He
> guided and directed the family.
> (3056)

The following example is similar. This example,
like the one above, illustrates how, when headship
was hanging in the balance, a claim by a young male
heir diverted the position away from potential interim
occupancy by the widowed mother.

> Since my father died, mother
> mainly just had me. When
> Dad died, I looked after
> everything. (3115)

Here is the same story, told from the point
of view of a mother who told how her eldest son became
head.

> After my husband passed away,
> he took over everything.(8084) [8]

In the next example, parent-caring by a
daughter may be viewed as a claim to headship. This
claim was supported by the involvement of the daughter's
spouse in taking care of financial affairs following
the father's death. The speaker named his sister as
head, and suggests she had been rehearsing for the
position long before it became vacant.

> She was born into it. She
> looked after my Mother when
> Dad passed away. Her husband
> was the executor of the will.
> (6058)

Respondents who want the job begin to perform
the duties of a head when the position becomes vacant.
If other family members acquiesce, the position becomes
theirs. This is no doubt what is implicit in the
descriptions given by many respondents about "taking
on the responsibility". For example, this woman made
clear when and how she became head as well as why she
considered herself to be head.

> Just my character. I was always
> the one since my father died to
> take the responsibility of what
> had to be done. (6009)

Sometimes, growing dependency of widows is
related to headship passing directly to the child upon

the father's death. In Chapter Three, it was seen
that kinkeeping responsibilities fell on those family
members who have provided a home for an aging parent.
Headship, too, may pass to the child with whom a
widowed or aging parent lives. Providing a home
is one way of claiming headship and may be perceived
by others as a sign or symbol of headship. The woman
in the following example explained why her daughter
was head.

> She provides a home for me
> and is my only child. (6011)

Sometimes headship does pass to the widowed
mother. Respondents may view this as simply following
the natural order of things. When asked how his
mother became head, this man said,

> By being my mother. We just
> consider her head of the family
> now that my father is gone. (4007)

This man too named his mother.

> I respect her. She is the
> oldest one. When she dies
> someone else will take her
> place. (3118)

Many women who are widowed in later life name
themselves as head of the family. For example, the
following respondent said she was head.

> Because my husband died. It
> naturally fell to me. (8098)

Women who are widowed early in life are very
likely to take over the position of head on their

husband's death. The children of these young widows
are not mature enough to be heads. What is interest-
ing in these cases is that, having assumed headship
at an early age, these women are likely to retain it
for many years to come, far into their children's
maturity.

> She became head after my
> father's death, when I was
> only 19 years old. (4146)

>   * * * * *

> My father died when I was
> young, 17 years, and my
> mother automatically be-
> came the head. (5111)

Succession most frequently occurs upon the
death of the former head, but sometimes the passage
of the former head into poor health precipitates the
passing on of headship.

> Because my husband don't
> hear too good now and he
> asks me to do everything
> now as he's getting old.
> My husband was head before
> but now I do everything. (8015)

>   * * * * *

> Because I can't see any-
> thing. She has had to be
> the head for the past four
> years. (5061)

Marriage creates new heads. Marriage was
mentioned almost as frequently as death as the time
at which the present head entered the position.

> When I got married. Our
> religion teaches us that it's
> the man's role. (3002)

> * * * * *

> Through marriage he assumed
> that role. (4092)

> * * * * *

> Through marriage and having
> children. (7150)

Up to this point, I have concentrated primarily on succession of headship in the lineage. I wish to point out here that succession of headship is by no means confined to the respondent's lineage. Siblings are often involved, either by being named as heads or by being included in the family group over which the head presides.

> After my dad and oldest brother
> died, the role fell to me. (7020)

> * * * * *

> She (sister) took over the
> mother role after my mother
> died. (5064)

> * * * * *

> Mother died and her being a girl
> ...In Scottish families the
> mother dominates. (3094)

Overall, two major patterns are clear. In some families, headship is retained by the father until his death, when it either passes to the mother or to a child. In a smaller number of families, people perceive themselves (or, their husbands, if they

are women) to become head when they found a new family
-- a family of procreation. What is interesting is
that, as the data from the oldest group of respondents
indicate, many people continue to see themselves
as head of a family that includes their grown children
long after these children have founded their own
families of procreation. There is no way of determining
from these data whether or not respondents who feel
they assumed headship upon marriage rather than upon
parental death grant the same early succession to
their children. We may assume, though, that it is
unlikely, since so few older people designate a
child as head.

Regardless of whether they themselves assumed
headship on parental death or marriage, none of these
respondents perceived their children's marriages as
creating new lineage heads. This points to a major
conclusion of this chapter: family and individual
life course transitions are perceived as creating
vacancies in headship into which the respondent's
own generation may step. Only death, however, and
occasionally ill health, are perceived as precipi-
tating succession to the younger generation.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have analysed the succession
of family authority and responsibility by a detailed

analysis of the movement of individuals in and out of
the position of head of the family. First, I invest-
igated who respondents identified as the present head
of their family. Then I examined how people become
head of the family, according to respondents'
descriptions of this process. Finally, I analysed
the succession of headship from generation to genera-
tion by analysing data on past, present and future
family heads.

I have delineated the main pattern of succession
of family authority through the male generations,
and have discussed as well a secondary or alternate
pattern in which women play a part. These same
patterns emerge from analyses of several bodies of
data -- data from children, data from respondents on
the present head of the family, and the sequences
identified by respondents when they describe who was
past, present and future head.

As is evident above, it has often occurred
to me, while discussing family headship, to use the
metaphor of the family as kingdom and the head as
monarch. Indeed, the very word "succession" conjures
up visions of kings and crowns. Heads, like monarchs,
are born, not elected. Sex is the chief criterion by
which headship is determined and age/generation coupled
with parental status is the criterion by which head-
ship is rightfully retained. Rules of inheritance,

lines of succession, duties and prerogatives, and a
widely shared notion of the "right to rule" are all
part of the headship phenomenon.

Different monarchies have different rules
governing succession. For example, in some monarchies
a woman could never ascend the throne, while in other
monarchies, such as in England, the rules allow a
female monarch. So too in family headship: different
families have different succession rules. In some
women may become heads, while in others this is not
possible.

As there are different types of monarchies,
so there are different types of family rule. Some
families are ruled by absolute monarchs.

> What he said was law. He
> was the father and we all
> respected him. (4099)

Some have monarchs who share authority with
others but retain the right to the final say.

> My wife and I discuss things
> together, but I make the final
> decisions. (5058)

Just as in monarchies, some rulers have real
power while others, such as in constitutional monarchies,
are solely honorific, so too in families some heads
are figurehead or titular monarchs who may, in fact,
wield little authority but who are acknowledged as
symbolic heads. Widowed women who succeed their husbands
as heads may be of this type.

> I don't know. I guess just
> for respect. She was always
> there. (4146)

Finally, some families have "shared rule", a more equalitarian arrangement where the couple shares authority.

> We've always discussed things
> together and made mutual
> decisions. (5131)

Although headship occupancy is patterned and largely predictable. I showed in this chapter that negotiation was part of the process of claiming and sustaining occupancy. I think the variety of types of headship, of styles of wielding authority, indicates again the range of possibilities and opportunities for negotiation within the broad patterns of headship and succession laid out by custom. How do some family members come to understand that someone's "word is law" while others perceive themselves to share headship authority? The simple statements above, made by the respondents, imply a multitude of day-to-day interaction situations in which the meaning of headship in a particular family is negotiated.

The part women play in headship and succession is interesting. In Chapter Three it was seen that women are the ones who do the work of keeping the wider family in touch with one another. Other research has emphasized the vertical generational bonds between females in lineages. Women keep the kingdom

intact so that men may rule it. Occasionally, women
rule, but this situation is often problematic. Female
heads seem to be perceived as not quite legitimate.
They are more likely to be described as having
pushed their way onto the throne, and to stay there
through some negative personality attribute. Or, they
are felt to have ascended it because the more approp-
riate male occupant, the one who was really the natural
heir, defaulted. Sometimes women become heads late in
life; in these cases, we may guess that the position
is perhaps more h.onourary than anything else.

Finally, these data show that people see their
families as entities persisting over time and encompass-
ing past, present and future generations. Further-
more, it is clear that adults live in several family
groupings simultaneously -- nuclear families, multi-
generational lineages, and larger family groups that
include siblings, cousins, and other relatives. The
meanings and boundaries of these groupings change as
people grow older. Over time, the nuclear family
becomes extended family: people grow up and leave
their parents' homes, their children grow up and leave
their homes. But this analysis has shown that this
lineage group is tied by common authority, held by
the father, and this continues to bind the members into
a lineage unit despite separate households and pro-
gression through the life course.

FOOTNOTES

1   A recent Gallup Poll surveyed Canadians regarding
their opinions on whether or not the father "should
have the last say in family affairs" (Gallup Poll of
Canada, 1981). Agreement with this view was expressed
by only 36% of Canadians, compared with 63% who were
surveyed in 1966. This suggests there has been a general
decline in the traditional notion that the man should be
head of the family. The most recent poll also found var-
iation by age. People over the age of 50 were slightly
more inclined to agree than disagree that the father should
have the last say, while for people under age 30, 69%
disagreed. The Gallup Poll question measured abstract or
general attitudes while my study investigated what people
perceive to exist in their own families. While attitudes
toward the normative aspect of male dominance may have
shifted, it is clear that as far as most respondents in
my study were concerned a man was the head of their
family.

2   The rest were uncodable for sex. Most of these
were cases where the couple was named as head.

3   Of course these patterns are very strongly
related to availability due to death of older family
members and maturing of younger ones.

4   As of the 1981 census, the question asking who
is the head of the household is no longer included in
the Canadian census.

5   Coding of open-ended responses allowed for
both ascriptive and non-ascriptive categories.

6   Both respondents who named a present head and
those who named no present head but said someone had
been head in the past were asked this question. There-
fore, some of the quotations used in this section will
refer to why someone was considered head in the past.
Given the purpose of the analysis in this section, the
distinction between past and present head is not important.

7   I regret that the necessity to describe these
sequences on paper and to keep the respondent's sex
clear makes for such awkward wording and confusing
reading; however, I hope the reader is able to gather
that in cases such as the one just described, both
sexes are actually describing the same sequence. It
is merely that the sex of the respondent/speaker makes
for a different point of reference.

8   This example appears as well on p.302, in the
deviant case analysis of respondents who name a child
as head of the family.

CHAPTER NINE

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE FAMILY

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, following the description of the
family as a work organization, I explore a number of facets
of the relationship between the position of head of the
family and the other five positions in the familial
division of labour.

I begin with a simple extension of the earlier
investigations of prevalence. By adding the position of
head to data on the five positions, I find that nine out of
ten families in the study had at least one position. This
demonstrates persuasively that my concept of the familial
division of labour is a social fact.

I then turn to an investigation of how the position
of head clusters with various other positions in families.
The financial advisor position is most likely to appear
along with the position of head. The kinkeeper, comforter
and placement officer positions all appear somewhat less
frequently than the financial advisor in families with
heads, and the ambassador seems least connected of all to
the position of head. The reasons for the patterns of
clustering are discussed in terms of the nature of the
different positions and the resulting implications for
organizational structure.

The next focus of concern is the clustering of position occupancy. Here, I analyse the data to see whether the person who is head is characteristically the occupant of any other position as well, and if so, which position or positions are so involved. The data show that if a family has a financial advisor, that person is also likely to be the head. Somewhat less frequently, but still quite commonly, the head is also the comforter. Occasionally, the same person occupies both the head and ambassador positions. However, the head is not usually the placement officer and is rarely the kinkeeper.

The relationship between the number of positions in a family and the number of people staffing these positions is explored. In this section, I extend the data base used in Chapter Six, and show that there is a tendency for the number of personnel to increase along with the division of work, but there are indications as well that a few people fill several positions. That is, the number of people is less than the number of specialized work areas. As work increases, personnel tend to take on responsibility for more than one area alone.

The relationship between the number of positions and headship is investigated. Families with more horizontal differentiation are more likely to have vertical or hier- archical differentiation as well. The more positions there are in a family, the more likely that family is to have a head.

The relationship between the number of people in the division of labour and the presence of the position of head is explored next, but consistent relationships are not found. I conclude that complexity of work, as indicated by the number of positions, is more important in predicting headship than the number of people involved in the division of labour.

Finally, I develop a typology of families based on the cross-classification of two variables: presence or absence of a headship position, and a dichotomized variable based on the number of positions in the familial division of labour other than the headship position. This leads to four ideal types of families. A number of independent variables are examined in relation to this typology, in order to identify the distinctive characteristics of each of the four organizational types. I demonstrate that these types of organization are meaningfully patterned by sociological variables. That is, certain sociological factors predict the type of organization that will emerge in a family, as it moves through time, continuing to grapple with the tasks of creating and maintaining continuity and solidarity.

FAMILIES AS WORK ORGANIZATIONS

Families may be thought of as work organizations. Organizations have a purpose, whether that purpose is

to produce and market steel, or to urge the government
to abolish capital punishment or to provide recreation
and enjoyable social activities for members. What-
ever the goal of the organization, ways of attaining
that goal must be devised and pursued. Structural
features such as size and complexity are related to
differences in the way organizations are internally
organized in order to effectively meet goals.

In this chapter, I conceptualize families as
organizations. As such, family members may wish to
attain a great variety of goals. For the purposes
at hand, I define the family as a larger group rather
than as a nuclear family or a lineage. And the goals
with which I am concerned are the achievement and
maintenance of solidarity and continuity. The way in
which the family is organized to pursue and attain
these particular goals is the focus of my interest and
investigation.

The family, like other organizations, may be
analysed according to the degree of structural
differentiation. Blau conceives of organizations as
being structurally differentiated along vertical and
horizontal lines.

> The number of hierarchical levels
> represents vertical differentiation.
> The number of major divisions
> under top management and of sections

> per division are two indicators
> of horizontal differentiation...T
> The subdivision of work into
> occupational specialties is
> reflected by the number of
> official job titles or positions
> ...The basic measure of admin-
> istrative apparatus is the
> proportion of managerial
> personnel...The assumption of
> causal order is: size --
> differentiation -- adminis-
> tration (Blau,1972: 3-4).

Blau relates various types of differentiation to

organizational size, and shows how the size of the

administrative apparatus is related to overall size.

Insight may be gained by viewing this relationship

between size, administration and complexity as, first,

a formal relationship in general social relations. Then,

translating this formal theory into a different sub-

stantive realm, Blau's theory may be applied to the

family. Inasmuch as families are organizations, an

increase in family size should be accompanied by an

increase in differentiation along various lines.

Goal attainment, that is, the maintenance of solidarity,

becomes increasingly difficult in large families. All

members in a small family may gather on regular occasions

almost automatically. No special accommodation

needs to be arranged. A family of ten may gather with

relative ease several times a year at someone's home,

while in a family of eighty there is much more difficulty

in contacting everyone, finding ample space in which to

meet, and so on. Thus, while getting together at
regular intervals may be quite routine for the smaller
group,it may become problematic in larger families and
require that someone in the family take the initiative
in organizing family gatherings. Similarly a position
such as the ambassador is less likely to arise in a
small family. Obviously, the job of attending the
funerals of distant relatives requires that there be a
large enough family to include distant relatives.

While increasing size sometimes creates problems
in a family, and increases the need for a kinkeeper,
in other respects size is an advantage in that it
enhances the opportunity for certain kinds of services
to be available to family members. The greater the
size of the family, the greater the pool of personal
resources or potential supports.

These various positions such as kinkeeper and
ambassador represent specialization in the division of
labour, and as such represent a departmental unit in
the organizational chart of family organization.
However, these specialists are not necessarily in
positions of authority above other family members.
Whereas in a formal organization such as a business firm,
the various departments tend to be arranged in some kind
of hierarchy, this is not necessarily so in the organ-
izational world, and in extension to the family viewed
as an organization, it is not necessary that the various

specialized positions within the family organization

be arranged hierarchically.

The lack of implicit authority in these positions

is evident in the verbatims used in earlier chapters

describing how or why these people named as family

comforters or kinkeepers came to occupy their positions.

These people were perceived as having taken on the jobs

out of interest or concern, and having personality

attributes that especially qualified them for the

particular task. A strong element of voluntarism seems

to be associated with these positions. People may

take on the positions of kinkeeper or ambassador on

their own initiative. The financial advisor, comforter

and placement officer are, to a greater extent, placed

in their positions through the actions of others.

However, such actions are again voluntary. There

is not any morally compelling reason to seek comfort

from a family member rather than a friend, for example.

For these reasons, I consider these positions to lack

any inherent authority component.

On the other hand, a certain amount of authority

or control can be wielded by people in these positions.

For example, the kinkeeper, by holding family gatherings,

may kindle feelings of indebtedness or obligation in

other family members, especially when reciprocity is

not likely. Furthermore, the kinkeeper, by taking the

initiative in kinkeeping activities, sets in motion

processes of social control; once a family reunion has been organized, it is not easy for a family member to refuse to go, nor is it easy to tell the organizer that the occasion is less than appealing. Individuals may grumble in private, but acquiesce in public. Control may be exercised through implicit or explicit reference to a norm that families ought to keep in touch.

Organizational theory provides the hypothesis that with an increase in family size will come an increase in the familial division of labour, with different family members specializing in and taking responsibility for different areas of work in the family. These individuals may be thought of as department managers. However, organizational structure requires some means of co-ordination or control or authority over these various sections. Thus, we expect that over the department heads there will be a president or chairman of the organization. In the family, this responsibility would be vested in the person occupying the position of head of the family.

While I have argued that the other positions in the familial division of labour do not carry with them any inherent authority, the position of head of the family is very different indeed. It is hierarchical by definition, and usually carries authority. Chapter Seven contained many quotations from respondents revealing the authority component of the position, and the importance

of ascriptive characteristics in determining who
occupies the position. The very title of the position,
meaningful to respondents, is almost synonymous with
authority. However, I noted in Chapters Seven and Eight
that sometimes the position is held not through authority
but through the exercise of power, and also that sometimes
the authority appeared more symbolic than anything else.
Aside from these exceptional cases, however, the
position of head of the family is one which implies
authority.

The ideal type of family organization, then,
involves a company president -- the head of the family
-- who has authority over a number of departments. In
this study, these consist of: a department that includes
responsibility for matters of family contact and communi-
cation and other kinkeeping activities; a department
that has responsibility for representation at ritual
events in the wider family, such as seeing that the
family is represented at funerals; a department responsible
for providing emotional support and personal advice;
a department responsible for providing financial advice
to family members; and a department responsible for
assisting family members to find jobs.

Ideally, I would like to argue that the person
named as head of the family should be viewed as directly
above the other position occupants in the hierarchy of
family organiztion and as exercising authority over them.

However, the data in this study do not logically allow
the deduction of such a model. The problem lies partially
in the ways in which "family" was defined to respondents
in the various questions in the interview schedule.
The series of questions concerning the five positions
discussed in Chapters Three through Five defined "family"
as extended family, by directing respondents as follows:

> Thinking about your side of the
> family in the broadest terms,
> including your brothers, sisters,
> aunts, uncles, cousins, grand-
> parents, and so forth...

It was for this family grouping that respondents
were to identify the position in question and from this
grouping that an occupant was to be named. In contrast,
the series of questions investigating the head of the
family defined "family" as the respondent's lineage,
and directed respondents this way:

> Thinking of your side of the
> family as including yourself,
> your spouse and your children,
> and your parents and grand-
> parents -- whichever of these
> people are still alive, is there
> anyone who is thought of as the
> "head of the family" on your
> side of the family?[1]

The assumption that the head of the family as a
position is above the other positions in the organiza-
tional hierarchy and that the person who is head has
authority over other position occupants is thus
jeopardized by this definitional inconsistency. The
head may be head simply of the smaller lineage group;

whether this headship extends to the wider family
cannot be assumed from the data at hand.

This problem is not always relevant to the
analysis. For example, some analysis simply takes the
position of head as an additional position in the
familial division of labour, without making any assump-
tions about hierarchy or authority. In addition, some
questions about clustering make no assumptions about
authority.

Having acknowledged that this definitional problem
may exist, I proceed in the analyses in this chapter as
though it did not. This, I argue, is quite justifiable
on the basis of the findings that emerge in this chapter.
A major finding is that families with heads are also
families with many positions; that is, families that
are highly organized with complex divisions of labour are
also families that are said to have someone who is considered
to be head. As I have pointed out, the two family groupings
in question may have different boundaries and thus different
membership. On the other hand, it may be assumed with some
degree of confidence, I think, that had respondents been
asked about the head of the wider family, the same respon-
dents would have identified such a person. Thus, while it
may be stretching the data to consider the person named as
head to be head of the wider family as well, it is feasible
and defensible to assume that the existence of a lineage
head points to the existence of the position in the wider
family as well. In other words, we may assume the existence

of the position, but cannot assume the identity of the occupant. However, this definitional problem is ultimately only a minor obstruction; with these data, despite this gap, a great deal of understanding about family organization is attainable.

PREVALENCE AND CLUSTERING OF POSITIONS IN THE FAMILIAL DIVISION OF LABOUR

The prevalence of each position was analysed in previous chapters and is summarized in Table 2.1. However, simply knowing the prevalence of each position cannot tell us whether there is a significant "overlap" in the extent to which these positions occur in certain families. That is, if most positions appear together in the same families, then their existence would be less widespread than the data might suggest. To clarify just how widespread these family positions are, in Chapter Six I analysed the data to see how many families had at least one of the five positions, how many had two, and so on. Here, I expand that analysis to include the position of head of the family. When all six positions were included in the analysis, I found that 92% of families in the study had at least one of the head (past or present) or the five other positions, 65.5% had two or more positions, and 45% had three or more. This is the strongest evidence of all, I think, for the existence of positions such as these as a social fact that appears widely in contemporary families.

The Clustering of the Position of Head With Other Positions

In this section I will examine the question of whether or not there are characteristic combinations of positions in families with heads.

This question was approached by determining for each position how often it appeared with the position of head, and expressing this as a proportion of the position's total occurences in the data (Table 9.1). This analysis showed that all positions appear far more frequently in families with heads, than in those which do not have heads.[2] The ambassador position, which had the lowest proportion of such occurrences, was found in 69% of the families that had heads.

TABLE 9.1

The Clustering of Positions and Position Occupancy

Frequency of Occurrence of Each Position with Head, as Percentage of Total Frequency of Each Position, and Proportion of These Joint Occurrences in Which Head Occupies Both Positions

Position	% of Times Position Occurs in Families with a Head	N	% of These Cases in Which Head Occupies Both Positions	N
Financial Advisor	82.7	72	45.8	33
Kinkeeper	76.9	177	17.5	31
Comforter	76.0	130	33.0	43
Placement Officer	74.6	59	20.3	12
Ambassador	69.4	141	26.2	37

Of all positions, that of financial advisor is
most likely to appear in combination with the head of the
family, and, conversely, least likely to appear on its
own in families that do not have heads. As I show in a
later section, these two positions are also likely to
be occupied by the same person, a finding that suggests
the ability to give financial advice may well lead to
headship. I pursue discussion of this later in the
chapter.

The kinkeeper, comforter and placement officer
positions appear in families with heads in almost equal
proportions. The one position which appears slightly
less often than any of the others is the ambassador.
The ambassador position differs from the other positions
in that its occupant performs an inter-family function,
linking the respondent's family to a more distant kin
or friendship group, rather than performing an intra-
family function as is the case for the four other positions.

Thus, the ambassador is less involved in internal
family affairs, and therefore less subject to being
part of an organizational or family management structure.
Unlike all of the other positions, the ambassador does not
need the cooperation or participation of any other family
members in order to fill the position and perform the
relevant activities. It is therefore, not surprising that
the position should be more likely than any of the other
positions to exist in families that do not have heads.

On the other hand, given the differences between the ambassador and the other positions, it is noteworthy that it still appears so much more often in families with heads than in those without. This suggests rather strongly that the tendency of some families to be highly organized is more important than the nature of individual positions in addressing the question of position clustering.

The Clustering of Position Occupancy

In this section, I analyse the data to see which positions if any, aside from that of head, are typically occupied by the person named as head. The purpose is to determine which kinds of activity in the familial division of labour are most associated with overall family headship.

Head and Financial Advisor

It was seen in the previous section that, in proportion to its overall frequency, the position that appeared most commonly with the position of head was that of the financial advisor. Analysis of occupancy of these positions when they occur together in families shows that the same person is more likely to occupy this pair of positions than any other pair (Table 9.1). In families with both heads and financial advisors, the two positions are filled by the same person almost half the time. This finding is all the more striking in view of the fact that respondents were directed to designate a lineage member or spouse as head, but anyone from the lineage or extended family as financial advisor.

The connection in occupancy between these two positions is partly related to the high proportion of males occupying each position and also to the higher proportion of self-designations in these positions than in the others (Table 9.2). These two factors increase the opportunity or the likelihood for the same person to occupy both positions, and help counteract the potential for disparity in occupancy due to the different parameters of the questions.

TABLE 9.2

Percent of Males and Self-Designations as Occupants of Each Position

Position	Males	Self-Designations	N
Head	69.8	37.9	305
Placement Officer	77.2	27.6	76
Financial Advisor	74.1	39.9	90
Ambassador	38.4	27.5	199
Comforter	37.7	37.0	173
Kinkeeper	21.3	23.3	238

However, there are more fundamental similarites between the two positions that contribute to the likelihood of the same person occupying both positions. The activities and responsibilities of the head of the family were described in detail in Chapter Seven. Many if not most of these could as easily apply to the financial advisor position.

To explore this further, I took the thirty-three cases of joint occupancy and examined the reasons the person was said to be head, to see what light this cast on the relationship to the financial advisor position.[3] Analysis revealed that one-quarter of these dual occupants described some attribute or activity that could be considered directly related to being financial advisor as well, over one-third mentioned age, and the remainder gave responses that were unrelated to the financial advisor position.

The respondents who described activities of the head that were equally relevant to being financial advisor referred to handling money, being sought out for advice, having business ability, or being experienced and intelligent. For example, this respondent, who was also the financial advisor, gave this reason for being head:

> I have always handled the money
> and everything around the house,
> so the children came to me. (4069)

Another respondent who occupied both positions gave this reason for being head:

> Age and business ability. (7006)

Heads were frequently said to be people who could give good advice; sometimes respondents specifically referred to financial advice, and other times we may assume this was often implicit as part of the advice-giving activity.

I showed in Chapter Seven that the head of the family was described as someone who made decisions and often was said to have the final say in decision-making. We may assume that economic decisions are included in this activity. In the following example, the person who is explaining why he is head is also the family financial advisor. It is easy to understand how the activities performed as head, and the experience backing up this performance, would qualify this man to be financial advisor as well.

> I guess because I handle the
> financing and am consulted and
> generally have the final say. (3077)

The combination of being a father and the oldest male was the strongest qualification for the position of head. Being an older male was also no handicap in the position of financial advisor (see Chapter Five). This makes intuitive sense since financial knowledge and experience increase with age.

Finally, in the introduction to this chapter I noted that the position of head may be considered to carry inherent authority while this is not necessarily true of the other positions. However, of all the other positions, we might speculate that the position of financial advisor would be most likely to carry authority because of its connection with financial expertise. This authority stems from the possession of special

knowledge and may be viewed as "expert power" (French and Raven, 1968). Other family members acknowledge this person's authority by singling him (or occasionally, her) out from other relatives for advice.

In summary, similar attributes, experiences and activities are relevant to both the financial advisor and head of the family positions. These include financial experience and knowledge, and the ability to give sound advice and make intelligent decisions. The opportunity to acquire and refine these skills is related to age and to being the family breadwinner. Thus, it is understandable that when there is a financial advisor in a family, that person is likely to be head as well.

Head and Comforter

The position of comforter is often filled by the person who is also the head of the family. When these two positions appear together, the same person occupies both in one-third of the cases. While less frequent than the financial advisor/head combination, this is still more common than in the three remaining position pairs (Table 9.1).

In some families, the qualities associated with the comforter position -- being able to provide comfort or give advice -- are the very qualities mentioned as the reason the same person is head of the family. This was true in twelve of the forty-four cases of dual occupancy of these two positions.

In another eighteen cases, the importance of ascriptive characteristics seems to link the two positions. Ascriptive characteristics figured prominently in why people were said to be head. While mentioned less frequently in connection with the comforter position, they still appeared in a number of responses (See Table 4.4).

In some families, ascriptive characteristics are seen as qualifying the same person to occupy both the comforter and the head of the family positions. For example, one respondent said he was head because...

> I'm the eldest male and it's
> just been this way. (7221)

The same man said he was comforter because...

> I'm the oldest brother, you
> see. (7221)

In the remaining cases of dual occupancy, a comparison of responses explaining why the person occupied each position showed that different, unrelated reasons were given for occupancy in each of the two positions. Availability was the most common reason these persons were head, and being sympathetic, understanding, or a good listener were usually given as reasons for being comforter.

The common elements in the two positions of comforter and head have been illustrated in this section. Both may involve giving advice or emotional support. People who are sought out for these purposes have earned

the respect or affection of others. Respect is often

due an older person, especially a parent. Affection,

too, often flows to a parent. The inter-relationship

between these qualities and the ascriptive characteristics

of parental status and age helps explain why ascriptive

features are sometimes mentioned for these dual occupants,

and why the same person might come to occupy both these

positions.

Head and Ambassador

The ambassador position appears least often with

head, but when it does appear in families with a head,

the same person occupies both positions in one out of

four cases. There is some logic as to why these two

positions might be held by the same person. An ambassador,

after all, represents the head of state at ritual or

ceremonial functions when the head of state cannot be

physically present. Here, the head of state, so to

speak, and the ambassador are one and the same person.

The thirty-seven family heads who also occupied the

ambassador position, added these ceremonial duties to their

responsibilities as head. The point is that these duties

are, in fact, quite consistent with the duties of the

head of the family.

Head and Placement Officer

The placement officer was the least prevalent of

all the positions investigated. When it occurs, it

occurs often in families with a head, yet in only one-

fifth of these cases does the same person occupy both positions (Table 9.1). This is partly because placement officers tended to be rather younger than other position occupants, while older age is related to headship. Furthermore, being the placement officer is strongly related to a person's position in the occupational structure, while being head is strongly related to the ascriptive characteristics of age, sex, and being a parent.

However, despite differences in the positions that make dual occupancy unlikely, twelve persons did occupy both positions. These were almost all males under the age of 65. The verbatims explaining why these persons were head[4] contrast with those in the data on comforter/ heads and echo those on financial advisor/heads. Heads who are also placement officers are often said to handle the family financing, bring in the family income, make decisions, and to be capable. In other words, these people are perceived (or perceive themselves) as having a strong economic or instrumental base to their claims to headship.

> I figured I was the guy that
> brought the money into the
> place so I am the head. (5085)

These people, in effect, add placement officer duties to their activities as head.

I think it is important to note that helping people get jobs can be an adjunct of headship. On the

other hand, it is even more important to note that this
does not occur often.

Kinkeeper and Head

The position of kinkeeper was very widespread
in the families in this study, and in more than three-
quarters of its occurrences it appears in families that
have heads. Interestingly, it is the least likely of all
positions to be occupied by the person who is head of the
family. It will be remembered that sisters were very
commonly family kinkeepers, and sisters are almost never
family heads; hence, we would not expect a high frequency
of joint occupancy. It is noteworthy, too, that in the
few instances where siblings were named as head of the
family (see Table 8.1), only one-sixth were also kin-
keepers. This argues against any connection between the
two positions. Someone often does this job, the job of
acting as family kinkeeper, but that person is rarely
the head. People may take on the kinkeeping job on their
own initiative, but this does not normally lead to
their being considered the head of the family. This conforms
to the findings of Bales and Slater in their research on
role differentiation in small groups. They found that
along with the fundamental tendency for one group member
to emerge as a task specialist and another as a social-
emotional specialist, there was a probability that group
members would attribute leadership to the task specialist

rather than the social-emotional specialist (Bales and
Slater, 1955: 298).

On the other hand, it is easy to see why there is
sometimes a relationship. Kinkeepers care about the
family. They try to keep the family together, they
exercise leadership by stepping in when the family
threatens to fall apart, they show more interest than
other family members in keeping people in touch, and
they often inherit the task when the former kinkeeper
dies. This kind of family involvement and leadership
is certainly consistent with the sense of responsibility
for the family heads are often said to have.

Implications of Clustering for Familial Power and Authority

I have shown in this section that there is a
strong likelihood of dual occupancy in the head-financial
advisor pair of positions, and a fairly strong likelihood
in the comforter-head pair. The reasons for these
associations were explored. The relationship between
the various attributes of comforters and financial advisors
and underlying ascriptive characteristics was discussed
and shown to be important. I also indicated that occupancy
in the positions of comforter and financial advisor
is acknowledged by other family members each time they
approach these occupants for help, comfort, or advice.
These family members place themselves in the position
of client, and by doing so contribute to an imbalanced
or asymmetrical relationship. While both parties draw

rewards from the social exchange involved in providing
and receiving advice, for example, the exchange process
gives rise to a potential differentiation of power.

> A person who commands services
> others need, and who is indep-
> endent of any at their command,
> attains power over others by
> making the satisfaction of their
> need contingent on their compliance.
> This principle is held to apply to
> the most intimate as well as the
> most distant social relations
> (Blau, 1964: 22).

This power becomes legitimated as authority if the
collectivity approves of the power and the way in which
it is exercised   (Blau, 1964: 23). I certainly do not
mean to make any extravagant claims about the degree of
power involved in being family comforter or financial
advisor. I simply mean to suggest that these positions
have the potential to endow their occupants with
varying degrees of authority, and that this potential can
be examined through theories of social exchange and
power. Thus, occupancy of these positions may be seen
as highly consistent with occupancy of the position of
head. The data do not really allow for an analysis of
the direction of the relationship between these positions
and the position of head of the family. Whether those
in line for headship are turned to for these services,
or whether the ability to provide these services enhances
a person's candidacy for headship are not questions that
I can answer definitively. It may be sufficient for
purposes here, however, to simply acknowledge that what-

ever the causal relationship, the processes probably
interact. It would certainly seem plausible to assume
that once a person becomes head, providing these other
services helps to legitimate and maintain occupancy.

The positions of ambassador and kinkeeper are
positions involving leadership in ritual affairs and
associational solidarity. While these are very important
to the ongoing family group, they involve little or no
provision of needed services to individual family
members. The occupancy of activities in these positions
may be taken on at the occupant's own initiative, with
or without the encouragement and enthusiasm of other
family members. Although tacit recognition and acceptance
of the kinkeeper's leadership is often necessary, for
example in the acceptance of an invitation to a family
gathering, the power differential in the kinkeeper-family
member relationship is not nearly as pronounced, or
potentially pronounced, as in the comforter or financial
advisor positions. Because of the lack of opportunity
for occupants of the kinkeeper or ambassador positions
to acquire significant authority or power over other
family members, there is no strong tendency for occupancy
of these positions to be shared with that of the position
of head.

The position of placement officer stands somewhat
apart from this general discussion, partly because no
natural clustering of this position was found to occur

either with respect to occupancy or to appearance with
other positions (see Chapter Six). In one sense, the
placement officer bears a theoretical resemblance to the
financial advisor and comforter. All these individuals are
sought out by other family members, provide a service
and thus are on the more powerful side of the exchange
relationship. However, being a placement officer is
less related to being head of the family than is true
for the other two positions. Perhaps this is because
the position of placement officer involves more purely
instrumental tasks. There is no necessary intimacy involved;
respect is not a prerequisite for seeking the help of the
placement officer, nor is it necessarily a product of the
placement officer's activities. For reasons such as
this, as well as reasons to do with age and opportunity
as discussed earlier, placement officers are not often
heads.

DIVISION OF LABOUR, NUMBER OF STAFF, AND HEADSHIP

The Relationship Between the Number of Positions and the
Number of People Involved in the Division of Labour

In this section, I return to an issue explored in
Chapter Six, the question of how many people are typically
involved in the familial division of labour and how this
number is related to the number of positions said to
exist in a family. In Chapter Six, I analysed data for
the five positions of kinkeeper, comforter, ambassador,
financial advisor and placement officer. Here, I include

data on the position of head, yielding a data set with six potential positions. By comparing these two sets of data, one based on a potential total of five positions in the family, and the other on a potential total of six positions, the findings in Chapter Six may be extended and more light cast on the theoretical question of the relationship between the complexity of task different-iation and the extent of personnel differentiation in the familial division of labour.

In Chapter Six, the analysis showed that it was most common to find two persons sharing in the familial division of labour, but it was also noteworthy that one-quarter of all families with three or more positions had three or more different people filling these positions. (These figures are summarized below in Table 9.3).

TABLE 9.3

The Relationship Between Number of Positions and Number of People in the Familial Division of Labour

	Number of Persons in Division of Labour			
Number of Positions in Family	1	2	3 or more	N
2 - 5 positions, excluding head	36.0	50.9	12.4	237
2 - 6 positions including head	16.7	59.3	23.2	302
3 - 5 positions, excluding head			22.6	128
3 - 6 positions including head			32.2	220

When the position of head is included in the
analysis, and results are compared with those based on
a total of five positions, the proportion of families
where only one person fills the various positions is
reduced and the proportion of families with two or more
persons filling positions is increased (Table 9.3).
Looking at six-position data, three-fifths of families
with two or more positions have two people sharing in
the division of labour, and one-fifth have three or
more people. Furthermore, when we look only at families
with three or more positions, one-third have at least
three different people as occupants. From these data,
while acknowledging that the different wording of the
question on the position of head may have maximized the
possibility of naming a different family member from those
named as occupants of the other positions, we may still
cautiously make two inferences: first, the more positions
investigated, the greater the average number of positions
will be in the families being studied, and, second, the
more positions in a family, the greater the number of
individuals involved in staffing these positions. In
other words, as the complexity of the division of labour
increases with respect to the number of positions, so does
the complexity increase with respect to the number of
people filling these positions.

The increase in complexity when data using a total
of five positions are compared with those using six

positions is important in that there is a host of other
possible positions that might exist in families. The
ones investigated in this study do not form any kind of
magical number. In other words, had more family positions
been explored, over and above the ones investigated in
this study, no doubt many families would have had some
of those too.

At the same time, it should be noted that a two-
person division of labour still remains the strongest
trend, and that while a three-person staff is quite common,
it remains very unusual to have more than three persons.
Such cases are extremely rare, whether or not we look at
data for five positions or for six positions. Thus, there
is a suggestion in these data, that there might be a
limit to the number of people typically involved in the
division of labour, regardless of the number of positions,
and that this number would be about three persons in
most instances.

In summary, the foregoing analysis underscores the
findings of Chapter Six that there is a division of
family labour. The work of keeping the family together,
involved with one another, helping one another with advice
or job assistance, and other such tasks, tends to be
concentrated in leaders. This usually means two or
three persons. It is not common for all leadership
tasks to be done by one person, nor is it

common to find many families with many such leaders.

Thus, I conclude that the number of persons involved in

the familial division of labour increases with the amount

of task differentiation. However, there are almost

always fewer persons involved than there are tasks or

specialty areas, suggesting that there might be a kind

of natural limiting of the number of personnel involved.

The Relationship Between the Number of Positions and Headship

In this section, I investigate the relationship be-

tween horizontal and vertical differentiation in the organ-

ization of the family. Horizontal differentiation is

indicated by the number of positions in a family, not

including the position of head. Vertical differentiation

is indicated by having a head of the family, a position

which, conceptually, is above the others in a hierarchy

of authority. Organizations characteristically have an

administrative hierarchy through which control over

organizational operations is maintained (Weber, 1946:197).

In the family, occupants of the various positions carry

out their tasks, under the overall direction or authority

of the head of the family. I would expect a positive

relationship between an increase in the number of positions

at this middle-managerial level and the likelihood of

having a chief administrator. Although I will analyse the

data for the various numbers of positions in families

from none at all through all five, I conceive of a complex

division of labour as being present in a family with two

or more positions. My hypothesis is that families with
two or more positions will be far more likely to have
a head than those with one or no positions.

When data are analysed, the hypothesis is supported;
families with two or more positions are more likely to
have heads than families with one or zero positions.
These data are displayed in Table 9.4. The great majority
of families with high task differentiation have a chief
administrator.

TABLE 9.4

The Relationship Between Number of Positions and Having
a Head: High and Low Division of Labour Families

Complexity of Division of Labour	Percent of Families With:		
	Head	No Head*	N
High (2 or more positions)	77.2	22.7	237
Low (1 or 0 positions)	54.6	45.3	227

Chi Square = 26.45, df = 1, Sign. = .001   Cramer's V = .24

* That is, no present head. Families that had heads in
the past are included in this category.

As I have pointed out before, the inference that
the head of the family stands at the head of the rest of
the staff, those who occupy the various positions, is
perhaps open to question. It could be argued that the
head is head of the lineage and those in other positions

work on behalf of the extended family, and that therefore
the two are not related. This is, of course, a possibil-
ity. However, what is so striking about Table 9.4 is
the strong relationship between the presence or absence
of a head and the number of positions in the larger
family. The pattern is so clear that at the very least
it must be acknowledged that families which are highly
organized with respect to number of positions are also
highly organized with respect to lineage heads. Whether or
not the lineage head would have been named as extended
family head, had the question been asked, cannot be
known from these data. I would hypothesize with confidence,
however, that these same highly organized families would
have an extended family head. Thus, although the occupants
may be different persons, we may take the existence of the
lineage head as a proxy for the position of head of the
larger family.

The reader will recall that respondents who said
no one in their family was currently considered head
were asked if there had been a head of the family in the
past. These data are displayed in Table 9.5 and lend
further support and insight to the hypothesis. It can
be seen that for families with no positions in the
division of labour, few named a past head. In the next group,
those with one position, families without present heads
are more equally divided with about half having had a
head in the past. For these families, it is as though

the remnants of past organization persist into the
present. Families with one position were more likely
to have had a head in the past, even if no present head,
than families with no positions.

TABLE 9.5

The Relationship Between Number of Positions in Families
and Having a Head of the Family: Percent of Families
with Heads, by Number of Positions.

| | | Percent of Families With: | | |
Number of Positions	Present Head	Past Head,No Present Head	No Head	N
0	52.7	14.5	32.7	110
1	56.4	22.2	21.3	117
2	74.0	12.9	12.9	108
3	74.6	14.4	10.8	83
4	87.8	3.0	9.0	33
5	92.3	7.6	0.0	13

Chi Square = 38.93, df = 10, Sign. = .001   Cramer's V=.20

In the most highly organized families, those with five
positions, the one family with no present head had a
past head, and none had ever been without a head.

There is, then, a strong pattern in which highly
organized families have heads, and the tendency to have
a head increases with the complexity of the division of
labour. There is also an indication that the effects
of past organization, even though headship no longer

exists, persist into the present and create a likeli-
hood to have some division of labour, even though it is
very low.

The Relationship Between the Number of People in the Division of Labour and Presence of a Head of the Family

I have been likening the family to a business firm
type of work organization. I have shown that the more
positions there are in the familial division of labour,
the more people are involved as occupants, although
in these data two or three persons were the most likely
extent of this complexity. Also, I have shown that the
more positions there are in the familial division of
labour, the more likely the family is to have a head.
These findings point to another hypothesis: the more
persons involved in the familial division, the more likely
the family is to have a head. This hypothesis derives
as well from the theoretical literature which postulates
that an increase in personnel size (as distinct from
differentiation of positions) is related to an increasing
tendency or need for a hierarchy of authority to emerge
(Blau, 1972; Emery, 1969: 21). This is necessary for
the direction of various activities and to facilitate
communication and coordination. Clearly, if one person
acts as kinkeeper, financial advisor and ambassador he or
she can coordinate these activities without assistance
or direction from above. However, if two or three or four
different people are involved, the need for overall

coordination should increase. The data displayed in
Table 9.6 support the hypothesis to some degree; in
families with two or more positions, when there are
two or more persons involved in the division of
familial labour, the likelihood of there being a head
of the family increases as the number of persons
increases. However, while families with three or more
persons staffing these positions are clearly the most
likely to have a head, families with only one person
involved are more likely to have a head than families with
two persons involved.

TABLE 9.6

The Relationship Between the Number of People in the
Division of Labour and Having a Head of the Family

Number of People in the Division of Labour in Families with 2 or More Positions	Percent of Families With Head	N
1 person	81.1	85
2 people	70.2	121
3 or more people	93.5	31

It is important to note that the tendency for
families with two or more positions to have a head is very
strong, regardless of whether one, two, three or more
people occupy these positions. Number of positions, then,

is more unequivocally related to having a head than
number of persons. Phrased another way, this means the
complexity of the division or organization of work
is more directly related to headship than the size
of the staff, in this sample.

A TYPOLOGY OF FAMILIES ACCORDING TO THEIR DIVISION OF LABOUR

In this section, I develop a typology of families
based on the cross-classification of two variables:
the presence or absence of the position of head of the
family, and a dichotomized variable based on the number
of other positions in the familial division of labour.
The latter variable dichotomizes families into those with
two or more positions aside from the position of head,
and those with one position or none at all.[5] This
leads to four ideal types of family organization. The
first type, with both a high division of labour and a
hierarchy of authority, I call "bureaucratic". The
second type, with high division of labour but no hierarchy
is termed "democratic". The third type, which has a
head in command but a low division of labour is the
"autocratic" type. The fourth type, characterized by
the absence of a head and little or no division of
labour is "anarchic". Table 9.7 shows the distribution
of families in this sample into each of the four
types.

TABLE 9.7

Types of Family Organization

Complexity of Division of Labour	Hierarchy of Authority	
	Has a Head	Does not have a Head
Two or more positions	Bureau-cratic 39.5	Democratic 11.6
1 or 0 positions	Auto-cratic 26.3	Anarchic 22.4

N = 463   Missing Observations = 1

Chi Square = 27.78, df = 1, Sign. = .001
Cramer's V = .24

These four types are ideal types. In reality, no family perfectly approximates the ideal. However, my approach here is to analyse the characteristics of the families in this study who fall into each organizational type. This analysis yields a more general description of the characteristics of each of these ideal family types and enhances understanding, of which characteristics of families in general lead to different types of family organization.

To delineate the distinguishing features of each of these ideal types, I constructed a variable called "family type". Taking each family type as the dependent variable, I investigated the relationship between family type and a number of independent variables. Based on the previous analysis of the familial division of labour

in Chapter Six, and the head of the family in Chapter
Seven, I selected the following variables as potentially
important: age, occupation, education, income, ethnicity,
marital status, total number of generations in the
lineage, number of generations above and below the
respondent in the lineage, whether or not the respondent
has children, number of children, availability of prox-
imate kin, and number of siblings. In Chapters Six and
Seven I discussed each of these variables in some detail.
Here, I recapitulate the way in which each might be
important. Age is related to marital status, especially
for women who so frequently are widowed in their later
years. With increasing age comes an increasing occur-
ence of the death of grandparents and parents, decreasing
family size. Of course, at the same time, increasing
years swell the ranks of the generational levels below
a person, adding children and grandchildren to the
lineage. The number of siblings is another family
structure variable investigated. All of these contribute
different pieces of information about aspects of family
structure and their relationship to family organization.
Furthermore, having kin within reasonable distance should
enhance the likelihood of becoming a highly organized
group. I showed in Chapter Six that family structural
factors such as having proximate kin and number of
siblings were related to having a high division of labour.
With regard to having a head, the number of generations

below the respondent assumed importance, as did marital
status. Age of respondent had an important effect on
the presence of a head. As discussed earlier in this
chapter, the hypothesis was derived from Blau (Blau,1972)
that with increasing size in families there would be an
increasing task differentiation. This hypothesis was
supported by the data. In addition, I hypothesized
that the proliferation of departments in the familial
division of labour would be related to a need for co-
ordination and direction, and would thus be accompanied
by the appearance of a supervisory position, higher in
authority, in the division of labour. This hypothesis,
too, was supported. Family size and structure relate
to these two levels of management. Size, as mentioned
above, is one factor. Proximity is another, for while
geographical dispersion does not destroy family
interaction, it limits the variety of positions possible.
For example, it is more difficult to attend funerals
or get jobs for relatives if family members are widely
scattered.

Occupation was shown in Chapter Six to have an
effect on the number of positions in the division of
labour; higher occupational levels were associated with
greater numbers of positions. As I discussed in Chapter
Six, this confirmed a hypothesis derived from the litera-
ture on social class and the family indicating that
families of higher social classes have a more stable

family life. Therefore, occupation will be investigated
again, to see how it relates to the typology. I expect
to find higher occupational levels characterizing
bureaucratic families. In addition, I add education to
the investigation, for although it did not prove signif-
icantly related to number of positions and having a head,
I want to examine the data to test out the hypothesis
that, significant or not, education should follow the
same pattern as occupation. It may, therefore, be
possible to locate education in the typology.

The analysis and discussion below are pursued
as a theory-building exercise. To this end, I first
take Family Type as the dependent variable, and I
investigate the characteristics of individuals associated
with each of the four family types. My purpose here is
to understand what factors are associated with an
individual appearing in each particular type of family.
Second, I organize a summary of these findings around a
discussion of the characteristics of each family type.
The data on which this analysis is based appear in
Table 9.8.

TABLE 9.8

Percent of Respondents in Each Family Type, by Selected Respondent Characteristics

(a) Male Respondents

Dependent Variable: Family Type

Independent Variable: Respondent Characteristic	Bureaucratic	Autocratic	Democratic	Anarchic	Chi Square Degrees of Freedom & Significance
Married	41.7	30.0	8.9	19.4	11.415
					3
Not Married	21.1	23.7	13.2	42.1	.009
Age:					
40-54	48.0	32.0	5.3	14.7	15.407
55-69	42.3	25.4	8.5	23.9	6
70+	23.6	29.2	15.3	31.9	.017
NGEN*					
1	16.7	12.5	16.7	54.2	26.048
2	35.3	44.1	2.9	17.6	9
3	39.3	28.9	9.6	22.2	.002
4	56.0	24.0	12.0	8.0	
NGEN Above					
0	30.9	30.9	10.5	27.6	11.724
1,2	54.5	24.2	7.6	13.6	3
					.008
NGEN Below					
0	19.2	15.4	15.4	50.0	14.564
1,2	40.6	30.7	8.9	19.8	3
					.002
Children					
0	19.2	15.4	15.4	50.0	21.717
1	40.7	25.9	14.8	18.5	15
2	35.3	32.4	5.9	26.5	.115
3	44.7	25.5	10.6	19.1	
4	40.7	40.7	7.4	11.1	
5+	47.8	30.4	8.7	13.0	

* NGEN is the variable measuring number of generations in the lineage.

TABLE 9.8 (Cont'd)

(a) <u>Males</u>

Independent Variable: Respondent Characteristic	Dependent Variable: Family Type				Chi Square Degrees of Freedom & Significance
	Bureau-cratic	Auto-cratic	Demo-cratic	Anarchic	
AVAILKIN					
0	22.2	18.5	18.5	40.7	23.628
1	32.2	35.6	7.8	24.4	9
2	41.0	25.6	10.3	23.1	.004
3	69.6	26.1	4.3	0	
PROXKIN					
0	23.5	23.5	17.6	35.3	16.254
1	32.1	35.9	6.9	25.6	15
2	45.8	25.0	10.4	18.8	.365
3	45.5	27.3	9.1	18.2	
4	64.3	21.4	7.1	7.1	
5	40.9	27.3	9.1	22.7	
At Least One Child	40.6	30.7	8.9	19.8	14.564
No Child	19.2	15.4	15.4	50.0	3 .002
Family Income					
4,000-5,999	15.4	26.9	7.7	50.0	33.106
6,000-7,999	36.8	15.8	21.1	26.3	18
8,000-9,999	11.8	47.1	11.8	29.4	.016
10,000-14,999	33.3	33.3	10.0	23.3	
15,000-19,999	38.5	30.8	11.5	19.2	
20,000-24,999	57.6	18.2	9.1	15.2	
25,000-39,999	52.6	28.1	5.3	14.0	
Occupation					
2	25.7	34.3	5.7	34.3	16.468
3	37.7	27.9	9.8	24.6	12
4	34.1	20.5	18.2	27.3	.170
5	50.0	27.5	2.5	20.0	
6	40.5	37.8	10.8	10.8	
Education					
Elem.	34.2	26.3	9.2	30.3	4.089
Sec.	37.1	31.5	10.1	21.3	6
Post-Sec.	45.3	28.3	9.4	17.0	.664

TABLE 9.8 (Cont'd)

(a) <u>Males</u>

Independent Variable: Respondent Characteristic	Dependent Variable: Family Type				Chi Square Degrees of Freedom & Significance
	Bureau-cratic	Auto-cratic	Demo-cratic	Anar-chic	
No. of Siblings					
0	27.4	33.9	8.1	30.6	17.868
1	41.7	25.0	14.6	18.8	15
2	55.9	26.5	5.9	11.8	.269
3	27.3	36.4	13.6	22.7	
4	41.2	11.8	17.6	29.4	
5+	40.0	31.4	2.9	25.7	

(b) <u>Female Respondents</u>

	Bureau-cratic	Auto-cratic	Demo-cratic	Anar-chic	Chi Square D.F. Sig.
Married	49.7	26.9	10.3	13.1	22.490
Not Married	28.0	20.0	18.0	34.0	3 .000
Age:					
40-54	49.4	32.5	8.4	9.6	21.179
55-69	43.8	17.5	15.0	23.8	6
70+	28.9	21.5	16.9	32.5	.001
NGEN					
1	33.3	4.8	23.8	38.1	15.930
2	41.9	35.5	9.7	12.9	9
3	38.9	24.8	15.3	21.0	.068
4	51.4	21.6	2.7	24.3	
NGEN Above-0	37.5	24.4	13.7	24.4	2.815
-1,2	47.4	23.1	12.8	16.7	3 .420
NGEN Below-0	33.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	7.296
-1,2	41.4	25.7	12.2	20.7	3 .063
Children					
0	33.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	14.624
1	35.1	27.0	16.2	21.6	15
2	44.8	19.4	11.9	23.9	.478
3	44.8	32.8	8.6	13.8	
4	31.8	22.7	18.2	27.3	
5+	42.1	26.3	10.5	21.1	

TABLE 9.8 (Cont'd)

(b) <u>Females</u>

Independent Variable: Respondent Characteristic	Dependent Variable: Family Type				Chi Square Degrees of Freedom & Significance
	Bureau-cratic	Auto-cratic	Demo-cratic	Anar-chic	
Avail. Kin.					
0	37.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	4.891
1	36.9	25.2	12.6	25.2	9
2	47.1	21.6	14.7	16.7	.843
3	32.0	28.0	12.0	28.0	
PROXKIN					
0	31.0	31.0	20.7	17.2	16.426
1	32.6	26.3	14.7	26.3	15
2	53.3	15.6	8.9	22.2	.354
3	51.6	16.1	9.7	22.6	
4	57.9	21.1	5.3	15.8	
5	33.3	33.3	18.5	14.8	
No. of Siblings					
0	24.6	30.4	15.9	29.0	17.938
1	37.5	27.5	10.0	25.0	15
2	44.9	16.3	14.3	24.5	.265
3	51.7	20.7	10.3	17.2	
4	52.9	11.8	17.6	17.6	
5+	52.4	26.2	11.9	9.5	
At Least One Child	41.4	25.7	12.2	20.7	7.296
No Child	33.3	8.3	25.0	33.3	3 .063
Family Income					
4,000-5,999	18.9	22.6	20.8	37.7	36.613
6,000-7,999	30.0	30.0	5.0	35.0	18
8,000-9,999	46.2	23.1	7.7	23.1	.005
10,000-14,999	39.3	39.3	10.7	10.7	
15,000-19,999	59.4	18.8	12.5	9.4	
20,000-24,999	57.6	24.2	12.1	6.1	
25,000-39,999	50.0	19.6	13.0	17.4	

TABLE 9.8 (Cont'd)

(b) <u>Females</u>

Independent Variable: Respondent Characteristic	Dependent Variable: Family Type				Chi Square Degrees of Freedom & Significance
	Bureau-cratic	Auto-cratic	Demo-cratic	Anar-chic	
Occupation (Spouse)					
2	43.6	15.4	15.4	25.6	13.483
3	32.1	37.5	14.3	16.1	12
4	38.7	27.4	11.3	22.6	.334
5	44.4	16.7	8.3	30.6	
6	48.5	21.2	18.2	12.1	
Occupation (Own)					
2	42.1	31.6	10.5	15.8	9.627
3	38.5	30.8	15.4	15.4	12
4	29.4	23.5	11.8	35.3	.648
5	46.7	10.0	20.0	23.3	
6	52.4	14.3	19.0	14.3	
Education					
Elem.	36.0	30.2	14.0	19.8	4.384
Sec.	43.1	19.6	11.8	25.5	6
Post. Sec.	43.1	22.4	15.5	19.0	.624

<u>Characteristics of Individuals Associated with Family Types</u>

<u>Age</u> predicts family type designation. Respondents under the age of 70 are more likely than elderly respondents to belong to bureaucratic families and less likely to belong to anarchic families. (For Chi Square and Significance Levels for this and other variables discussed in this section, see Table 9.8). They are also less likely to describe their families in such a way as to lead to the democratic label.

Marital status, too, predicts the family type of
both men and women. Married people are most likely to
belong to bureaucratic families, with a secondary tendency
to belong to autocratic families. People who are not
currently married tend to belong to anarchic families, but
they are also more likely to belong to democratic families
than are people who are currently married. That is,
married people belong to families organized under a head,
usually with a complex division of labour. Unmarried people
belong to families without a head, most commonly with a low
or non-existent division of labour.

The generational depth of the lineage is a predictor
of family type. Generational depth was measured in several
ways: total number of living generations, number of
generations above the respondent, number of generations
below, and whether or not the respondent had at least one
living child. The data indicate that multi-generational
families are likely to be of the bureaucratic type, and
families where the respondent's generation is the only
one represented are very likely to be anarchic. Generational
depth is, obviously, related to family size, but it is the
generational complexity rather than sheer size that
increases the likelihood of bureaucratic organization.
I infer this from the fact that while having at least
one child, in contrast to having none, is a predictor
of type of family organization, the number of
children does not continue to differentiate members of

the four family types. Generational complexity should
increase the need for a division of family labour and
coordination of work because it is a type of structural
differentiation. As well, generational complexity
is related to headship in that these relationships
reflect a hierarchy based on age and generation. Such
authority relationships may become formalized in the
position of head of the family. It should also be noted
that families of people who have a living parent tend to
be bureaucratic. In other words, having a living parent
enhances the likelihood of having a highly organized
family.

Generational structure of the respondent's
lineage tends to predict whether or not the respondent
belongs to a bureaucratic or anarchic family. Patterns
are not as strong with respect to predicting membership
in either autocratic or democratic families, but there
is a tendency to "echo" the major pattern above. In
this secondary pattern, people whose families have more
than one generation are likely to belong to autocratic
families and people whose families are generationally
shallow are likely to belong to democratic families.

Number of siblings was not statistically signifi-
cant for either sex in relation to this typology.
However, the more siblings women have, the more they
tend to belong to bureaucratic families, while there
is a tendency for those with fewer siblings to belong to

anarchic families. For men, the pattern is much less
clear, but it does appear that having at least one sibling
increases the likelihood for men to belong to bureaucratic
families. Thus, based on the patterning of responses
rather than overall statistical significance, the data
do suggest that the presence of siblings, or _generational_
breadth in the family, is somewhat related to the type
of organization in a family.

Whether or not a respondent has living children,
parents, siblings, grandparents, or grandchildren has
been shown above to relate to family type. However, the
proximity or dispersion of family members also affects
family type. Although parent-child relationships do
not weaken simply because the adult child is geographically
distant (Litwak, 1960; Morgan, 1975:64), geographical
dispersion might well have a negative effect on extended
family solidarity, particularly as measured by the
presence or absence of positions in this study. For
example, while kinkeepers and financial advisors can
perform their activities across geographical distances,
the ambassador and the placement officer need to be
fairly proximate to other relatives. The same is
probably true for the comforter, though perhaps to a
lesser degree. Here as elsewhere proximity was measured
in two ways (see Chapter Two for a description of these
measures). Men who have at least one child, parent and

sibling living close by are far more likely than those with-
out such proximate kin to belong to bureaucratic families, and
those without these available kin are far more likely to belong
to anarchic families. And, having greater numbers of
proximate kin also increases the tendency for the family to
be bureaucratic, although this pattern is not as strong as
for the first measure. Interestingly, for women, having at
least one parent, child and sibling living nearby does not
seem to make a difference; while women with greater numbers of
proximate kin seem more likely to belong to bureaucratic
families, this is not a clear-cut tendency either.

Family income predicts family type: the higher the
family income, the more likely the family is to be bureau-
cratic. Conversely, the lower the family income, the more
likely the family is to be anarchic. Income distinguishes in
a very moderate way between the other two types: low income
is characteristic of people in democratic families, while
middle income levels are characteristic of people whose
families are autocratic.

Occupation and education did not prove statistically
significant. However, the data in Table 9.8 do reveal some
patterns. Higher education is associated with the bureaucratic
family type. Families of men with post-secondary education
and of women with secondary education or better tend to be of
the highly organized, bureaucratic type. Families of men with
only elementary school education tend to be anarchic in organ-
ization, while women with this same level of education tend to
belong to families which are autocratic in organization. Sim-

ilarly, families of men with higher level occupations
are likely to be bureaucratic, and families of men with
lower level occupations are likely to be anarchic. Thus,
social class suggests, if not predicts, family type, but
appears to be slightly more important for men than for
women.

I turn now to a discussion of the characteristics
of the four types of families. These characteristics
are summarized in Figure 9.1 and are drawn from the data
for my stratified sample, displayed in Table 9.8.

The Bureaucratic Family

The most common type of family organization for the
respondents in this study is the bureaucratic type; the
reader will recall that these highly organized families
had heads and two or more positions. Investigation and
analysis of the variables discussed above yielded a
characterization of the bureaucratic family type.

In this study, people who are married are likely
to belong to bureaucratic families, with a secondary
tendency to belong to autocratic families. People under
the age of 70 were most likely to belong to this family
type. On this basis, in an unweighted, truly represent-
ative sample we would therefore expect to find an even
greater proportion of people belonging to bureaucratic
families.

People whose lineages have generational depth tend

FIGURE 9.1

Ideal Typology of Family Organization

	Families with Heads	Families without Heads
Families with Two or More Positions	**Bureaucratic** Members are married and comparatively young. Multi-generational lineages: living parents, children, and grandchildren. Women often have several siblings; men have at least one sibling. Large pool of proximate kin, especially for men. Well educated. Middle to upper-middle class, especially for men. Men are in the upper occupational levels and have relatively high incomes.	**Democratic** Members are not married. Men are elderly, women are aged 55+. Generationally shallow lineages: members are childless. Low income levels.
Families with One or No Positions	**Autocratic** Members are married. Women are relatively young. Lineages tend to be two-generational. Members have children. Men do not have living parents. Women in lower educational levels, and whose husbands' occupations are service, skilled, or clerical workers. Middle income levels.	**Anarchic** Members are not married and are elderly. Lineages are generationally shallow: one generation. No children or living parents. Women tend to have few or no siblings. Lower income levels. Men in lower educational and occupational levels.

to belong to bureaucratic families. Generational depth
usually implies that the respondent has children and
grandchildren, and often living parents.

Lineages of people in this family type tend to
have breadth as well as depth. Men who have at least
one sibling and women who have several siblings are likely
to belong to families that are organized along bureaucratic
lines.

People who have large pools of proximate kin tend
to belong to bureaucratic families. This was especially
the case for the men in this study, and it probably relates
to the tendency for younger people to be in bureaucratic
families.

More highly educated people tend to belong to
bureaucratic families. For men this means post-secondary
education, while for women it refers to secondary education
or better.

Income and occupation seem related to this family
type for men, but not for women. Men in the upper income
and occupational levels tend to belong to bureaucratic
families. The educational and occupational indicators
thus suggest that middle and upper-middle class people,
especially men, tend to belong to families of the bureau-
cratic type.

Bureaucratic families, then, are distinguished by
family structure and proximity, social class, and age.

They have generational breadth in that members have a spouse and siblings, and generational depth inasmuch as members have children, grandchildren, and often have living parents. Members of this large and diverse kin group tend to live geographically close to one another. Taking income, occupation, and education as indicators, members of bureaucratic families, especially men, tend to be middle or upper-middle class. Finally, this family type is related to age in that it is the type to which younger respondents in this study tend to belong. In fact, all of the distinguishing characteristics of people in bureaucratic families are related to age in one way or another, either through age-related events or cohort effects. For example, younger people are more likely to have living siblings and parents, and less likely to be widowed. At the same time, even the respondents in the study's youngest age group (40-54 years) are old enough to have children and many are old enough to have grandchildren, enhancing the likelihood of belonging to a bureaucratic family. Age is also related to income, in that younger people have not experienced the decline in income that accompanies retirement. Finally, age is related to education, in that the older age cohort had lower educational attainment than the age cohorts which succeeded them (Table C.10).

The Anarchic Family

The anarchic family type, with no head and a low

division of labour, is the conceptual opposite of the bureaucratic type. On almost all dimensions, the characteristics related to a person being a member of an anarchic family are opposite to those which are related to someone belonging to a bureaucratic family.

People who are not currently married tend to be members of anarchic families, with a lesser tendency to belong to democratic families. Elderly respondents tend to belong to this family type, or to the democratic type. Here again, age is related to the likelihood of being without a spouse, as it is to the loss of other kin such as parents and siblings. Thus, this family type is also related to having a paucity of kin. People with generationally-shallow lineages are likely to belong to anarchic families, if not to democratic families. In fact, such persons may represent the only generational level in their lineages. People with no children or living parents are likely to be members of these families, or of democratic families. In addition, having few or no siblings is related to belonging to families of this type for women, although not for men.

People whose income is low are much more likely to be in anarchic families than in any other type. Finally, men in the lower educational and occupational levels are more likely to be members of anarchic families.

In summary, the anarchic family, like the bureaucratic family, is distinguished by age, family structure,

and social class characteristics. Older people, without
spouse, surviving parents, children or siblings, tend to
belong to this family type. In addition, lower income,
and lower educational and occupational levels for men,
tend to be related to membership in this type of family.

Some of these distinguishing characteristics stem
from age-related events such as widowhood and the death
of other kin. Other characteristics relate to cohort
effects. For example, lower educational attainment is
more typical for the older than the younger age cohorts
in this study. In addition, people who never married and
hence are childless are likely to belong to anarchic
families; such people are most prevalent in the study's
oldest age cohort (Tables C.5 and C.9).

The Autocratic Family

The autocratic family is a "mixed" type in that
while it does have someone who is considered head of the
family, it has a very low division of labour as far as
other family positions are concerned. Analysis shows that
certain characteristics that are related to membership in
autocratic families are similar to those for bureaucratic
families.

Married people tend to belong to this family type,
if not to bureaucratic families.

For men, age does not seem to be related to belonging
to this type of family. However, for women, being in the

younger age groups increases the likelihood of being a
member of an autocratic family. These women tend to have
low educational attainment, even though, on the whole,
younger women in the sample had higher educational attain-
ment than older women.

Being in the middle income levels -- for men, this
refers to a yearly family income of between $8,000 and
$19,999, and for women, a family income between $10,000
and $14,999 -- is related to belonging to this family type.
Furthermore, women whose husbands are in the lower (but
not the lowest) occupational categories -- that is, service,
skilled, or clerical workers -- tend to be in autocratic
families.

Whereas having a multi-generational lineage was
related to membership in the bureaucratic family type,
having a somewhat shallower lineage, but still with at
least two generations, is related to belonging to the
autocratic family type. People who have children tend
to belong to autocratic families, if not to bureaucratic
families. Not having living parents, at least for men,
increases the likelihood of belonging to an autocratic
family, as opposed to a bureaucratic one.

The Democratic Family

The democratic family type, with no head but two
or more positions in the familial division of labour,
tends to resemble the anarchic family.

Age seems related to belonging to this family

type. Men in the oldest age group, and women in the middle and oldest age groups are more likely than their younger counterparts to be members of democratic families.

People who are not currently married are somewhat more likely to be in this family type, although this tendency is much less pronounced than in the anarchic family type.

People without children are more likely than those with children to be members of democratic families, again reflecting a similarity to members of anarchic families. However, whereas not having living parents increased the likelihood of a person belonging to an anarchic family, this characteristic does not seem to be related to belonging to a democratic family.

As was the case for anarchic families, here too having a low income increases the likelihood of belonging to a democratic family. For men, having a yearly family income of $6,000 to $7,999 and for women, $4,000 to $5,999 is related to belonging to this type of family.

Thus, respondent characteristics which seem to increase the likelihood of belonging to the democratic family type echo findings for the anarchic family type: being unmarried, elderly, childless, and in a low income group. This family type is distinguished from the autocratic type, and even more from the bureaucratic type, by the absence of children, lower income, age, and marital status.

To summarize this section on family types, the
bureaucratic family type represents one extreme or ideal
type of family organization, characterized by several living
generations, living siblings, and proximate kin. Members
of such families are likely to be married, relatively
young, well educated, and middle to upper-middle class.
The opposite ideal type, the anarchic family, is charac-
terized by members who are elderly, not married, without
children or parents, and, for women, with few or no siblings.
For men, this type seems associated with lower social
class. The autocratic family tends to echo the bureau-
cratic family with respect to marital status, age (at least
for women), and having children. However, persons in
autocratic families tend to have lower incomes than persons
in bureaucratic families, and there are indications that
they also have lower educational and occupational attain-
ment. The democratic family echoes the anarchic family
in that members tend to be old, not married, without children,
and with low family incomes. Respondent characteristics
which differentiate between these two family types are
not very striking. However, women in the study's middle
age group display a tendency to belong to democratic
but not anarchic families. No doubt related to this is
the finding that not having living parents is a character-
istic related to belonging to anarchic but not to democratic
families. Finally, for men, low educational and occupational
attainment is related to belonging to anarchic but not
to democratic families.

CONCLUSION

The analysis in this chapter has clearly demon-
strated that families are organized in different ways,
and that these forms of organization are meaningfully
patterned. A typology of four ideal types of family
organization was constructed. Most of the families in
the study (although not necessarily in any other population)
fell into one of the two "pure" types -- highly organized,
bureaucratic, and unorganized, anarchic. These types
are conceptually opposite to one another. When the
characteristics of individuals falling into each of the
four types were analysed, these characteristics clustered
by family type. Thus, I argue that my typology of family
organization describes an underlying social reality.
Families in the real world, while not completely approx-
imating any ideal type, come close enough that these types
may be considered to be useful sociological concepts to
guide research in this area.

This typology of family organization marks the
conclusion of this study. I began by investigating the
positions in the horizontal division of labour. From
there I moved to a consideration of headship and family
authority. In this final chapter, I have drawn these
two strands of analysis together and shown that they are
very much related in the overall organizational structure
in families.

In this dissertation, I have taken a new road
into the study of the family. I have shown that the
familial division of labour and family headship are
socially real phenomena. Families do indeed have
kinkeepers, ambassadors, comforters, financial advisors,
and placement officers. Furthermore, families have
heads, who exercise family authority and perform a
variety of activities for the benefit of the family.

One important contribution of the present study
is the demonstration of the value in studying these
individual family positions in their own right. Such
study reveals much about the nature of contemporary
families and the work of their members on behalf of
the family. Investigation of the content, succession,
and other dimensions of these positions brings to life
the human side of the familial division of labour.
It is through this kind of study that we glimpse neg-
otiation between members, gain understanding of their
concerns about the family, and view the ways in which
they make active, ongoing efforts that contribute to
the achievement of family solidarity and continuity.

At a somewhat higher level of abstraction, I
have shown that these positions clearly exist as struc-
tural aspects of contemporary families. This is a
structure that persists in families over time, extending
well beyond the life span of any particular individual.

At a still higher level, I have shown that the concepts of the familial division of labour and headship may be used as a basis for analysing the family as a work organization. These two concepts may be taken to represent vertical and horizontal or hierarchical differentiation in the administrative organization of the family. I demonstrated that the organizational structure of families, when analysed in this way, follows the same principles as does any work organization.

Finally, this study demonstrates that families may be characterized according to the overall nature of their organization with respect to vertical and horizontal differentiation, and that this characterization follows sociologically meaningful patterns.

This study delineates both a neglected aspect of family structure and a novel approach to the study of the family. It is my hope that future research will exploit what I believe is the potential richness in this approach to the study of the contemporary family.

FOOTNOTES

1   With the wisdom of hindsight, if I were to conduct
this study again I would ask two questions concerning
the head of the family: first, who the respondent con-
sidered was the head of the lineage, and, second, who
was the head of the respondent's family including aunts,
uncles, siblings, and so on.

2   Cluster analysis failed to show significant
clustering of any one position with that of family head.
The clusters that emerged in the analysis were simply
the same ones that were described in Chapter Six.
Kinkeeper clustered with ambassador and comforter with
financial advisor; these then joined with placement officer
to make a cluster of five positions; finally, these five
joined with the position of head.

Cluster Analysis of Five Positions With Head

Position	Variable No.	Other Boundary of Cluster	Number of Items in Cluster
Kin.	14	25	6
Amb.	17	14	2
Com.	16	18	2
Fin.	18	14	4
P. Off.	15	14	5
Head	25	14	6

3   In this section, I draw on respondents' views
about why the person named was head of the family. No
similar open-ended questions were included in the
investigation of the financial advisor.

4   There were no comparable verbatims telling why
people were placement officers. The verbatims used in
Chapter Five were obtained from the one-quarter of the
sample that was interviewed a second time, and unfortun-
ately were not useful in the present exercise of linking
data for persons who were both heads and placement officers.

5   Here I have followed the technique outlined by
Barton who suggests the construction of such a typology
through the cross-classification of two variables
(Barton, 1955). As he suggests, I have dichotomized a
continuous variable, the number of positions, to create
a dichotomous attribute: high or low division of labour.
A second dichotomous attribute is head or no head. These
two family attributes are cross-classified to produce a
fourfold ideal typology.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Family Life Course Study
KTH Room 627
1280 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4M4
Telephone: 525-9140 Ext. 4833

Administrative Co-ordinator   B.J. Nussey

Investigators   V.W. Marshall, Ph.D.   C.J. Rosenthal, M.A.   J. Synge, Ph.D.

April   , 1980

Dear   :

A research team from McMaster University is conducting a survey
to understand more about the experiences people have at differ-
ent stages in their lives. This study is being funded by the
Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, with additional
support from Health and Welfare Canada.

An interviewer will soon contact you (probably by telephone).
We wanted to let you know about our telephone call and sub-
sequent visit so that you would not mistake our interviewer for
a sales person. Each of our interviewers carries a Hamilton
Opinion Research Centre employee identification card and will
be pleased to show it to you.

Your name was chosen by chance from a listing of residents of
Hamilton and Stoney Creek. We are not interested in identifying
the answers of any particular person and, as such, your name
will not appear on the questionnaire. Please be assured that
your answers will remain anonymous and confidential. No infor-
mation is ever released about the contents of a single interview.

The information you provide will be of great importance to
our study. We think you will find the questions interesting
and pleasant. If you have any questions, please ask your inter-
viewer when she calls.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jane Synge and Dr. Victor Marshall,   Mr. N.P. Sidoruk,
Principal Investigators,   Director of
McMaster University   Survey Research,
                                                Hamilton Opinion
                                                Research Centre

McMaster in Hamilton — Working together for 50 years — 1930 - 1980

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTATION

INSTRUMENTATION

The Generational Relations and Succession Project
used nine different measurement instruments, totalling
170 pages. It was neither feasible nor necessary to
include copies of all these instruments in this appendix.
Instead, I have excerpted from each instrument those
items which I have used in this dissertation. The
question numbers from the original instruments have
been retained.

Included in this appendix are questions from the
Main Interview Schedule, Master Listing, Parent and Child
Fact Sheets, Follow-up Interview Schedule, Drop-Off
Questionnaire, and Child's Mail-back Questionnaire.

The Main Interview Schedule was administered to
the sample of 464 respondents. During the interview,
the MasterListing was filled out by the interviewer, and
a Fact Sheet was filled out for each living parent and
parent-in-law, as well as for each child 18 years of
age or over. A Drop-Off Questionnaire was left with each
respondent to be completed and returned by mail. The
Follow-Up Interview Schedule was administered to one-quarter
of the original respondents who were pre-selected for a
second interview. The Child's Mail-Back Questionnaire
was sent to all respondents' children over the age of 18,
if the respondents consented to this.

MAIN INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTERVIEWER: INTRODUCE YOURSELF TO THE RESPONDENT.
SELECT PROPER FORM OF ADDRESS FROM THE RESPONDENT LIST.

SAY: "Hello (Mr./Mrs./Ms.) _____My name is
_____ from the Hamilton Opinion Research Centre. I
telephoned you earlier to arrange this time for an
interview as part of the study we are doing for McMaster
University.

The questions are about the family life of people at
different stages in their lives. Some of the questions
may not seem to apply to you. However, we are gathering
information from people living in all kinds of circum-
stances.

The information you give us is very important to our study
and we appreciate your co-operation. We are not interested
in identifying the answers of any one person, so your
name will not appear on the questionnaire and, therefore,
your answers will remain anonymous as well as strictly
confidential. Of course, your participation is voluntary
and if we should come to a question you don't want to
answer, just let me know and we will skip over it.

First, can you tell me a little about yourself.

1. How long have you lived in the Hamilton-Stoney Creek
area, that is, within about 10 miles from where you live
now?

( )1. 20 yrs. or more, all my life   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. 10 yrs. but less than 20   ( )8. DK
( )3. 5 yrs. but less than 10   ( )9. NA
( )4. less than 5 yrs.

2. When you were about 16 years old, were you living...

( )1. In the Hamilton/Stoney Creek area, or

        (INTERVIEWER: ALLOW WITHIN 10 MILES OF PRESENT
        CITY LIMITS)

( )2. In a different place?

   2a. Was this...

        ( )1. a city,
        ( )2. a small town, a village,
        ( )3. or, did you grow up on a farm?

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

3. In what province or country were you born?

( ) 01. Newfoundland
( ) 02. Prince Edward Island
( ) 03. Nova Scotia
( ) 04. New Brunswick
( ) 05. Quebec
( ) 06. Ontario
( ) 07. Manitoba
( ) 08. Saskatchewan

( ) 09. Alberta
( ) 10. British Columbia

( ) 11. Other English speaking country
_____

( ) 12. Other country
_____

3a. About how old were you when you came to Canada?
_____

4. Sex of respondent is

( )1. male
( )2. female

5. In what year were you born?_____

6. Please look at this card which lists several terms. Which letter best describes your current situation? You will notice that we have included common-law unions and other living arrangements which some people have these days.

( )02. married
( )03. widowed
( )04. separated or divorced

( )01. single
( )05. Common Law Union
( )06. Just Living Together

6a. Has this been your only marriage?

( )1. Yes   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. No   ( )8. DK
                   ( )9. NA

6b. Have you ever been married?

( )1. Yes   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. No   ( )8. DK
                   ( )9. NA

7. Could you give me a brief history of your marital status. What we are interested in here is the year and the length of your marriage(s) and so on.

a. _____   _____
   year of   duration
   marriage   in years
   or union

Reason for end of marriage
( ) death

( ) divorce or separation

b. _____   _____
   year of   duration
   marriage   in years
   or union

Reason for end of marriage
( ) death

( ) divorce or separation

9G. In this section, we would like to find out how many relatives people have, how far away they live and so on.

Some of the questions we ask may not apply to you but we are required to ask every question.

The following questions are about children.

Have you ever raised any children of any kind, by that we mean all children to whom you gave birth, adopted children, step-children, or other children that you raised?

( )1. Yes   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. No   ( )8. DK
                                 ( )9. NA

Can you tell me the names of these children, regardless of whether you raised them yourself or not? Please start with the first born.

RECORD CHILDREN'S NAMES, AGE AND SEX ON MASTER LISTING

FILL OUT CHILD FACT SHEET FOR EACH CHILD WHO LIVED TO 18 AND OVER ONLY

10a. Let's see, how many grandchildren do you have altogether? _____

10b. How many of your grandchildren are 18 or over? _____

RECORD TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANDCHILDREN, AND THOSE 18+ ON MASTER LISTING

18. The following questions are about your parents (and parents-in-law). Can you tell me something about them?

Are they still alive?

Are they presently separated, divorced, or what?

RECORD AGE AND MARITAL STATUS ON MASTER LISTING

20. Do you happen to have any grandparents who are still living?

CIRCLE LIVING GRANDPARENTS ON MASTER LISTING

21. Can you tell me the names of your living brothers and sisters. Please include half and step-brothers and sisters who were raised with you. Please start with the oldest, and please tell me which ones are older than you.

FILL OUT MASTER LISTING FOR BROTHERS AND SISTERS

BE SURE TO USE ONE LINE FOR <u>R</u>.

RECORD NUMBER OF R's SPOUSE'S LIVING BROTHERS AND
SISTERS ON MASTER LISTING EVEN IF SPOUSE NOT LIVING

33. People sometimes help their parents in <u>special
times</u> or <u>times of crisis</u> - for example, during a period
of illness, a death in the family, moving, a financial
crisis, birth of a child, unemployment, or marital
problems. Over the last 10 years, were there one or
two times in your parents' lives when (you or your
spouse) helped them in a time of crisis?

( )2. No
( )1. Yes   33a. What kind of crisis was that?

                    ( ) Period of illness
                    ( ) Death in the family
                    ( ) Moving
                    ( ) Birth of a child
                    ( ) Unemployment
                    ( ) Marital problems
                    ( ) Financial or business problems
                    ( ) Other_____

( ) 7. Ref
( ) 8. DK
( ) 9. NA

38. In this next section we want to ask some questions
about you.

These questions are about your own health these days.

How would you rate your overall health at the present time...

( ) 1. Excellent,   ( ) 7. Ref.
( ) 2. Good,   ( ) 8. DK
( ) 3. Fair, or   ( ) 9. NA
( ) 4. Poor?

40. Is there any physical condition, illness or health
problem that bothers you <u>now</u>?

( ) 1. Yes   ( ) 7. Ref.
( ) 2. No   ( ) 8. DK
                        ( ) 9. NA

41. How much do health problems stand in the way of
your doing the things you want to do...

( )1. Not at all,   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. Only a little, or ( )8. DK
( )3. A great deal?   ( )9. NA

42. Would you say that your health is better, about
the same, or not as good as most people your age?

( )1. Better than most people   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. Same   ( )8. DK
( )3. Not as good as most people ( )9. NA

47. Thinking about your spouse,

How would you rate your spouse's overall health at
the present time...

( )1. Excellent,   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. Good,   ( )8. DK
( )3. Fair, or   ( )9. NA
( )4. Poor?

86. Thinking about your side of the family in the
broadest terms - including your brothers, sisters,
aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents, and so forth -

is there currently any one person among you and your
family who, in your opinion, works harder than others
at keeping the family in touch with one another?

( )2. No. 86a. Was there ever such a person?

                 ( )1. Yes - Who was that? _____

                 ( )2. No

                 ( )7. Ref.
                 ( )8. DK
                 ( )9. NA

( )1. Yes 86b. Who is this? _____

           86c. What does this person do to keep family
                 members in touch?
                 (PROBE: WRITES LETTERS, PHONES, VISITS,
                  HAS FAMILY GATHERINGS.)

                 _____

           86d. About how many years has this person had
                 such a role of trying to keep family
                 members in touch?

                 _____
                                 years

           86e. Why do you think this person started
                 to do this?
                 (PROBE: PROXIMITY, SPECIAL TALENTS ETC.)

                 _____

87. Is there currently any one person among you and
<u>any</u> of the relatives on your side of the family who
helps other relatives find jobs or get started in
occupations or businesses?

( )1. Yes 87a. Who is this?_____

(2)2. No

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

88. Is there currently any one person among you and
<u>any</u> of the relatives on your side of the family who is
often turned to by other family members for advice about
money matters?

Include investment advice.

( )2. No

( )1. Yes 88b. Who is this?_____

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

89. Is there currently any one person among you and
<u>any</u> of the relatives on your side of the family with whom
other family members particularly like to talk over
their troubles -- someone they can go to for advice and
comfort?

( )2. No 90a. Was there ever such a person?

        ( )1. Yes - Who was this? _____

        ( )2. No

        ( )7. Ref.
        ( )8. DK
        ( )9. NA

( )1. Yes 90b. Who is this?_____

        90c. Why is this person sought out for advice
             and comfort?

( )7. Ref
( )8. DK   PROBE: PROXIMITY, OCCUPATION, SEX,
( )9. NA   SPECIAL TALENTS, AGE

        90d. About how many years has this person had
             such a role of giving advice and comfort?

             _____
                years

90e. How did this come about?_____

90f. As far as you remember, who filled this role before that person (named above)?

_____

91. Is there any one person among you and your side of the family who, more than others, makes a point of making sure that the family is represented at things like the funerals of more distant relatives or old family friends?

( )2. No.

( )1. Yes 91a. Who is this?_____

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

92. Are there any things in particular that you yourself do, in addition to what you have already mentioned to keep the family together?

( )2. No

( )1. Yes 92a. What are these? _____

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

93. Now, thinking of your side of the family as including yourself, your spouse and children, and your parents and grandparents -- whichever of these people are still alive, is there anyone who is thought of as the "head of the family" on your side of the family? A couple <u>can</u> be a "head".

( )1. Yes GO TO QUESTION 93b. AT THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE.

( )2. No 93a. Was there ever a time when someone was thought of as the head of the family on your side of the family?

( )2. No GO TO QUESTION 98.

( )1. Yes GO TO QUESTION 93b.

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

( )3. R DOES NOT UNDERSTAND THE TERM "HEAD OF THE FAMILY" OR CLAIMS NOT TO THINK IN THESE TERMS.

R's comments: _____

GO TO QUESTION 98   ( )7. Ref
                           ( )8. DK
                           ( )9. NA
93b. Who would that be?_____

94. Why is/was) this person considered to be the head of your side of the family? _____

95. How did this person come to be the head of your side of the family? _____

96. Who was the head of your side of the family before then? _____

97. Who, if anyone, will be the next head of the family?

_____

( )1. no-one
( )2. person named _____
( )7.Ref.   97a. Do you think there will be
( )8.Don't know   a head at all?
( )9.NA
                         ( ) 1. Yes   ( )7. Ref.
                         ( ) 2. No   ( )8. DK
                                        ( )9. NA

These next questions are of a more general nature.

113A. Taking all things together how would you say things are these days. Would you say you are...

( )1. very happy   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. pretty happy, or,   ( )8. DK
( )3. not too happy these days?   ( )9. NA

113B. Compared with 5 years ago, would you say you are...

( )1. much happier now,   ( )7.Ref.
( )2. somewhat happier,   ( )8.DK
( )3. about the same   ( )9.NA
( )4. somewhat less happy now, or
( )5. much less happy now?

113C. In the past year, have you been severely depressed?

( )1. Yes   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. No   ( )8. DK
                              ( )9. NA

114. Now turning to your own life, are you currently employed?

( )1. Yes 114a. Is this full-time or part-time work?

           ( )1. full-time   ( )7. Ref.
           ( )2. part-time   ( )8. DK
                              ( )9. NA

114b. What kind of work are you doing?
(GIVE A FULL DESCRIPTION, e.g. SELLING
SHOES, MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIRING, METAL
MACHINING, CLERICAL WORK, SECRETARIAL
WORK)

_____

114c. What are your most important activities
or duties? (e.g. FITTING SHOES, AUTOBODY
WORK, OPERATING LATHE, POSTING INVOICES,
TAKING DICTATION OR TYPING.)

_____

114d. In what kind of business, industry or
service is this job? (e.g. RETAIL STORE,
AUTOBODY REPAIR SHOP, MACHINE PARTS
MANUFACTURING, MEDICAL CLINIC).

( )2. No   114e. Do you consider yourself to be...

( )1. retired,   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. unemployed,   ( )8. DK
( )3. laid off temporarily,   ( )9. NA
( )4. a full-time homemaker,
( )5. a student, or
( )6. something else (sick, on strike, etc.)?

_____
                    specify

115. What has been your major occupation during most
of your life?

( )1. same answer as in question 114.

( )2. homemaker

( )3. different from question 114.

                115a. What kind of work were you mostly doing?
( )7.Ref   (GIVE A FULL DESCRIPTION, e.g. SELLING SHOES,
( )8.DK   MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIRING, METAL MACHINING,
( )9.NA   CLERICAL WORK, SECRETARIAL WORK)

                115b. What were your most important activities
or duties? (e.g. FITTING SHOES, AUTOBODY WORK,
OPERATING LATHE, POSTING INVOICES, TAKING
DICTATION OR TYPING)

_____

115c. In what kind of business, industry or
service was this job? (e.g. RETAIL SHOE STORE,
AUTOBODY REPAIR SHOP, MACHINE PARTS MANUFACTURING,
MEDICAL CLINIC).

116. Is your spouse currently employed?

( )1. Yes   116a. Is this full-time or part-time work?

          ( )1. full-time   ( )7. Ref.
          ( )2. part-time   ( )8. DK
                                 ( )9. NA

116b. What kind of work is (he/she) doing? (GIVE A FULL DESCRIPTION e.g. SELLING SHOES, MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIRING, METAL MACHINING, CLERICAL WORK, SECRETARIAL WORK) _____

116c. What are (his/her) most important activities or duties? (e.g. FITTING SHOES, AUTOBODY WORK, OPERATING LATHE, POSTING INVOICES, TAKING DICTATION OR TYPING)

_____

116d. In what kind of business, industry or service is this job? (e.g. RETAIL SHOE STORE, AUTOBODY REPAIR SHOP, MACHINE PARTS MANUFACTURING, MEDICAL CLINIC). _____

_____

( )2. No.   116e Do you consider him/her) to be...

( )7. Ref.   ( )1. retired
( )8. DK   ( )2. unemployed
( )9. NA   ( )3. laid-off temporarily
                     ( )4. a full-time homemaker
                     ( )5. a student, or
                     ( )6. something else (sick, on strike, etc.)?

_____
                            specify

117. What was your spouse's major occupation during most of (his/her) life?

( )1. Same as in question 116.   ( )7. Ref.
( )2. Homemaker   ( )8. DK
                                ( )9. NA
( )3. Different from question 116.

117a. What kind of work was (he/she) doing mostly? (GIVE A FULL DESCRIPTION, e.g. SELLING SHOES, MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIRING, METAL MACHINING, CLERICAL WORK, SECRETARIAL WORK). _____

117b. What was (his/her) most important activities or duties? (e.g. FITTING SHOES, AUTOBODY WORK, OPERATING LATHE, POSTING INVOICES, TAKING DICTATION OR TYPING.) _____

117c. In what kind of business, industry or service was this job? (e.g. RETAIL SHOE STORE, AUTOBODY REPAIR SHOP, MACHINE PARTS MANUFACTURING, MEDICAL CLINIC)

_____

118. When you were growing up, what was your father's main occupation? _____

     118a. What kind of work was he doing? (GIVE A FULL DESCRIPTION, e.g. SELLING SHOES, MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIRING, METAL MACHINING, CLERICAL WORK, SECRETARIAL WORK) _____

     118b. What were his most important activities or duties? (e.g. FITTING SHOES, AUTOBODY WORK, OPERATING LATHE, POSTING INVOICES, TAKING DICTATION OR TYPING)_____

     118c. In what kind of business, industry or service was this job? (e.g. RETAIL SHOE STORE, AUTOBODY REPAIR SHOP, MACHINE PARTS MANUFACTURING, MEDICAL CLINIC). _____

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

119. In addition to being a Canadian or living in Canada what is your main ancestry or ethnic group?

( )1. British (includes England, Scotland, Wales)
( )2. French
( )3. German
( )4. Irish
( )5. Italian
( )6. Other _____

( )7. Ref
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

120. In addition to (being a Canadian/living in Canada) what is your spouse's main ancestry or ethnic group?

( )1. British (includes England, Scotland, Wales)
( )2. French
( )3. German   ( )7.Ref.
( )4. Irish   ( )8.DK
( )5. Italian   ( )9.NA
( )6. Other _____

121. What language do you usually speak in your home?

( )1. English
( )2. French
( )3. German
( )4. Italian

( )6. Other _____
( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

122. What language (do/did) you usually speak with your parents?

( )1. English
( )2. French
( )3. German
( )4. Italian

( )6. Other _____
( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

123. Was your father born in Canada, or not?

( )2. No   Where was he born? _____

( )1. Yes

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

124. Was your mother born in Canada or not?

( )2. No Where was she born? _____

( )1. Yes

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

127. The next questions are about the education of family members.

What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (If you were not educated in this country please give the category which best describes your educational attainment.)

( )01. No formal schooling
( )02. Some elementary or public school
( )03. Completed public or elementary school
( )04. Some high school
( )05. Completed high school
( )06. Vocational or technical college
( )07. Special diplomas - e.g. teaching, nursing
( )08. Some university
( )09. Graduated from university

( )77. Ref.
( )88. DK
( )99. NA

128. What about your spouse?

( )01. No formal schooling
( )02. Some elementary or public school
( )03. Completed public or elementary school
( )04. Some high school
( )05. Completed high school
( )06. Vocational or technical college
( )07. Special diplomas - e.g. teaching, nursing
( )08. Some university
( )09. Graduated from university

( )77. Ref.
( )88. DK
( )99. NA

133. Could you please tell me which letter on this card
corresponds to your (and your spouse's) total income,
before taxes, in the past year. Be sure to include income
received from all sources: social insurance, pensions,
support from other family members, bank interests,
annuities, or anything else.

A( )01. No income
B( )02. less than 2,000
C( )03. 2,000 to 2,999
D( )04. 3,000 to 3,999
E( )05. 4,000 to 5,999
F( )06. 6,000 to 7,999
G( )10. 8,000 to 9,999
H( )11. 10,000 to 14,999
I( )12. 15,000 to 19,999
J( )13. 20,000 to 24,999
K( )14. 25,000 to 39,999
L( )15. 40,000 or more

That almost completes the questions we have for you, and
we really appreciate your help. There are just a few
more details.

ASK ONLY IF PRE-SELECTED FOR SECOND INTERVIEW

139. In this study, we are asking one in four people
we interview to participate in one additional interview
in about three or four weeks. We would like to interview
you at that time. Might we arrange an appointment now,
or could I call you in a few weeks to arrange to come
back for a last visit?

( )1. No. Record reason for refusal _____

( )2. Yes, call me to arrange

( )3. Yes, make appointment now

        appointment details _____

140. ASK EVERYONE WHO IS NOT RECEIVING SECOND INTERVIEW

Because we are interested in the overall picture of family
life, we would like to be able to contact other members
of your family, such as a parent or child(ren), by mail.
With your permission, we will mail (one of your parents)
(and one of your parents-in-law) a short questionnaire
with some of the same kinds of questions. We would also
like to mail a short questionnaire to your child(ren) if
they are at least 18 years of age.

Just as we keep all that you have told us confidential,
we will keep all such material from other members of
your family confidential too.

Do you think they would be able to answer a short
questionnaire in English?

Name   Address/City/Province/Country

Mother _____

Father_____

Mother-in-law _____

Father-in-law _____

Child Number	First Name	Surname	Address/City/Province/Country or record reason if unable to complete

Thank you. We won't be able to send a questionnaire to
all these people. However, if you are talking with
them in the near future you might mention that we have
interviewed you and that we might be contacting them.

141. As we said at the beginning, everything is
confidential and we never identify any individual's
answers. We are only interested in the overall picture.

We would like to mail you a brief summary report of
our study, when it is available. Would you like to
receive this?

( )1. No
( )2. Yes

142. Our last request is that you fill out a short
questionnaire we will leave with you. Could you do
this within the next few days and mail it in this
envelope? It takes no more than 20 minutes.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

_____
length of interview in minutes

RELATIONSHIP
CODE

MASTER LISTING

01 R.   I.D. _____   1 = male   2 = female

11 Spouse   age _____   name _____

CHILDREN

Name	Living/Dead	Age/Age at Death	M/F

21 _____

_____

(ETC. UP TO 17 CHILDREN)

PARENTS	Living/Dead	00=Dead/Age if Living	Marital Status for living only

40 Mother _____

41 Father _____

42 Mother-in-law _____

43 Father-in-law _____

GRANDCHILDREN LIVING?

In total, how many? _____
Age 18 and over, how many? _____

R's GRANDPARENTS   Living/Dead

46 Mother's Mother _____

47 Mother's Father _____

48 Father's Mother _____

49 Father's Father _____

BROTHERS AND SISTERS LIVING

Name	M/F	Marital Status	Where Lives (SEE CHILD FACT SHEET,C7, FOR CODES)

51 _____

52 _____

(ETC. UP TO 15 SIBLINGS)

IF R. EVER MARRIED, EVEN IF SPOUSE NOT LIVING

How many brothers and sisters who are now living (does/did)
your spouse have? _____

CHILD FACT SHEET

(ONLY FOR AGE 18 AND OVER, INCLUDING DEATH AT 18+)

Respondent I.D. _____ Child's First Name _____

Master Listing Number _____

Where does _____ presently live?

( )1. Same household
( )2. Hamilton or Stoney Creek--i.e. same town or city
( )3. outside of Hamilton or Stoney Creek but less than
       one and one half hour drive
( )4. 1 1/2 hour drive or more but same province:
       specify city _____
( )5. other province within Canada: specify province_____
( )6. other country: specify country _____

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

PARENT FACT SHEET

(ASK ONLY IF LIVING)

Respondent I.D._____ Master Listing Number _____
Relationship _____

The next questions are about your: (Father-in-law
(mother-in-law
(father
(mother

P1. Where does _____ presently live?

( )1. Same household
( )2. Hamilton or Stoney Creek--i.e. same town or city
( )3. outside of Hamilton or Stoney Creek but less than
one and one half hour drive
( )4. one and a half hr. drive or more but same province:
specify city _____
( )5. other province within Canada: specify province _____

( )6. other country: specify country _____

( )7. Ref.
( )8. DK
( )9. NA

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

18. In the first interview, we asked you if there ever was a person on your side of the family who helped other relatives find jobs or get started in occupations or business. Did you say that there was such a person?

( )2. No

( )1. Yes

18a. Who is/was this?

18b. Can you tell me how this person has helped out anyone in the family in this way?

18c. Why does this person seem to help out in this way more than other family members?

       (PROBE: IS IT BECAUSE OF THIS PERSON'S
       OCCUPATION OR FINANCIAL POSITION?)

       (PROBE: DOES THIS PERSON HAVE SOME SPECIAL
       TALENT, SKILL OR KNOWLEDGE FOR HELPING IN
       THIS WAY?) _____

18d. About how many years has this person had such a role of helping people out in this way? _____

18e. How did this person first come to be seen as someone who could be counted on for such help? _____

(PROBE: HOW DID THIS PERSON FIRST START HELPING FAMILY MEMBERS IN THIS WAY?)

CHILD'S MAIL-BACK QUESTIONNAIRE

25. Now, thinking of your side of the family as including yourself, your spouse and children, and your parents and grandparents -- whichever of these people are still alive, is there anyone who is thought of as the "head of the family" on your side of the family?

1. Yes Who would that be? _____

2. No   Was there ever a time when someone was thought of as the head of the family on your side of the family?

      2. No.

      1. Yes   Who would that have been?

      _____

DROP-OFF QUESTIONNAIRE

3. In the past year, how often have you usually seen any of your brothers or sisters?

(Check one)

_____Every day or two
_____Once or twice a week
_____At least once a month but less than once a week
_____2-11 times a year
_____Once a year
_____Less often than once a year
_____Never
_____I have no brothers or sisters

4. In the past year, how often have you usually spoken on the phone to any of your brothers or sisters? (Check one)

_____Every day or two
_____Once or twice a week
_____At least once a month but less than once a week
_____2-11 times a year
_____Once a year
_____Less often than once a year
_____Never
_____I have no brothers or sisters

APPENDIX C

SELECTED SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE C.1

Ethnicity of Sample[*]

Ethnicity	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:			Percent of Total Sample
	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+	
British	37.5	57.6	68.3	54.4
French	7.0	.3	1.9	4.3
German	8.2	4.6	3.2	5.3
Irish	7.6	5.9	8.3	7.3
Italian	14.0	5.9	.6	6.9
Other	24.8	20.5	17.4	20.9
Refuse	0	.6	0	.2
Don't Know	.6	.6	0	.4
N	158	151	155	464

[*]In this table, ethnicity is operationalized as respondent's main ancestry, as measured by the question, "In addition to being a Canadian or living in Canada, what is your main ancestry or ethnic group?"

TABLE C.2

Occupational Level of Sample*

Occupational Level	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:			Percent of Total Sample
	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+	
a) Males (Own Occupation)				
20	10.6	14.0	23.2	15.9
30	25.3	30.9	27.3	27.8
40	22.6	19.7	17.8	20.0
50	16.0	21.1	19.1	18.7
60+	25.3	14.0	12.3	17.3
b) Females (Spouse's Occupation)				
20	16.8	15.0	14.6	15.5
30	26.5	23.7	18.2	22.8
40	24.0	23.7	28.0	25.3
50	12.0	18.7	13.4	14.6
60+	14.4	16.2	9.7	13.4
Not Applicable	6.0	2.5	15.8	8.1
N Males	75	71	73	219
Females	83	80	82	245

* Reclassified Blishen Codes into 5 S.E.S. levels

TABLE C.3

Major Source of Income of Sample

Major Source of Income	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:			Percent of Total Sample
	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+	
Work and Business Earnings	93.6	57.6	7.7	53.2
Investment Earnings	1.8	3.9	16.1	7.3
Pension Programs	2.5	34.4	70.3	35.6
Other Government Programs	1.8	3.3	5.1	3.4
Other Sources	0	.6	.6	.2
N	158	151	155	464

TABLE C.4

Total Yearly Family Income of Sample

| Total Yearly Family Income | Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged: | | | | | | Percent of Total Sample |
| | 40 – 54 | | 55 – 69 | | 70+ | | |
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Less than 3,999	0	2.4	4.2	7.5	13.6	23.1	8.6
4,000 to 5,999	1.3	2.4	4.2	7.5	12.3	21.9	8.4
6,000 to 7,999	1.3	2.4	7.0	10.0	17.8	12.1	8.4
8,000 to 9,999	0	2.4	9.8	5.0	15.0	7.3	6.4
10,000 to 14,999	9.3	10.8	18.3	17.5	13.6	6.0	12.5
15,000 to 19,999	10.6	15.6	11.2	17.5	12.3	7.3	12.5
20,000 to 24,999	20.0	26.5	19.7	11.2	5.4	2.4	14.2
25,000 to 39,999	45.3	28.9	14.0	15.0	1.3	2.4	17.8
40,000 +	9.3	3.6	5.6	3.7	2.7	1.2	4.3
Refuse	2.6	2.4	4.2	0	4.1	3.6	2.8
Don't Know/ Not Applicable	0	2.4	1.4	5.0	1.3	12.1	3.8
N	75	83	71	80	73	82	464

TABLE C.5

Marital Status of Sample

Marital Status	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:									Percent of Total Sample
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	
a) Males										
Single	0	5.3	6.3	2.9	0	0	3.3	3.6	6.7	3.2
Married	100.0	89.5	84.4	88.2	85.7	76.5	83.3	78.6	46.7	83.1
Widowed	0	0	0	0	4.8	0	3.3	10.7	46.7	5.5
Separated/ Divorced	0	5.3	3.1	5.9	4.8	23.5	10.0	7.1	0	6.4
Other	0	0	6.3	2.9	4.8	0	0	0	0	1.9
b) Females										
Single	0	3.6	2.9	0	3.8	0	25.8	8.3	3.7	5.8
Married	90.0	85.7	74.3	87.5	57.7	65.0	25.8	33.3	14.8	59.3
Widowed	0	10.7	2.9	9.4	26.9	25.0	45.2	58.3	81.5	28.4
Separated/ Divorced	10.0	0	14.3	0	11.5	10.0	3.2	0	0	5.3
Other	0	0	5.8	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	1.2
N Males	23	19	32	34	21	17	30	28	15	219
Females	20	28	35	32	26	20	31	24	27	243

Missing Observations = 2

TABLE C.6

Percent of Sample With Living Parents

Living Parent	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:			Percent of Total Sample
	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+	
Father Only	40.1	18.6	.6	19.8
Mother Only	7.0	4.6	.6	4.1
Neither Alive	36.3	72.6	98.7	69.1
Both Alive	16.5	4.0	0	6.9
N	157	150	156	463

Missing Observations = 1

TABLE C.7

Percent of Sample Currently Employed

Sex of Respondent	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:			Percent of Total Sample
	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+	
Male	94.7	52.1	8.2	52.0
Female	54.2	27.5	2.4	28.1
N Males	75	71	73	219
Females	83	80	82	245

TABLE C.8

Percent of Sample Females Ever Employed

| | Percent of Females Who Are Aged: | | | Percent of Total Sample Females |
	40 - 54	55 - 69	70+	
Ever Employed	45.7	39.7	51.8	45.9
N	83	80	82	245

TABLE C.9

Number of Children of Sample

| Number of Children | Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged: | | | | | | Percent of Total Sample |
| | 40 - 54 | | 55 - 69 | | 70+ | | |
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
0	6.7	3.6	9.9	6.3	19.2	19.5	10.8
1	5.3	7.2	11.3	16.2	20.5	20.7	13.6
2	37.3	28.9	23.9	28.8	32.9	24.4	29.3
3	20.0	36.1	28.2	15.0	16.4	19.5	22.6
4	18.7	10.8	14.1	6.3	4.1	9.8	10.6
5+	12.0	13.2	12.6	27.5	6.8	6.0	13.1
N	75	83	71	80	73	82	464

TABLE C.10

Educational Attainment of Sample

Educat-ional Attain-ment	Percent of Respondents Who Are Aged:						Percent of Total Sample
	40 - 54		55 - 69		70+		
	M	F	M	F	M	F	
Some Elementary	10.7	6.0	15.5	8.8	15.1	9.8	10.8
Completed Elementary	16.0	27.7	19.7	21.2	26.0	32.9	24.1
Some Secondary	22.7	32.5	32.4	28.8	26.0	15.9	26.3
Completed Secondary	12.0	14.5	19.7	18.8	12.3	12.2	14.9
Vocational or Technical	6.7	2.4	8.5	6.3	9.6	11.0	7.3
Special Diploma	5.3	12.0	0	8.8	2.7	6.1	6.0
Some University	9.3	0	2.8	6.3	4.1	3.7	4.3
Completed University	17.3	4.8	1.4	1.2	4.1	8.5	6.2
N	75	83	71	80	73	82	464

APPENDIX D

Percent of Respondents Identifying Each Position, by
Age and Sex

Position	Age of Respondent									
	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65-69	70-74	75-79	80+	All
Kin.										
Males	47.8	42.1	59.4	48.6	61.9	50.0	46.7	37.0	40.0	48.6
Females	65.0	60.7	45.7	74.2	53.8	42.9	67.7	40.0	32.1	53.9
All	55.8	53.2	52.2	60.6	57.4	45.9	57.4	38.5	34.9	51.4
Amb.										
Males	43.5	31.6	59.4	34.3	28.6	31.3	56.7	33.3	33.3	40.8
Females	45.0	57.1	48.6	67.7	38.5	38.1	51.6	20.0	28.6	44.9
All	44.2	46.8	53.7	50.0	34.0	35.1	54.1	26.9	30.2	43.0
Comf.										
Males	47.8	36.8	46.9	31.4	47.6	18.8	36.7	29.6	13.3	35.8
Females	45.0	42.9	40.0	45.2	46.2	38.1	45.2	28.0	17.9	38.8
All	46.5	40.4	43.3	37.9	46.8	29.7	41.0	28.8	16.3	37.4
Fin.Adv.										
Males	21.7	15.8	18.8	17.1	28.6	12.5	20.0	14.8	20.0	18.8
Females	20.0	25.0	28.6	25.3	23.1	14.3	16.1	12.0	10.7	20.0
All	20.9	21.3	23.9	21.2	25.5	13.5	18.0	13.5	14.0	19.4
Pl. Off.										
Males	8.7	31.6	18.8	20.0	33.3	6.3	20.0	3.7	0	16.5
Females	20.0	25.0	17.1	16.1	15.4	9.5	19.4	8.0	14.3	16.3
All	14.0	27.7	17.9	18.2	23.4	8.1	19.7	5.8	9.3	16.4
N Males	23	19	30	34	20	15	30	27	14	
Females	20	28	35	31	26	21	31	25	28	
All	43	47	67	66	47	37	61	52	43	

Missing Observations = 1

REFERENCES

Abu-Laban, Sharon
    1978   "The Family Life of Older Canadians."
                Canadian Home Economics Journal
                (January):16-25.

Adams, Bert
    1968   Kinship in an Urban Setting. Chicago:
                Markham.

Albrecht, Ruth
    1962   "The Role of Older People in Family
                Rituals." Pp.486-491 in Clark Tibbits
                and Wilma Donahue (eds.), Social and
                Psychological Aspects of Aging. New
                York: Columbia University Press.

Aldous, Joan
    1965   "The Consequences of Intergenerational
                Continuity." Journal of Marriage and
                the Family 27:462-468.

Aldous, Joan
    1967   "Intergenerational Visiting Patterns:
                Variation in Boundary Maintenance as
                an Explanation." Family Process 6:235-251.

Aldous, Joan, and R. Hill
    1965   "Social Cohesion, Lineage Type, and
                Intergenerational Transmission."
                Social Forces 43:471-482.

Atchley, Robert C.
    1972   The Social Forces in Later Life.
                Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing
                Company.

Ayoub, Millicent R.
    1966   "The Family Reunion." Ethnology 5:
                415-433.

Bales, Robert F., and Philip Slater
    1955   "Role Differentiation in Small Decision-
                Making Groups." Pp.259-306 in Talcott
                Parsons and Robert F. Bales, Family
                Socialization and Interaction Process.
                New York: Free Press.

Ballweg, John A.
    1967   "Resolution of Conjugal Role Adjustment
             after Retirement." <u>Journal of Marriage
             and the Family</u> 29:277-281.

Barber, Bernard
    1957   <u>Social Stratification. A Comparative
             Analysis of Structure and Process</u>.
             New York and Burlingame: Harcourt,
             Brace and World, Inc.

Barton, Allen H.
    1955   "The Concept of Property-Space in Social
             Research." Pp.40-53 in Paul L. Lazarsfeld
             and Morris Rosenberg (eds.), <u>The Language
             of Social Research</u>. New York: The Free
             Press.

Bengtson, Vern L.
    1971   "Inter-age Differences in Perception and
             the Generation Gap." <u>Gerontologist</u>, Part
             II:85-90.

Bengtson, Vern L.
    1975   "Generation and Family Effects in
             Value Socialization." <u>American Sociol-
             ogical Review</u> 40:358-371.

Bengtson, Vern L.
    1979   "Research Perspectives on Intergenerational
             Interaction." Pp.37-57 in Pauline K.
             Ragan (ed.), <u>Aging Parents</u>. The Ethel
             Percy Andrus Gerontology Center: The
             University of Southern California Press.

Bengtson, Vern L., and J.A. Kuypers
    1971   "Generational Differences and the
             Developmental Stake." <u>Aging and Human
             Development</u> 2:249-260.

Bengtson, Vern L., and K.D. Black
    1973   "Intergenerational Relations and
             Continuities in Socialization." Pp.
             208-234 in P. Baltes and K. Schaie
             (eds.), <u>Life-Span Developmental Psychology</u>.

Bengtson, Vern L.,and N. Cutler
    1976   "Generations and Intergenerational
             Relations: Perspectives on Age Groups and
             Social Change." Pp.130-159 in R.H.
             Binstock and E. Shanas (eds.), <u>Handbook
             of Aging and the Social Sciences</u>. New York,
             Cincinnati, Atlanta, Dallas, San Francisco:
             Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Bengtson, Vern L., Edward B. Olander,and Anees A. Haddad
    1976   "The 'Generation Gap'and Aging Family
                Members: Toward a Conceptual Model."
                Pp.237-263 in Jaber F. Gubrium (ed.),
                Time Roles and Self in Old Age. New
                York: Human Sciences Press.

Bengtson, Vern L.,and S. Schrader
    1981   "Parent-Child Relations: The Measurement
forthcoming   of Inter-Generational Interaction and
                Affect in Old Age." In David J. Mangen
                and Warren Peterson (eds.), Research
                Instruments in Social Gerontology.
                Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Berardo, Felix M.
    1970   "Survivorship and Social Isolation:
                The Case of the Aged Widower." Family
                Coordinator 19:11-25.

Berger, Peter L.,and H. Kellner
    1964   "Marriage and the Construction of Reality."
                Diogene 46:3-32.

Berger, Peter,and Thomas Luckmann
    1967   The Social Construction of Reality.
                Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Blau, Peter M.
    1964   Exchange and Power in Social Life. New
                York, London, Sydney: John Wiley and
                Sons, Inc.

Blau , Peter M.
    1972   "Interdependency and Hierarchy in
                Organizations." Social Science Research
                1:1-24.

Blood, R.O., Jr., and D.M. Wolfe
    1960   Husbands and Wives. New York: The Free Press.

Bossard, James H., and Eleanor S. Boll
    1950   Ritual in Family Living. Philadelphia:
                University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bott, Elizabeth
    1957   Family and Social Network. New York:
                The Free Press.

Brown, David G.
    1965   The Market for College Teachers. Chapel
                Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Brown, James S., Harry K. Schwartzweller and Joseph Maangalam
    1968   "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem
                Family." Pp.150-158 in N. Bell and E. Vogel
                (eds.), A Modern Introduction to the Family,
                Revised Edition. New York: The Free Press.

Burgess, E.W.
    1960   "Aging in Western Culture." Pp.3-28 in
                E.W. Burgess (ed.), Aging in Western
                Societies: A Comparative Survey. Chicago:
                University of Chicago Press.

Butler, Robert N.
    1963   "The Life Review: An Interpretation of
                Reminiscence in the Aged." Psychiatry,
                Journal for the Study of Interpersonal
                Processes 26:65-76.

Clark, Margaret,and Barbara G. Anderson
    1967   Culture and Aging. Springfield, Illinois:
                Charles C. Thomas.

Clement, Wallace
    1975   The Canadian Corporate Elite. Toronto:
                McLelland and Stewart.

Cumming, Elaine, and David Schneider
    1961   "Sibling Solidarity: A Property of American
                Kinship." American Anthropologist 63:
                498-507.

Dawe, Alan
    1970   "The Two Sociologies." British Journal
                of Sociology 21:207-218.

de Schweinitz, Dorothea
    1932   How Workers Find Jobs. Philadelphia:
                University of Pennsylvania Press.

Denton, Frank T.,and Byron G. Spencer
    1979   "Some Economic and Demographic Implications
                of Future Population Change." Journal of
                Canadian Studies 14:81-93.

Dowd, James J.
    1980   Stratification Among the Aged. Monterey,
                California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Durkheim, Emile
    1961   The Elementary Form of Religious Life.
                New York: Collier Books. (Originally
                published 1912)

Eisenstadt, Samuel N.
1956   _From Generation to Generation_. Glencoe,
             Illinois: The Free Press.

Emery, James C.
1969   _Organizational Planning and Control
             Systems_. New York: The Macmillan
             Company.

Faris, Robert E.L.
1947   "Interaction of Generations and Family
             Stability." _American Sociological
             Review_ 12:159-164.

Feldman, Harold
1964   Development of the Husband-Wife Relation-
             ship. Preliminary Report. Cornell Studies
             of Marital Development: Study in the
             Transition to Parenthood. Department of
             Child Development and Family Relationships.
             New York State College of Home Economics
             Cornell University.

Fischer, David Hackett
1978   _Growing Old in America_. Oxford, London,
             New York: Oxford University Press.

French, John R.P., and Bertram Raven
1968   "The Bases of Social Power." Pp.259-
             269 in D. Cartwright and A. Zander (eds.),
             Group Dynamics, 3rd Edition. New York:
             Harper and Row.

Friedmann, Eugene A., and Harold L. Orbach
1974   "Adjustment to Retirement." Pp.609-
             645 in Silvano Arieti (ed.), _American
             Handbook of Psychiatry, 2nd Edition_,
             Volume One. New York: Basic Books.

Gagan, David
1975-76   "The Prose of Life: Literary Reflections
             of the Family, Individual Experiences
             and Social Structure in Nineteenth-
             Century Canada. _Journal of Social
             History_ 9:367-381.

Gallup Poll of Canada
1966   Toronto: The Canadian Gallup Poll
             Limited.

Gallup Poll of Canada
     1981   Cited in Hamilton Spectator, August
                   15, 1981.

Gans, Herbert J.
     1962   The Urban Villagers. New York: The
                   Free Press.

Gillespie, Dair L.
     1971   "Who Has the Power? The Marital Struggle."
                   Journal of Marriage and the Family   :445-
                   458.

Glazer, N., and H. Waehrer (eds.)
     1977   Woman in a Man-Made World. Chicago:
                   Rand McNally.

Glick, Paul C.
     1947   "The Family Cycle." American Sociolog-
                   ical Review 12:164-174.

Goffman, Erving
     1959   The Presentation of Self in Everyday
                   Life. Garden City: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, Erving
     1961   Encounters. Indianapolis and New York:
                   Bobbs-Merrill.

Goffman, Erving
     1970   Strategic Interaction. Oxford: Basil
                   Blackwell.

Goode, William J.
     1964   The Family. Englewood Cliffs, New
                   Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Goody, Jack
     1962   Death, Property and the Ancestors.
                   Stanford, California: Stanford Univer-
                   sity Press.

Goyder, J.C.,and J.E. Curtis
     1977   "Occupational Mobility in Canada Over
                   Four Generations." The Canadian Review
                   of Sociology and Anthropology 14:303-
                   319.

Granovetter, Mark S.
     1973   "The Strength of Weak Ties." American
                   Journal of Sociology 78:1360-1380.

Granovetter, Mark S.
    1974   Getting a Job. Cambridge, Mass.:
                Harvard University Press.

Hareven, Tamara K.
    1977   "Family Time and Historical Time."
                Daedalus 106:57-71.

Hartmann, Heidi
    1976   "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Seg-
                regation." Signs: Journal of Women in
                Culture and Society 1:137-169.

Henry, Jules
    1971   Pathways to Madness. New York: Random
                House.

Hill, Reuben, N. Foote, J. Aldous, B. Carlson, and R.
MacDonald
    1970   Family Development in Three Generations.
                Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co.

Howard, Jane
    1978   Families. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Keating, Nora C., and Priscilla Cole
    1980   "What Do I Do With Him 24 Hours a Day?
                Changes in the Housewife Role After
                Retirement." The Gerontologist 20:84-89.

Kenkel, William F.
    1977   The Family in Perspective. 4th Edition.
                Santa Monica, California: Goodyear
                Publishing Co., Inc.

Kerckhoff, A.C.
    1966   "Family Patterns and Morale in Retire-
                ment." Pp.173-192 in I.H. Simpson and
                J.C. McKinney (eds.), Social Aspects
                of Aging. Durham, North Carolina:
                Duke University Press.

Kett, Joseph
    1971   "Growing Up in Rural New England,
                1800-1840." Pp.1-16 in Tamara K. Hareven
                (ed.), Anonymous Americans. Explorations
                in Nineteenth-Century Social History.
                Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-
                Hall.

Kohn, Melvin
    1969   Class and Conformity. A Study in Values.
                Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press.

Komarovsky, M.
   1964   Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Random House.

Kuhn, Thomas
   1962   The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Laing, R.D., and A. Esterson
   1970   Sanity, Madness and the Family. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Lasch, Christopher
   1977   Haven in a Heartless World: The Family Besieged. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Laslett, Peter
   1971   The World We Have Lost, 2nd Edition. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Lee, Gary
   1980   "Kinship in the Seventies: A Decade Review of Research and Theory." Journal of Marriage and the Family 42:923-934.

Leichter, Hope, and William E. Mitchell
   1967   Kinship and Casework. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lipman, Aaron
   1960   "Marital Roles of the Retired Aged." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 6:192-195.

Lipman, Aaron
   1961   "Role Conceptions and Morale of Couples in Retirement." Journal of Gerontology 16: 267-271.

Litman, T.J.
   1971   "Health Care and the Family: A Three-Generational Analysis." Medical Care 9: 67-81.

Litwak, Eugene
   1960   "Geographical Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review 25:385-394.

Litwak, Eugene
   1965   "Extended Kin Relations in an Industrial Democratic Society." In E. Shanas and G. Streib (eds.), Social Structure and the Family: Generational Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Lopata, Helena
  1973   Widowhood in an American City. Cambridge,
             Mass.: Schenkman.

Lopata, Helena
  1979   Women as Widows: Support Systems. New
             York: Elsevier.

Lowenthal, Marjorie Fiske,and Clayton Haven
  1968   "Interaction and Adaptation: Intimacy as
             a Critical Variable." American Sociolog-
             ical Review 33: 20-30.

Malinowski, B.
  1948   "Magic, Science and Religion." Pp.1-71
             in B. Malinowski, Magic, Science and Religion
             and Other Essays. Glencoe, Illinois: The
             Free Press.

Mannheim, Karl
  1952   "The Problem of Generations." Pp.276-
             322 in P. Keczkemeti (ed.), Karl Mannheim,
             Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge.
             London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Marcus, Lotte
  1978   "The Situation of the Elderly and their
             Families: Problems and Solutions." Paper
             prepared for the National Symposium on
             Aging, Ottawa (October).

Marshall, Victor W.
  1978-79   "No Exit: A Symbolic Interactionist Per-
             spective on Aging." International Journal
             of Aging and Human Development 9:345-358.

Marshall, Victor W.
  1980   Last Chapters. A Sociology of Aging and
             Dying. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole
             Publishing Co.

Marshall, Victor W.
  1981   "The Changing Family Relationships of Older
  forth-   People." QSEP Research Report No.   ,
  coming   Program for Quantitative Studies in Economics
             and Population, McMaster University, Hamilton,
             Ontario.

Matthews, Sarah H.
  1979   The Social World of Old Women: Management
             of Self-Identity. Beverly Hills/London:
             Sage Publications.

McDonald, Gerald W.
   1980   "Family Power: The Assessment of a Decade of
                Theory and Research, 1970-1979." _Journal
                of Marriage and the Family_ 42:841-854.

McKinley, D.G.
   1964   _Social Class and Family Life_. Glencoe,
                Illinois: Free Press.

Miller, S.J.
   1965   "The Social Dilemma of the Aging Leisure
                Participant." Pp.77-92 in A.M. Rose and
                W.A. Peterson (eds.), _Older People and Their
                Social World_. Philadelphia: F.A. Davis Co.

Moore, Wilbert
   1967   "Aging and the Social System." Pp.23-41
                in John C. McKinney and Frank T. de Vyver
                (eds.), _Aging and Social Policy_. New York:
                Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Morgan, D.H.J.
   1975   _Social Theory and the Family_. London and
                Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Myerhoff, Barbara
   1978   _Number Our Days_. New York: E.P. Dutton.

National Institutes of Health
   1979   "The Older Woman: Continuities and Dis-
                continuities." Report of the National
                Institute on Aging and the National Institute
                of Mental Health Workshop, September, 1978.
                U.S. Department of Health, Education and
                Welfare: N.I.H. Publication Number 79-
                1897, October, 1979.

Neugarten, Bernice L.
   1979   "The Middle Generations." Pp.258-266 in
                Pauline K. Ragan (ed.), _Aging Parents_. The
                Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center: The
                University of Southern California Press.

Neugarten, Bernice L.,and Gunhild O. Hagestad
   1976   "Aging and the Life Course." Pp.35-57
                in R. Binstock and E. Shanas (eds.),
                Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences.
                New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Orr, John B.
   1979   "The Changing Family: A Social Ethical
                Perspective." Pp.377-388 in Virginia Tufte
                and Barbara Myerhoff (eds.), _Changing Images
                of the Family_. New Haven and London: Yale
                University Press.

Parnes, Herbert
    1954   Research on Labor Mobility. New York:
                Social Science Research Council.

Parsons, Talcott
    1942   "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of
                the United States." American Sociological
                Review 7:604-616.

Parsons, Talcott
    1943   "The Kinship System of the Contemporary
                United States." American Anthropologist
                45:22-38.

Parsons, Talcott
    1951   The Social System. New York: The Free
                Press.

Parsons, Talcott
    1954   "The Incest Taboo in Relation to Social
                Structure." The British Journal of Sociology
                5:101-117.

Parsons, Talcott
    1955   "Family Structure and the Socialization of
                the Child." Pp.35-131 in T. Parsons and
                R.F. Bales (eds.), Family, Socialization and
                Interaction Process. New York: The Free
                Press.

Parsons, Talcott, and Robert F. Bales
    1955   Family, Socialization and Interaction Process.
                New York: The Free Press.

Parsons, Talcott, and R. Fox
    1952   "Illness, Therapy, and the Modern Urban
                American Family." Journal of Social Issues
                8:31-44.

Pennock, Mike
    1977   Social Trends in Hamilton-Wentworth: A
                Statistical Compendium. Hamilton: Social
                Planning and Research Council of Hamilton
                and District.

Peterson, James A.
    1979   "The Relationships of Middle-aged Children
                and Their Parents." Pp.27-36 in Pauline K.
                Ragan (ed.), Aging Parents. The Ethel Percy
                Andrus Gerontology Center: The University of
                Southern California Press.

Porter, John
 1965 The Vertical Mosaic. An Analysis of Social
     Class and Power in Canada. Toronto: Univ-
     ersity of Toronto Press.

Reiss, P.J.
 1962 "Extended Kinship System: Correlates of and
     Attitudes to Frequency of Interaction."
     Marriage and Family Living 24:333-339.

Rogoff, Natalie
 1953 Recent Trends in Occupational Mobility.
     Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Rosenberg, G.S., and D.F. Anspach
 1973 "Sibling Solidarity in the Working Class."
     Journal of Marriage and the Family 35:108-
     113.

Rosenmayr, L.
 1977 "The Family -- A Source of Help for the
     Elderly?" Pp.132-157 in E. Shanas and
     M.B. Sussman (eds.), Family, Bureaucracy,
     and the Elderly. Durham, North Carolina:
     Duke University Press.

Rosenthal, Carolyn J., Victor W. Marshall, A.S. Macpherson,
and Susan French
 1980 Nurses, Patients and Families. London:
     Croom Helm.

Rosow, I.
 1967 Social Integration of the Aged. New York:
     The Free Press.

Rubin, Lillian B.
 1976 Worlds of Pain. New York: Basic Books.

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina
 1970 "The Study of Family Power Structure: A
     Review, 1960-1969." Journal of Marriage and
     the Family 32:539-551.

Scanzoni, J.H.
 1970 Opportunity and the Family. New York:
     Free Press.

Schwartz, Arthur N.
 1979 "Psychological Dependency: An Emphasis on
     the Later Years." Pp.116-125 in Pauline K.
     Ragan (ed.), Aging Parents. The Ethel Percy
     Andrus Gerontology Center: The University
     of Southern California Press.

Shanas, Ethel
   1967   "Family Help Patterns and Social Class in Three Countries." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29:257-266.

Shanas, Ethel
   1973   "Family-Kin Networks and Aging in Cross-Cultural Perspective." Journal of Marriage and the Family 35:505-511.

Shanas, Ethel
   1981   "Old Parents: Middle-Aged Children." Paper presented at the meetings of the International Association of Gerontology, Hamburg, Germany, July, 1981.

Shanas, Ethel, P. Townsend, D. Wedderburn, H. Friis, P. Milhøj, and J. Stehouwer
   1968   Old People in Three Industrial Societies. New York: Atherton Press.

Shapero, Albert, Richard Howell, and James Tombaugh
   1965   The Structure and Dynamics of the Defense R&D Industry. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute.

Shorter, Edward
   1977   The Making of the Modern Family, Paperback Edition. New York: Basic Books.

Skolnick, Arlene
   1978   The Intimate Environment, 2nd Edition. Boston/Toronto: Little, Brown.

Spiro, Melford
   1951   "Culture and Personality." Psychiatry 14: 19-46.

Stearns, Peter N.
   1976   Old Age in European Society: The Case of France. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.

Stebbins, Robert A.
   1967   "A Note on the Concept of Role Distance." American Journal of Sociology 72:247-250.

Stern, C. (ed.)
   1978   Gates of Repentance. New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Strauss, Anselm, L. Schatzman, D. Ehrlich, R. Bucher, and
M. Sabshin
   1963   "The Hospital and Its Negotiated Order."
               Pp.147-169 in Eliot Freidson (ed.), The
               Hospital in Modern Society. New York: The
               Free Press of Glencoe.

Streib, G.F.
   1958   "Family Patterns in Retirement." Journal of
               Social Issues 14:46-60.

Streib, G.F.
   1965   "Intergenerational Relations: Perspectives
               of the Two Generations on the Older Parent."
               Journal of Marriage and the Family 27:469-476.

Streib, G.F.
   1971   "Relations Between Older Family Members and
               Younger Generations." Family Coordinator 20:
               121-132.

Streib, G.F.
   1980   "The Aged, the Family and Society: A
               Sociological View." Paper presented at 33rd
               Annual Scientific Meeting of The Gerontolog-
               ical Society of America, San Diego, California,
               November, 1980.

Streib, G.F.,and C.J. Schneider
   1971   Retirement in American Society. Ithaca,
               New York: Cornell University Press.

Sussman, M.B.
   1953   "The Help Pattern in the Middle Class Family."
               American Sociological Review 18:22-28.

Sussman, M.B.
   1959   "The Isolated Nuclear Family: Fact or
               Fiction." Social Problems 6: 333-339.

Sussman, M.B.
   1965   "Relationships of Adult Children with Their
               Parents." Pp.62-92 in E. Shanas and G.
               Streib (eds.), Social Structure and the
               Family: Generational Relations. Englewood
               Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Sussman, M.B.,and Lee Burchinal
   1962   "Kin Family Network, Unheralded Structure in
               Current Conceptualization of Family Function-
               ing." Marriage and Family Living 24:231-240.

Sweetser, D.A.
    1963   "Asymmetry in Intergenerational Family
                Relationships." <u>Social Forces</u> 41:346-354.

Tigges, Leann, Donald Cowgill, and Robert Habenstein
    1980   "Confidant Relations of the Aged." Paper
                presented at the 33rd Annual Scientific
                Meeting of The Gerontological Society of
                America, San Diego, California, November,1980.

Townsend, Peter
    1963   <u>The Family Life of Old People, Revised
                Edition</u>. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Treas, Judith
    1977   "Family Support Systems for the Aged: Some
                Social and Demographic Considerations." <u>The
                Gerontologist</u> 17:486-491.

Treas, Judith
    1979   "Intergenerational Families and Social
                Change." Pp. 58-65 in Pauline K. Ragan (ed.),
                <u>Aging Parents</u>. The Ethel Percy Andrus
                Gerontology Center: The University of
                Southern California Press.

Troll, Lillian
    1971   "The Family of Later Life: A Decade Review."
                Journal of Marriage and the Family 33 :263-290.

Troll, Lillian, and Vern L. Bengtson
    1979   "Generations in the Family." Pp.127-161
                in W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye and I.L.
                Reiss (eds.), <u>Contemporary Theories About
                the Family, Volume 1</u>. New York: The Free
                Press.

Troll, Lillian, S. Miller, and R. Atchley
    1979   <u>Families in Later Life</u>. California:
                Wadwsorth.

Troll, Lillian, Bernice L. Neugarten and R.G. Kraines
    1969   "Similarities in Values and Other Personality
                Characteristics in College Students and
                Their Parents." <u>Merrill-Palmer Quarterly</u> 15:
                323-336.

Uhlenberg, Peter R.
    1969   "A Study of Cohort Life Cycles: Cohorts of
                Native Born Massachusetts Women, 1830-1920."
                <u>Population. Studies</u> 23:407-420.

Watson, J.A., and V.R. Kivett
    1973   "Influences on the Life Satisfaction of
                Older Fathers." Family Coordinator 25:
                482-488.

Weber, Max
    1946   Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford
                University Press.

Weinstein, Eugene A., and Paul Deutschberger
    1963   "Some Dimensions of Altercasting." Sociometry
                26:454-466.

Wells, Robert V.
    1973   "Demographic Change and the Life Cycle of
                American Families." Pp.85-94 in Theodore
                K. Rabb and Robert Rotberg (eds.), The Family
                in History. New York: Harper and Row.

Weishaus, Sylvia
    1979   "Aging is a Family Affair." Pp.154-174 in
                Pauline K. Ragan (ed.), Aging Parents.
                The Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center:
                The University of Southern California Press.

Wigdor, Blossom T.
    1978   "Implications of the Demographic Changes in
                the Canadian Population Over the Next 25
                Years." Paper prepared for the National
                Symposium on Aging, Ottawa, October, 1978.

Young, M., and P. Willmott
    1962   Family and Kinship in East London, Revised
                Edition. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Zaretsky, Eli
    1977   "Capitalism, The Family and Personal Life."
                Pp. 55-70 in N. Glazer and H. Waehrer (eds.),
                Woman in a Man-Made World. Chicago: Rand
                McNally.

Zay, Nicolas
    1978   "Old Age and Aging in Canada's Ethnic
                Population. Paper prepared for the
                National Symposium on Aging, Ottawa, October,1978.